



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2005

No. 33

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: In the Book of the Deuteronomy we read:

“The Lord your God has chosen you from all the nations on the face of Earth to be a people especially his own. It was because the Lord loves you and because his fidelity to the oath he has sworn to your fathers that He brought you out with a strong hand from the place of slavery and ransomed you.”

“Understand, then, that the Lord, your God, is God indeed, the faithful God who keeps his merciful covenant to the thousandth generation toward those who love him and keep his commandments.”

Lord, as we prepare for the great feasts of Passover and the Sacred Triduum, Lord our God, breathe forth Your Spirit on all the Members of Congress and the people of this great Nation. Make of us Your own. Recreate us in Your image. Convert our hearts that we may long to do Your will and that we may lead others in the world by revealing Your self-giving love in our lives.

You are faithful, O God, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain 5 one-minute speeches per side.

BILL SAVING TERRI SCHIAVO

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, last night when H.R. 1332 was passed by the House this Chamber did a good thing. It offered to the disabled an opportunity to live and it reaffirmed our culture's desire to value the right to life of each and every member of it regardless of disability.

This bill gives Terri Schiavo a right to appeal the ruling of the Florida State courts in Federal court, and it will allow her to challenge the ruling that she is to starve to death.

The bill applies only to medically incapacitated patients, not to convicted criminals. And it is further evidence that the disabled have a place in our culture, that life has a place in our culture.

I commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) for taking the lead and I thank the House leadership for expediting action on it. Now the Senate must do the same. Terri deserves to live.

MORALITY LACKING IN REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget. This budget is fiscally reckless, mor-

ally irresponsible and represents a failure of leadership.

The budget slashes funding that provides a vital lifeline to our most vulnerable communities. It cuts funding for support of housing for the disabled by 50 percent. Where is the morality in turning our back on the disabled?

This budget will dramatically cut housing opportunities for people living with AIDS. Where is the morality in forcing people living with AIDS to choose between medication and housing?

At the same time, this budget seeks to extend tax cuts to the most wealthy. Where is the morality in turning people out into the streets in order to pay for these tax cuts?

As a person of deep religious conviction, I know that there is nothing moral about balancing the budget on the backs of those who can least afford it. A moral budget does not seek to punish the least of these.

Mr. Speaker, this is an example, a gross example of the moral irresponsibility of the Republican budget.

U.S. TRADE AMBASSADOR PORTMAN

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, for those who are Irish, those that think they are Irish, and those that wish they were Irish, happy, happy St. Patrick's Day.

I would also like to take a moment to congratulate and commend the President of the United States, George Bush, for his appointment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, as the next United States Trade ambassador.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H1625

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) is an outstanding, outstanding choice. He is one of the hardest working, most thoughtful members of our panel. He has immersed himself in the details of trade and tax law. He is an extraordinary individual who has served this President in a wonderful way as adviser to the White House and one of the closest confidants he has here on Capitol Hill.

I believe it is an extraordinary opportunity, not only for the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and his family but for the United States trade representation around the globe. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the building to quickly dispatch that name forward to the committee of responsibility and urge the passage and allow the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) to show the great credentials he has displayed in our committee on this floor and ultimately as the next trade ambassador for the country.

SOCIAL SECURITY PRIVATIZATION HARMS AMERICANS

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise because the constituents in the 32nd Congressional District are very concerned about the privatization of Social Security.

There are nearly 60,000 Social Security beneficiaries in my district who are very concerned about the risky privatization scheme that the President is proposing. However, other young workers also are very concerned about the future of their retirement security.

To date my office has held well over 25 senior center visits, high school visits, parent centers visits, and health care facilities visits, and we have spoken to constituents about this proposed privatization plan. We have been asking them to fill out surveys on how they feel about Social Security. We have one in English and one in Spanish.

Overwhelmingly, my constituents are telling me that they are not in agreement with the proposed privatization plan. They would like to see a secure and a structured reform that would truly be available to every single individual that needs and requires Social Security assistance. I would like to tell Members that we have received well over 300 responses through e-mail and direct mail from our constituents who are resoundingly saying that the President should rethink his plan.

COMMENDING HARRY GILMORE

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Harry Gilmore, the first American Ambassador to Ar-

menia who is the latest U.S. official to publicly acknowledge the Armenian genocide and call for international recognition.

In an interview with Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, the retired diplomat recently said, "There is no doubt that the Armenian events were genocide."

Gilmore's comments followed those of the current U.S. Ambassador to Armenia, John Evans, who recently evoked the Armenian Genocide during his first stateside visit to Armenian communities across the country. During a series of public exchanges with Armenians late last month, Evans stated, "The Armenian genocide was the first genocide of the twentieth century."

As a proud member of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues and an ardent supporter of Fresno's Armenian American community, I thank the Ambassadors for their statements and pledge to continue my efforts for a full United States affirmation of the Armenian genocide.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. Res. 23

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 23.

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

There was no objection.

SAVE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to the administration's budget proposal.

Although the Community Development Block Grant Program is now on its way out if this is approved, I think it is important for the Nation to know that on August 22, 1974, the Community Development Block Grant Act was signed into law by Republican President Gerald Ford, but it is the brain child of President Richard Nixon.

Today, there is a proposal that would allow for a consolidation of 18 other programs in the Department of Commerce, and the new commerce program would then be funded at a level that is 35 percent lower than the combined fiscal year 2005 appropriated level for all 18 programs.

The pro-rata reduction of CDBG alone would be \$1.42 billion. That would devastate a program, Mr. Speaker.

When I was mayor of Kansas City, Missouri, we identified 60,000 homes in need of rehabilitation or repair. We were able to complete 12,000. What will happen to the 48,000 others?

STOP YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROJECT NOW

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the last 20 years the Nevada delegation, Republican and Democrat, have fought to keep the Yucca Mountain Project from becoming a reality.

What is the Yucca Mountain Project? 77,000 tons of toxic nuclear waste being transported across 43 States to be buried in a hole in the Nevada desert where we have groundwater issues, seismic activity, and volcanic activity.

The President when he approved this said that his decision was based on sound science. Sound science? There were 294 unresolved scientific and technical issues.

There is no canister that can safely store this radioactive waste, and we have a court decision that says that rather than a 10,000-year standard for radiation there should be a 300,000-year standard for radiation.

Now, as of yesterday, the new Secretary of Energy has come forward and disclosed that the scientific documentation for Yucca Mountain has been falsified. It is about time that the rest of the country knew what the Nevada delegation knows and has been saying for 20 years. This is not based on sound science. It is based on sound politics.

I have urged the Secretary of Energy to appoint an independent body to investigate the science. We know now it has been falsified. It is wrong. This is a bad project and I urge the President to rescind his order to Yucca Mountain and stop this project now.

CORPORATE TAX RATE

(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, more than 260,000 jobs were created last month making February the 21st straight month in which we have seen steady job gains. Companies are hiring more and more these days. More people are now collecting well-earned paychecks rather than unemployment checks. However, companies here in the U.S. are facing competition from around the globe, and to ensure economic prosperity over the long run we must be competitive in the world. To do this we have to address corporate tax rates.

Why do we penalize American companies for keeping their business here in the U.S.? Why are companies leaving America to go overseas? Should we not be trying to attract businesses rather than drive them away?

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. corporate tax rate is a whopping 40 percent. For every \$10 a company earns, \$4 has to be sent to the IRS. It is no wonder businesses are taking a look at moving out

of the country. Our tax code is literally sucking jobs right out of the economy by depriving our businesses of the money that should be invested in hiring.

Only one other country, Japan, taxes its companies more than we, only one other country. Mr. Speaker, clearly that is not the road we want to travel and it is not the way we want to create jobs.

REJECT WOLFOWITZ AS WORLD BANK NOMINEE

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

Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed to learn that President Bush has nominated the architect of the ongoing war of Iraq, Mr. Paul Wolfowitz, to head the World Bank.

The nominee's intimate relationship with the Iraq policy's gravest failures, phony intelligence, torture, contractor corruption, and incompetent planning, makes his nomination extremely disturbing.

□ 1015

Mr. Wolfowitz may be qualified as an expert in conducting preemptive war, but he is far from qualified to battle global poverty, overcome the AIDS pandemic or to promote gender equity, all World Bank priorities.

The world community deserves a development expert to champion the World Bank's mission of fighting poverty, a leader who can rally the world's support.

To enhance America's reputation in the world, to ensure that future success of the World Bank and to build a better future for the world's poorest citizens, I urge the World Bank's board of directors to reject this nomination.

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 H. Con. Res. 95.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR). 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.

□ 1016

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. SHAW (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 16, 2005, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 109-19, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), had been postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 109-19.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. OBEY:

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

(1) In paragraph (4) (relating to the deficit), the amount of the deficit for fiscal year 2006 shall be reduced by \$10,091,000,000.

(2) In paragraph (1) (relating to Federal revenues), the recommended level of Federal revenues for fiscal year 2006 shall be increased by \$18,073,000,000 and the amount by which the aggregate level of Federal revenues should be changed shall be increased by \$18,073,000,000.

(3) In paragraph (2) (relating to new budget authority), the appropriate level of total new budget authority for fiscal year 2006 shall be increased by \$15,800,000,000.

(4) In paragraph (3) (relating to budget outlays), the appropriate level of total budget outlays for fiscal year 2006 shall be increased by \$7,982,000,000.

In section 102, for fiscal year 2006:

(1) In paragraph (1) (relating to National Defense (050)), the amount of new budget authority shall be reduced by \$1,000,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be reduced by \$678,000,000.

(2) In paragraph (2) (relating to International Affairs (150)), the amount of new budget authority shall be reduced by \$423,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be reduced by \$193,000,000.

(3) In paragraph (3) (relating to General Science, Space and Technology (250)), the amount of new budget authority shall be increased by \$300,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$150,000,000, to fund basic research and development to allow American workers to compete in the international economy.

(4) In paragraph (5) (relating to Natural Resources and Environment (300)), the amount of new budget authority shall be increased by \$100,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$63,000,000, to provide clean water and open spaces for future generations.

(5) In paragraph (6) (relating to Agriculture (350)), the amount of new budget authority shall be increased by \$540,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$446,000,000, to improve economic opportunities, infrastructure, and the quality of life for rural Americans.

(6) In paragraph (8) (relating to Transportation (400)), the amount of new budget au-

thority shall be increased by \$600,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$460,000,000, to improve infrastructure development.

(7) In paragraph (10) (relating to Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500)), the amount of new budget authority shall be increased by \$8,050,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$2,977,000,000, to create opportunities for our children and young adults, and to address the needs of low-income communities and assist the long-term unemployed.

(8) In paragraph (11) (relating to Health (550)), the amount of new budget authority shall be increased by \$1,950,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$723,000,000, to provide health care for children and others in need, control infectious diseases, foster medical research, and alleviate shortages of nurses and other health professionals.

(9) In paragraph (13) (relating to Income Security (600)), the amounts of new budget authority shall be increased by \$1,091,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$695,000,000, to help provide housing and energy assistance to the poor and alleviate the impact of refugees on State and local communities.

(10) In paragraph (15) (relating to Veterans Benefits and Services (700)), the amounts of new budget authority shall be increased by \$2,903,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$2,447,000,000, to maintain quality health care for veterans.

(11) In paragraph (17) (relating to General Government (800)), the amounts of new budget authority shall be decreased by \$56,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be decreased by \$44,000,000, which shall include the following changes:

(A) Increase new budget authority by \$200,000,000 and outlays by \$155,000,000, to ensure corporate responsibility.

(B) Reduce new budget authority by \$256,000,000 and outlays by \$199,000,000.

(12) To improve our hometown response capabilities, strengthen our borders and ports, and meet our security mandates, amounts of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2006 shall be further modified as follows:

(A) In paragraph (9) (relating to community and regional development (450)), increase new budget authority by \$660,000,000 and outlays by \$121,000,000.

(B) In paragraph (16) (relating to Administration of Justice (750)), increase new budget authority by \$935,000,000 and outlays by \$759,000,000.

(C) In paragraph (11) (relating to Health (550)), increase new budget authority by \$150,000,000 and outlays by \$56,000,000.

In section 201(b) (relating to reconciliation in the House of Representatives), insert "(1)" after "(b)" and add at the end the following new paragraph:

(2) REDUCTION IN TAX CUTS FOR TAXPAYERS WITH INCOMES ABOVE \$1,000,000.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall also include in the reconciliation bill reported pursuant to paragraph (1) changes in tax laws sufficient to increase revenues by \$25,818,000,000, to be achieved by reducing or offsetting the tax reductions received during 2006 by taxpayers with adjusted gross income above \$1,000,000 for taxpayers filing joint returns and comparable amounts for taxpayers with other filing statuses as a result of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 and the Jobs and Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 154, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will enable the House to choose between the social Darwinism of the President's budget and a different budget which more accurately reflects the message of the social gospel.

If we take a look at what the President has done, he inherited a \$240 billion surplus when he came into office, and yet the budget he presents to the Congress today contains a \$290 billion deficit. That deficit does not include the \$80 billion that we spent yesterday on the war on Iraq. It does not include the \$2 trillion it is estimated will be the cost of borrowing to pay for the personal or private accounts that the President wants to use to blow up Social Security. It does not include dollar one of the \$1.2 trillion it is estimated that it will cost to make the President's previously passed tax cuts permanent. So we have a huge deficit as far as the eye can see, under the President's budget.

Then the President tries to reclaim the mantle of fiscal responsibility by making some well-publicized cuts in the domestic discretionary portion of the budget. In plain terms, that is the appropriated part of the budget that goes for programs like education, health care, science, veterans benefits, things like that.

The President's cuts in the domestic arena do not lay a glove on the deficit because the deficit is so large; but I would point out, for instance, that those cuts average only about 5 percent of the over \$200 billion cost in this year's budget alone of the President's tax cuts. They are less than 20 percent of the over-\$50 billion in costs, for the cost of the supersize tax cuts that the President has given to the top 1 percent of earners in this country. But those cuts are large enough, Mr. Chairman, to do great damage over time in the investments that we need to make in education, health care, science, veterans, community infrastructure and the like.

In real terms, those cuts amount, after you adjust for inflation, to about \$16 billion; and if you further adjust them for population growth, that is a real reduction in services of about \$19 billion for those programs.

So this amendment does basically three things. It cuts \$5 million from some of the President's proposed initiatives, and it combines those cuts with savings on the tax front. What we do on the tax front is to just simply recognize the essential injustice of the fact that right now folks who make more than \$1 million in this country this year will on average get a \$140,000 tax cut. This amendment would limit that \$140,000 tax cut to about \$27,000 and save enough money to devote \$10 billion to deficit reduction and to use the other \$16 billion for the initiatives that we have outlined in the amendment in

the area of education, health, science, veterans, homeland security, environment, law enforcement, and community development.

Now, within that framework, we are able to add \$2.4 billion to programs that can do real things to reduce the pressures for abortions. Among the critical investments made by this amendment are a cluster of programs that would make it economically easier for low-income and vulnerable women who choose to carry pregnancies to term by providing additional funding for maternal and infant health care, for child care and Head Start and after-school programs, for low-income housing assistance, for the community service block grant, to provide people with the opportunity to get help in the education and training areas, and also to provide additional medical services such as dental care. We also provide additional funding for child abuse and domestic violence prevention programs.

Now, I would simply say that if our concern for life does not stop at the checkbook's edge, then these are initiatives which ought to be supported by everybody in this Chamber.

The reason I offer this amendment is because over the last 30 years something really bad has happened in this country. Thirty years ago, we had the smallest gap between rich and poor of any industrialized country in the world. Today, we have the largest gap between the rich and the poor of any industrialized country.

The wealthiest 1 percent of people in this country control 33 percent of the Nation's wealth. The poorest 40 percent are struggling to hang on to less than 3 percent of the Nation's wealth, and the President's budget makes it worse.

That is why I say that this amendment helps us choose between the social Darwinism of the President's package and values that more accurately reflect the social gospel.

Now, the opposition will say, "Oh, we do not need these additional education dollars because we have had such a large increase in education the past 2 years!" Let me point out the Republican majority has been dragged kicking and screaming into supporting those education increases.

If Congress had approved House Republican Labor-H bills for education over the past 10 years, we would be spending \$19 billion less on education than we are spending today. On title I, if House Republican bills had passed, we would have spent \$2.8 billion less for title I grants to school districts than we are spending today. After-school centers, if the administration's budget request had been passed throughout the years, we would be providing \$1 million less to local school districts for help in that program, and the list goes on and on.

So I would ask, Mr. Chairman, do we really want to pay for \$140,000 tax cuts for the most well-off people in this society by providing real cuts in the

number of grants that the National Institutes of Health will be able to finance research grants into cancer, diabetes, Parkinson's and the like? Do we really want to pay for \$120,000 in tax cuts for the most well-off in this society by continuing to mount barriers that prevent people without means to get a college education for their kids?

The College Board last year indicated that the average cost of attendance at a 4-year public university has increased by \$2,300 over the past 4 years, biggest 4-year increase in history. The President's answer to that is to toss an extra hundred dollars on the table in the form of Pell grants, and then he pays for it by wiping out Perkins loans and a number of other education initiatives for those same people.

I really think that the issue is very simple. All this amendment does is to prevent real reductions in the kinds of programs that I have just talked about. What it does is to restore our ability to at least keep up with inflation on those programs by saying to the most well-off people in this country, "Sorry, folks, you are going to have to get along with a tax cut of only \$27,000." Most of them I think would agree that this is a far more socially just and economically wise set of decisions to make than the budget resolution we have before us.

This applies only for 1 year. We do not get into any games about 5-year or 10-year budgets. This applies only for the next year. This is the priority statement which people will be able to make on appropriated portions of the budget for the coming year; and if they think these priorities are better, I hope they vote for the amendment. If they think they are not, then they have a perfect right to vote against it.

I would urge an "aye" vote.

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

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

I rise with great respect for the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations and in agreement, frankly, with his final comments about this, his alternative to our budget, laying out a different approach, a different set of priorities for this Nation, and that is the beauty of this deliberative body. Frankly, it was the beauty of the fairness of the rule I believe that was crafted that allowed four separate approaches, four separate sets of priorities in budgeting to be debated and considered on this House floor.

But I must strongly oppose the Obey amendment. It authorizes higher, uncontrolled spending, while at the same time cutting national defense in a time when our soldiers and sailors and Marines and airmen and Guardsmen and Reservists are engaged all around the world, an unacceptable notion.

In addition to cutting our spending on national defense, it raises taxes by an estimated \$18 billion for the next fiscal year. It does increase education

spending by \$8 billion. It increases veterans spending and health care spending as well, but I would add that in a time when we are engaged in an unprecedented war on terror and waging a separate effort against growing budget deficits, that the level of growth laid out by the House Committee on the Budget's spending plan meets our national priorities, continues our commitment to veterans and education.

□ 1030

The Department of Education under the House budgets for the last 10 years, the Department of Education's spending has gone up 146 percent over the last decade. It is hard to argue that is an inadequate rate of growth. Veterans spending continues to grow. Investments in IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act have gone up dramatically higher than in the previous 10 years under a different management of this House.

This budget resolution that comes out of the House committee sets these priorities moving our Nation forward and protecting our homeland, investing in homeland security, investing in national defense and in our personnel who are in harm's way, and it maintains those policies of pro-growth that allows our economy to expand, that allows small businesses, medium businesses, and even large businesses to operate in a climate where they want to grow and hire employees and continue to open up new markets around the world, giving Americans new opportunities to move products and giving Americans the opportunity to achieve the American dream.

Congress has addressed extraordinary spending demands in the last several years. They bring us face to face with the reality that it is an unsustainable rate of spending growth, one that must be slowed. Last year's projected deficit was \$521 billion, but we ended the year with a deficit of \$412 billion, reducing that deficit by 20 percent. Although that number is staggeringly high, admittedly, this House-passed budget, the committee-passed budget, puts us on track to cut that deficit in half in 5 years. In doing so it makes some tough decisions, which is what we are paid to do around here.

It requires us to prioritize and make tradeoffs while ensuring that those highest priorities are fully funded and met, and in the House budget we identify that highest priority as being national security and homeland security. This amendment, the amendment we are debating today, cuts defense spending and we find that to be unacceptable in today's climate.

The budget slows the growth of mandatory spending by 0.1 percent over 5 years, from its current rate of 6.4 percent to 6.3 percent. I think that is an important fact. While we spend an awful lot of time in this Chamber talking about cuts, what we are doing is slowing the rate of growth. If someone were to offer workers a 6.3 percent pay

raise, it would be a pretty good deal. The fact that these programs continue to grow at 6.3 rather than 6.4 percent is not throwing starving children into the streets. It is not taking food out of seniors' mouths. It is not wrecking our ability to be a compassionate and decent society, it is simply recognizing the simple fact that we cannot maintain the dramatic rates of growth we have been engaged in for the past decade and solve the deficit problem.

This budget resolution continues to make homeland and national security major priorities. Since September 11, Congress has spent nearly \$1.9 trillion to provide for defense and homeland security, not including supplementals. Like last year's budget, this plan takes into account funding for the ongoing war in Iraq. The resolution budgets \$50 billion to provide for the ongoing war against terrorism. The national defense budget continues the multiyear plan to enable our Armed Services both to fight the war against terrorism now and to transform itself to counter unconventional threats in the future. It fully accommodates the President's request for defense.

Mr. Chairman, the last time we made any real effort to rein in spending, that piece of spending in our budget that makes up 55 percent of the budget, was in 1997. That 55 percent is what we call mandatory spending. I know that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is very familiar with this. As an appropriator, he has seen his share of the budget in discretionary shrink over time, and it will continue to without us making important reforms on the mandatory side of the ledger.

This budget, again for the first time since 1997, instructs the authorizing committees, those committees with the greatest expertise in their areas of jurisdiction, through the reconciliation process to find \$7.8 billion in savings for next year and \$68.6 billion in savings over the next 5 years. What that means is we are putting the people who understand these policy areas best, we are putting them on the trail to find out the ways to help make those programs be the most effective and the most efficient. They know best the successes and failures in the myriad of government programs that are now on autopilot through the mandatory spending process.

It is estimated that if mandatory spending grows at its current pace, by 2015 it will consume 62 percent of the Federal government. I think it is an important piece of our budget that we begin the process of mandatory spending reform. That reform happens through the reconciliation process.

A number of the President's key initiatives supported in this budget include \$40 billion for homeland security outside the Department of Defense; an additional \$2.5 billion for Project BioShield to secure new vaccines against smallpox, anthrax and other deadly bioterrorist threats. These funds follow on the heels of massive increases over

the past several years to make sure our Nation is prepared to deal with the terrorist threats we know are out there.

I support our budget. It is an important, thoughtful, prioritized budget that makes some tough decisions. I appreciate the gentleman's right to offer an alternative vision. That is what this is. This is a clash of visions, a clash of priorities that our Nation faces. Do we grow our way out of the deficit by fostering a climate that encourages people to find work and start businesses and grow existing businesses, or do we take the approach that we should tax our way out of the deficits? Do we fund our priorities? And what are our highest priorities? Our approach is our highest priority in a time of war is national defense, and our high priority in a time of increased threats from terrorism is homeland security.

We believe that it is important to follow the lead of other Presidents, other administrations, other Congresses that have found themselves budgeting in a time of war to make necessary tradeoffs. The New Deal agencies when World War II came about did not continue to receive the same level of funding. In fact, it was President Roosevelt himself who curtailed and even eliminated a number of the agencies he created.

We recognize in our budget that we cannot continue to spend on the domestic side as aggressively as we had at a time of peace when we are at war, and to that end we call for a 0.8 percent reduction in nonsecurity domestic discretionary spending. While it is an important first step and it has not been done since the Reagan administration, it will hardly cause starvation and pandemonium in the streets at a 0.8 percent reduction. Nor will the directed reconciliation process to the authorizing committees do the same.

We make some tough choices. We admit that. We lay out our priorities, and we proudly defend them. And those priorities include investing in defense, caring for those most in need and creating an economic climate that allows people to succeed without raising the burden of taxation on them.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), but I think he must have been talking about a different amendment. The gentleman refers to significant cuts in national defense. There is only one cut in any program that can be considered at all related to national defense in this amendment, and that is a \$1 billion reduction in the Star Wars account because they have had so many technical problems with that program that they cannot in the coming fiscal year spend all of the money that has been provided to them. So the practical impact on the program will be zero. That is the only reduction in defense.

I would point out that this comes on top of a \$16 billion increase in the defense budget which is before us right now, and it comes on top of the \$80 billion that we added yesterday for Iraq that was not counted in the President's budget. So I would suggest it is a red herring to claim this has any significant negative effect on defense. In fact, I will bet Members that considerably more than a billion dollars remains unspent from that Star Wars account at the end of the fiscal year because of technical problems that the Pentagon itself has admitted are there.

With respect to tax increases, I know the majority party likes to pretend that Democrats are talking about tax increases for the middle class. The facts are quite to the contrary. The only people who will lose anything by way of tax cuts in this amendment are people who make more than a million dollars a year. Under existing law if we leave things as they are right now, if you make less than \$10,000, you average about an \$8 tax cut under the President's package. If you make less than \$20,000, you will get back the princely sum of \$326. If you make \$500,000 to \$1 million, you will get on average a \$27,000 tax cut. And if you make \$1 million adjusted gross income or more, on average you will get a tax cut of \$140,000.

I do not know many people in that bracket who would not feel that investing in children, investing in homeland security, investing in veterans' benefits is preferable to giving those folks a super-size tax cut. We are not saying they cannot have a tax cut, we are simply limiting the size of their tax cut to \$27,000 so we can meet these other investment needs. I think the vast majority of citizens in this country would think that is a better balance and a better set of priorities.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to be here on the floor once again, this time as a member of the Committee on the Budget. After being absent from this floor for 16 years, some things are comforting, such as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) still maintains his skepticism about the anti-missile system. I appreciate that. I appreciate that in terms of his concern about us spending too much money this year in that regard.

With respect to the comments made by some on the other side of the aisle that somehow the Republican budget is immoral, and I heard that during the one-minute speeches, and somehow it does not follow a standard of social justice or the social gospel, I tried to look at the numbers to see what we are talking about, and if one looks at any graph that looks at the mandatory spending, we see the difference between the baseline and what we have placed

in this budget is almost indistinguishable.

So then I looked at some of the other areas that the gentleman has spoken to, and one is the National Institutes of Health. I thought since I have been gone and since the Republicans have taken over the House of Representatives that reflecting the comments about the Republican attitude toward NIH, that somehow we had denuded NIH in the time since Republicans had taken over. So I went back and checked it out, and under Republican Congresses, NIH spending has doubled between 1999 and the year 2003, rising from \$13.6 billion in 1999 to \$27.2 billion in the year 2003.

□ 1045

Again I heard a comment about veterans, that somehow Republicans are not concerned about veterans. I went back and checked the numbers since I was last here. Since 1995, total spending on veterans, that is, 1995 since the Republicans took over, total spending on veterans has increased from \$38.2 billion to \$67.6 billion. That is a 77 percent increase.

I wanted to see how that compared with the previous 10 years, again, most of which I was gone, but during which the Democrats were in control of the House; and I found out that there was a 40 percent increase during the previous 10 years.

I would not on this floor suggest that the Democrats were immoral in their approach to the veterans in their previous 10 years even though their increase for veterans was substantially lower than Republicans'. It is not a question of morality, it is not a question of social justice, it is not a question of social gospel, the words that I heard expressed just a moment ago; but, rather, it is a question as to where we are now. After we have had significant, hefty increases in these particular areas during the time that Republicans have been in control, is it a time for us to slow down that increased rate of growth during a time in which we finally are confronting the fiscal responsibility that is visited upon this House as our obligation and our authority?

During the time I was gone, I was able to observe this House from a distance, and I realized there is a real disconnect. People back home seem to think that we are spending too much. They are not arguing for increased taxes. I understand the gentleman believes that an increase in taxes on some people is not a general increase in taxes. We can always follow that old slogan, Don't tax you, don't tax me, tax that guy behind the tree. It is always that game, I will not call it a game, it is always that approach that can be relevant in debates such as this.

But the fact of the matter is that the gentleman from Wisconsin has with sincerity presented us an amendment that increases taxes and increases spending. That is the long and short of

it. The suggestion is that somehow we have been unfaithful to our charge to be concerned about the education of the people of America and the veterans. That charge is just patently false. The fact of the matter is we now have established priorities overall for our spending. We believe we have done this in a responsible way. We believe we have done this in a way that most Americans would support. We believe we have made sure that we are not going to cut defense.

The gentleman has suggested \$1 billion less spending in defense. I think most Members would not support that. We can suggest to the appropriators and the authorizing committees where they ought to cut, but we cannot demand that. So the gentleman's desire that they take the \$1 billion out of a particular place is not necessarily where it is going to come out of. The only thing we know if we adopt the gentleman's amendment is that we will be spending \$1 billion less on national defense at a time when very few Americans would support that.

With all due respect to the gentleman from Wisconsin, I appreciate his approach. It is a consistent approach that he has used; but it is an approach that, yes, increases spending and increases taxes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes. I find the logic of the gentleman interesting. He says that this amendment will result in cutting defense \$1 billion. It will not. It will result in a defense budget increase of \$16 billion, not counting the \$80 billion add-on that we provided yesterday. All we are doing is eliminating \$1 billion of the increase because it cannot be spent because of technical problems in the program. That does not reduce the effective firepower of the United States by one bullet.

Let me also note the gentleman had some interesting comments on mandatories. This amendment does not touch mandatories. All we are dealing with in our amendment is the appropriated side of the budget for 1 year alone. We are not getting into the argument about mandatories. That is in the jurisdiction of another committee. So the gentleman's remarks are interesting, but irrelevant in terms of this amendment.

With respect to NIH, let me simply say, we can talk about how much it has been increased the past few years. If you think it is a good idea for us to have 500 fewer research grants out in the field attacking cancer, attacking Parkinson's, attacking diabetes, then by all means vote against my amendment. If you think we ought to correct that, I would urge you to vote for it. If you think we are spending enough on veterans, then by all means vote against this amendment. If you think we are not, then I would suggest you vote for our amendment which adds \$3 billion to the veterans health care budget.

We have a huge hole in the services that we provide veterans. All you have

to do to realize that is to talk to some of those soldiers who have come back missing arms, missing legs, missing eyes. If you are comfortable with the amount that we are providing for the VA now, by all means vote against my amendment. Otherwise, vote for it. If you are comfortable with the fact that the President's budget will make it harder for low-income seniors to keep their houses heated during wintertime, then by all means vote against the amendment.

But do not do what 40 Members of the majority party did last year. After they voted for a budget which required a squeeze on all kinds of domestic programs, then they wrote our committee a letter asking us to increase funding for LIHEAP, increase funding for education, something which we could not do under the budget which the majority imposed on us.

As the gentleman said, this is a question of priorities, and I make no apology for mine.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the distinguished ranking member's suggestion that if we disagree we should vote against it, and I assure him that we shall.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I was listening and I heard the very distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin suggest that his cuts to defense were slowing down the rate of growth for defense. It is kind of an interesting argument. I hope that the Members on his side listened to that argument because we are doing the same thing. We are slowing down the rate of growth. All of the mandatory programs will receive increases. All of those automatic spending programs will receive increases. All we are asking for is reform in slowing down the rate of growth. I have enormous respect for the gentleman when it comes to his advocacy for finding savings in defense. We should look for savings in defense. We should look for reforms. I do not think we should do that necessarily today during a war; but when you argue to slow the rate of growth, I think it is a valuable argument. I hope that we hear that more often now. When we hear about these drastic, dramatic cuts to the mandatory programs in the future, I hope they will listen to the very distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I could not resist speaking this morning on this amendment that promotes, in my opinion, family values. The budget instructions call for \$4.3 billion in cuts in education. How does that reflect family values? It calls for a \$69 billion reduction in health care programs like Medicaid and food stamps. I as a parent and as a Member of this body would hope that the majority

would see the wisdom in adopting the Obey amendment.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the newest member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, he did mention I am the newest member, but I am also the only CPA on the committee. I brought that burden to the activities of the committee. It seems that every business that I have ever consulted with, every client that I have ever had, every family that I am aware of has to live within their means. All of us can at one point or another spend more money than we are bringing in, whether it is family or a business; but you cannot do it very long.

The only organization that can do it over an extended amount of time is this body, is the Federal Government here in Washington, DC. Just because it can should not mean that it should. And we should not be doing that. We are leaving debt to our children that they will have to pay off or that they will have to look their children in the eye and say, We're going to pass it on to you. Our grandparents passed it on to us, and we're going to keep passing this thing on.

The issue of living within our means means that you have to make some tough choices and you do have to set some priorities. The Budget Committee hearing on members' day, we sat there all day long and listened to a long litany of amendments just like this one, couched in the phrases that we have already heard, that these are not family values when you, quote-unquote, cut spending; these are not love for the military when you cut spending for veterans and veterans affairs. You can make these arguments that if you vote against mom, apple pie and the girl you left behind, you are a horrible person; but the truth of the matter is all across this Nation, all of us have to make tough decisions on where we spend our money.

I stand in opposition to this amendment. The budget that is going to be proposed later on today does in fact make some of those tough choices, begins to start that process of trying to force this government to live within its means. Tax revenues are going up because the economy that we live in is improving. That is the way that we ought to do it. But we have to hold down spending. Reducing the rate of growth overall in mandatory spending by one-tenth percent from 6.4 percent growth to 6.3 percent growth, I am hard pressed as an accountant and a CPA to understand why that is a cut. It is just a slowdown in the growth of increases.

The other side presents every one of these very good programs as if they are the best they can be, that they are totally efficient, that they are not spending money where they should not. I do not think that is the case. I stand in

opposition to this gentleman's amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply cite a couple of other specifics. One of my objections to the President's budget is that the President is not asking to slow the rate of increase in education; the President is asking us to cut education funding below last year's level at the same time that we have laid the mother of all mandates on local school districts. Under No Child Left Behind, we have given them a whole set of marching orders. They are very expensive marching orders, but we have fallen more than \$9 billion behind the amount that we promised in the authorization that we would be providing to those local school districts if we passed those education mandates. It seems to me we ought to live up to our promise.

Pell grants. Pell grants is the major program that enables young people from poor families to go to college so that "equal opportunity" is something other than a slogan in this country. Under the President's budget, the percentage of cost at a 4-year public university that will be paid for by Pell grants will drop from 41 percent to 34 percent. I do not call that progress.

I would also point out that the President's budget requires the imposition of new fees on veterans in order to gain access to the veterans health care system. I do not think we ought to do that.

So the issue before us is very simple. Do you want to insist that we give tax cuts of \$140,000 on average to people who make over a million bucks? Or do you want to scale those tax cuts back to \$27,000 on average and use that money to invest in more care for our veterans, to invest in better education for our kids, to invest in a stronger homeland defense, to invest in more efforts to protect our parks from encroachment?

The choice is simple. I think it is very clear where the American people come down on this.

I will repeat my assertion. I believe the President's budget adds to the gap between the wealthy and the poor in this country. In that sense, I think it is social Darwinism. I repeat that charge, I stand by it, and I think that this in contrast more nearly recognizes the message of the social gospel, which is that we do need to care about each other.

I would remind you of the words, "What you do for the least of these, you do for me." That is what this amendment is trying to do. I make no apology for it.

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

The gentleman is right. It is simple. His amendment is not a complete substitute for our budget. It is simply reducing the amount of growth in defense, as he clarified for us, and increasing taxes.

□ 1100

He points out the eight-tenths of 1 percent reduction in nonsecurity domestic discretionary spending. Does the gentleman believe that in amongst the stacks of GAO reports that come across his desk as the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, our desk in the Committee on the Budget, that there is not eight-tenths of 1 percent? Eight-tenths of 1 percent in one's personal budget they lose on diet Cokes on the way to work every morning. Eight-tenths of 1 percent cannot be found in negotiating a better deal on computer equipment, office supplies, travel, increased financial accounting?

Spending for education, one that he pointed out specifically, has gone up 146 percent over the last 10 years, and now we are talking about shaving eight-tenths of 1 percent off. Pell grants, the President calls for them to go up. Our budget would allow for that. Fees for veterans are not even budgeted for in this. While the gentleman rightly pointed out the President's budget, the President's budget is not up for debate today, and this budget that the House will vote on later does not call for fees on our veterans.

I urge a "no" vote on the Obey amendment and support for the underlying House budget.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would simply say the gentleman asked whether I thought that we could possibly find places in the budget that are wasteful that we could eliminate in order to meet the limits of the budget resolution. I would ask him how did he vote yesterday on our motion to create a Truman-like committee to investigate the fraud that is going on in the part of a number of military contractors in Iraq? We hear daily stories about how taxpayers are being ripped off. If the gentleman is concerned about taxpayers' money being wasted, why did he not vote for that amendment yesterday instead of voting against it like every other good soldier did over there yesterday? They all voted against it.

So, Mr. Chairman, what we have before us is very simple. We have a choice of sticking with the Committee on the Budget's budget, which will leave in place tax cuts of \$140,000 on average for people who make over 1 million bucks or whether they think in the interest of social justice and compassion, we ought to scale back those tax cuts so they have to skimp by on only \$27,000. The poor devils. They are going to have to get food stamps to get along, I guess, if they are only getting a \$27,000 tax cut.

The question is, are we going to scale back those super-sized tax cuts so we can meet our obligations in the area of education, veterans health care, homeland security, and the other items I have just named? I think economically and morally it is not even a close choice.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHAW). All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, this 15-minute vote on the Obey amendment will be followed by a 5-minute vote, if ordered, on the Hensarling amendment on which proceedings were postponed last evening.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 242, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

AYES—180

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

NOES—242

Aderholt	Bachus	Barrow
Akin	Baker	Bartlett (MD)
Alexander	Barrett (SC)	Barton (TX)

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

NOT VOTING—12

Coble	Diaz-Balart, M.	Larson (CT)
Cubin	Foley	Portman
Delahunt	Forbes	Reynolds
Diaz-Balart, L.	King (NY)	Young (FL)

□ 1133

Messrs. SCHWARZ of Michigan, TERRY, CHOCOLA, DAVIS of Tennessee and FORD changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MURTHA and Mr. BILIRAKIS changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 82 I was unavoidably detained at a meeting at the White House. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. GILLMOR). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate 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.

(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 fis-

cal 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 a 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 surplus 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 discre-

tionary 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.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 102, noes 320, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

AYES—102

Akin	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Norwood
Bartlett (MD)	Gutknecht	Otter
Barton (TX)	Harris	Paul
Beauprez	Hayworth	Pence
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Petri
Blackburn	Herger	Pitts
Blunt	Hoekstra	Poe
Boehner	Hostetler	Pombo
Bonner	Inglis (SC)	Price (GA)
Boozman	Istook	Radanovich
Brady (TX)	Jenkins	Reynolds
Brown-Waite,	Jindal	Rogers (MI)
Ginny	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Keller	Royce
Cannon	Kennedy (MN)	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	King (IA)	Ryun (KS)
Case	Kline	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Kuhl (NY)	Sessions
Chocola	Linder	Shadegg
Cole (OK)	Lungren, Daniel	Shimkus
Conaway	E.	Shuster
Cox	Mack	Sodrel
Deal (GA)	Manzullo	Stearns
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marchant	Sullivan
Drake	McCaul (TX)	Tancredro
Duncan	McCotter	Terry
English (PA)	McHenry	Thornberry
Feeney	McMorris	Tiahrt
Flake	Mica	Walden (OR)
Foxx	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Weller
Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)	Westmoreland
Gibbons	Musgrave	Wilson (SC)
Gingrey	Myrick	

NOES—320

Abercrombie	Aderholt	Allen
Ackerman	Alexander	Andrews

Baca	Gilchrest	Moore (KS)
Bachus	Gillmor	Moore (WI)
Baird	Gonzalez	Moran (VA)
Baker	Goode	Murphy
Baldwin	Gordon	Murtha
Barrow	Granger	Nadler
Bass	Graves	Napolitano
Bean	Green (WI)	Neal (MA)
Becerra	Green, Al	Ney
Berkley	Green, Gene	Northup
Berman	Grijalva	Nunes
Berry	Gutierrez	Nussle
Biggert	Hall	Oberstar
Bilirakis	Harman	Obey
Bishop (GA)	Hart	Olver
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz
Blumenauer	Hastings (WA)	Osborne
Boehlert	Hayes	Owens
Bonilla	Hefley	Oxley
Bono	Herseth	Pallone
Boren	Higgins	Pascrell
Boswell	Hincheey	Pastor
Boucher	Hinojosa	Payne
Boustany	Hobson	Pearce
Boyd	Holden	Pelosi
Bradley (NH)	Holt	Peterson (MN)
Brady (PA)	Honda	Peterson (PA)
Brown (OH)	Hooley	Pickering
Brown (SC)	Hoyer	Platts
Brown, Corrine	Hulshof	Pomeroy
Burton (IN)	Hunter	Porter
Butterfield	Hyde	Price (NC)
Buyer	Inslee	Pryce (OH)
Calvert	Israel	Putnam
Camp	Issa	Rahall
Capito	Jackson (IL)	Ramstad
Capps	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Capuano	(TX)	Regula
Cardin	Johnson (CT)	Rehberg
Cardoza	Johnson (IL)	Reichert
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Renzi
Carson	Jones (NC)	Reyes
Carter	Jones (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Castle	Kanjorski	Rogers (KY)
Chandler	Kaptur	Ros-Lehtinen
Clay	Kelly	Ross
Cleaver	Kennedy (RI)	Rothman
Clyburn	Kildee	Royal-Allard
Conyers	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ruppersberger
Cooper	Kind	Rush
Costa	Kingston	Ryan (OH)
Costello	Kirk	Sabo
Cramer	Knollenberg	Salazar
Crenshaw	Kolbe	Sanchez, Linda
Crowley	Kucinich	T.
Cuellar	LaHood	Sanchez, Loretta
Culberson	Langevin	Sanders
Cummings	Lantos	Saxton
Cunningham	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Davis (AL)	Latham	Schiff
Davis (CA)	LaTourette	Schwartz (PA)
Davis (FL)	Leach	Schwarz (MI)
Davis (IL)	Lee	Scott (GA)
Davis (KY)	Levin	Scott (VA)
Davis (TN)	Lewis (CA)	Serrano
Davis, Jo Ann	Lewis (GA)	Shaw
Davis, Tom	Lewis (KY)	Shays
DeFazio	Lipinski	Sherman
DeGette	LoBiondo	Sherwood
DeLauro	Lofgren, Zoe	Simmons
DeLay	Lowey	Simpson
Dent	Lucas	Skelton
Dicks	Lynch	Slaughter
Dingell	Maloney	Smith (NJ)
Doggett	Markey	Smith (TX)
Doolittle	Marshall	Smith (WA)
Doyle	Matheson	Snyder
Dreier	Matsui	Solis
Edwards	McCarthy	Souder
Ehlers	McCollum (MN)	Spratt
Emanuel	McCrery	Stark
Emerson	McDermott	Strickland
Engel	McGovern	Stupak
Eshoo	McHugh	Sweeney
Etheridge	McIntyre	Tanner
Evans	McKeon	Tauscher
Everett	McKinney	Taylor (MS)
Farr	McNulty	Taylor (NC)
Fattah	Meehan	Thomas
Ferguson	Meek (FL)	Thompson (CA)
Filner	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Menendez	Tiberi
Ford	Michaud	Tierney
Fortenberry	Millender-	Towns
Fossella	McDonald	Turner
Frank (MA)	Miller (MI)	Udall (CO)
Frelinghuysen	Miller (NC)	Udall (NM)
Galleghy	Miller, George	Upton
Gerlach	Mollohan	Van Hollen

Velázquez Watt Wicker
Visclosky Waxman Wilson (NM)
Walsh Weiner Wolf
Wasserman Weldon (FL) Woolsey
Schultz Weldon (PA) Wu
Waters Wexler Wynn
Watson Whitfield Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Coble Foley Larson (CT)
Cubin Forbes Melancon
Delahunt Jefferson Portman
Diaz-Balart, L. King (NY) Young (FL)

□ 1141

Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 83 I was unavoidably detained at a meeting at the White House. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

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. TERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. GILLMOR, Acting 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.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 32, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 1, answered “present” 4, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—419

Abercrombie Baird Beauprez
Ackerman Baker Becerra
Aderholt Baldwin Berkley
Akin Barrett (SC) Berman
Alexander Barrow Berry
Allen Bartlett (MD) Biggert
Andrews Barton (TX) Bilirakis
Baca Bass Bishop (GA)
Bachus Bean Bishop (NY)

Bishop (UT) Fitzpatrick (PA) Lewis (KY)
Blackburn Flake Linder
Blumenauer Ford Lipinski
Blunt Portenberry LoBiondo
Boehert Fossella Lofgren, Zoe
Boehner Foxx Lowey
Bonilla Frank (MA) Lucas
Bonner Franks (AZ) Lungren, Daniel
Bono Frelinghuysen E.
Boozman Gallegly Lynch
Boren Garrett (NJ) Mack
Boswell Gerlach Maloney
Boucher Gibbons Manzullo
Boustany Gilchrest Marchant
Boyd Gillmor Markey
Bradley (NH) Gingrey Marshall
Brady (PA) Gohmert Matheson
Brady (TX) Gonzalez Matsui
Brown (OH) Goode McCarthy
Brown (SC) Goodlatte McCaul (TX)
Brown, Corrine Gordon McCollum (MN)
Brunt-Ginny Granger McCotter
Burgess Graves McCreery
Burton (IN) Green (WI) McGovern
Butterfield Green, Al McHenry
Buyer Grijalva McHugh
Calvert Gutierrez McIntyre
Camp Gutknecht McKeon
Cannon Hall McMorris
Cantor Harman McNulty
Capito Harris Meehan
Capps Hart Meek (FL)
Capuano Hastings (FL) Meeks (NY)
Cardin Hastings (WA) Melancon
Cardoza Hayes Menendez
Carnahan Hayworth Mica
Carson Hefley Michaud
Carter Hensarling Millender-
Case Herger McDonald
Castle Herseth Miller (FL)
Chabot Higgins Miller (MI)
Chandler Hinojosa Miller (NC)
Chocola Hobson Miller, George
Clay Hoekstra Mollohan
Cleaver Holden Moore (KS)
Clyburn Holt Moore (WI)
Cole (OK) Honda Moran (KS)
Conaway Hooley Moran (VA)
Conyers Hostettler Murphy
Cooper Hoyer Murtha
Costa Hulshof Musgrave
Costello Hunter Myrick
Cox Hyde Nadler
Cramer Inglis (SC) Napolitano
Crenshaw Inslee Neal (MA)
Crowley Israel Neugebauer
Cuellar Issa Ney
Culberson Istook Northup
Cummings Jackson (IL) Norwood
Cunningham Jackson-Lee Nunes
Davis (AL) (TX) Nussle
Davis (CA) Jefferson Oberstar
Davis (FL) Jenkins Obey
Davis (IL) Jindal Oliver
Davis (KY) Johnson (CT) Ortiz
Davis (TN) Johnson (IL) Osborne
Davis, Jo Ann Johnson, E. B. Otter
Davis, Tom Johnson, Sam Owens
Deal (GA) Jones (NC) Oxley
DeFazio Jones (OH) Pallone
DeGette Kanjorski Pascrell
DeLauro Kaptur Pastor
Dent Keller Payne
Diaz-Balart, L. Kelly Pearce
Diaz-Balart, M. Kennedy (MN) Pelosi
Dicks Kennedy (RI) Pence
Dingell Kildee Peterson (MN)
Doggett Kilpatrick (MI) Peterson (PA)
Doolittle Kind Petri
Doyle King (IA) Pickering
Drake Kingston Pitts
Dreier Kirk Platts
Duncan Kline Poe
Edwards Knollenberg Pombo
Ehlers Kolbe Pomeroy
Emanuel Kuhl (NY) Porter
Emerson LaHood Price (GA)
Engel Langevin Price (NC)
English (PA) Lantos Pryce (OH)
Eshoo Larsen (WA) Putnam
Etheridge Larson (CT) Radanovich
Evans Latham Rahall
Everett LaTourrette Ramstad
Farr Leach Rangel
Fattah Lee Regula
Feeney Levin Rehberg
Ferguson Lewis (CA) Reichert
Filner Lewis (GA) Renzi

Reyes Shays Tierney
Reynolds Sherman Towns
Rogers (AL) Sherwood Turner
Rogers (KY) Shimkus Udall (CO)
Rogers (MI) Shuster Udall (NM)
Rohrabacher Simmons Upton
Ros-Lehtinen Simpson Van Hollen
Ross Skelton Velázquez
Rothman Slaughter Visclosky
Roybal-Allard Smith (NJ) Walden (OR)
Royce Smith (TX) Walsh
Ruppersberger Smith (WA) Wamp
Rush Snyder Wasserman
Ryan (OH) Sodrel Schultz
Ryan (WI) Solis Waters
Ryun (KS) Souder Watson
Sabo Spratt Watt
Salazar Stark Waxman
Sánchez, Linda Stearns Weiner
T. Strickland Weldon (FL)
Sanchez, Loretta Stupak Weldon (PA)
Sanders Sullivan Weller
Saxton Sweeney Westmoreland
Schakowsky Tancredo Wexler
Schiff Tanner Whitfield
Schwartz (PA) Tauscher Wicker
Schwarz (MI) Taylor (MS) Wilson (NM)
Scott (GA) Taylor (NC) Wilson (SC)
Scott (VA) Terry Wolf
Sensenbrenner Thomas Woolsey
Serrano Thompson (CA) Wu
Sessions Thompson (MS) Wynn
Shadegg Thornberry Young (AK)
Shaw Tiahrt

NAYS—1

Paul

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—4

Hinchey McDermott
Kucinich McKinney

NOT VOTING—10

Coble Foley Tiberi
Cubin Forbes Young (FL)
Delahunt King (NY)
DeLay Portman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1159

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: “A concurrent resolution expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the occupation of the Lebanese Republic by the Syrian Arab Republic.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 84 I was unavoidably detained at a meeting at the White House. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

PROVIDING FOR FINAL PERIOD OF GENERAL DEBATE ON H. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I have a unanimous consent request that has been worked out between both sides. I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H. Con. Res. 95 in the Committee of the Whole, a final period of general debate shall be in order at the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for

amendment, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

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.

□ 1159

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. GILLMOR (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 109-19, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), had been disposed of.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, there shall be a final period of general debate at the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 109-19.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. WATT

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Acting 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. 3 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. WATT:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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 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 2006 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 2006: \$1,643,962,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$1,757,771,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008: \$1,878,285,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009: \$2,002,315,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010: \$2,115,768,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2006: \$36,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$38,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008: \$42,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009: \$46,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010: \$49,400,000,000.

(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 2006: \$2,167,892,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$2,234,617,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008: \$2,347,844,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009: \$2,462,004,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010: \$2,567,326,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2006: \$2,173,159,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$2,227,030,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008: \$2,333,346,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009: \$2,439,718,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010: \$2,545,019,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2006: \$-529,197,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$-469,259,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008: \$-455,061,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009: \$-437,403,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010: \$-429,251,000,000.

(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 2006: \$8,602,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$9,188,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008: \$9,767,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009: \$10,333,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010: \$10,896,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2006: \$5,039,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$5,313,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008: \$5,555,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009: \$5,760,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010: \$5,941,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2006 through 2010 for each major functional category are:

- (1) National Defense (050):
 - Fiscal year 2006:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$434,862,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$471,148,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2007:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$444,650,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$437,735,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2008:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$455,521,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$450,234,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2009:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$466,677,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$460,789,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$478,016,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$471,926,000,000.
- (2) International Affairs (150):
 - Fiscal year 2006:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$32,718,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$35,571,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2007:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$34,580,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$33,231,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2008:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$35,281,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$32,424,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2009:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$35,984,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$32,560,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2010:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$36,706,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$32,686,000,000.
- (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
 - Fiscal year 2006:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$25,235,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$24,149,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2007:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$25,670,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$25,040,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2008:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$26,203,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$25,512,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2009:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$26,727,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$26,019,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2010:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$27,256,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$26,532,000,000.
- (4) Energy (270):
 - Fiscal year 2006:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$3,147,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$2,027,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2007:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$2,971,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$1,479,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2008:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$3,031,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$1,113,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2009:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$2,811,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$1,352,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2010:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$2,747,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$1,451,000,000.
- (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 - Fiscal year 2006:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$30,563,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$32,306,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2007:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$31,660,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$32,394,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2008:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$32,494,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$33,420,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2009:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$34,118,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$34,556,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2010:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$34,896,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$35,317,000,000.
- (6) Agriculture (350):
 - Fiscal year 2006:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$29,780,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$28,733,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2007:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$27,324,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$26,190,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2008:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$25,576,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$24,545,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2009:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$26,073,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$25,195,000,000.
 - Fiscal year 2010:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$26,012,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$25,220,000,000.
- (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 - Fiscal year 2006:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$11,772,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$5,629,000,000.

- Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,124,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,245,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,151,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,938,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,235,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,143,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,326,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,810,000,000.
- (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,157,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,455,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,638,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$72,176,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,911,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$73,730,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,556,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$74,668,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,180,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,619,000,000.
- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,679,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,727,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,537,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,668,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,754,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,257,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,056,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,295,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,357,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,061,000,000.
- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$115,878,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$100,398,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$117,983,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$112,710,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$120,075,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$116,968,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$122,075,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$119,556,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$124,711,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$121,907,000,000.
- (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$263,151,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$262,872,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$277,813,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$276,036,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$298,412,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$296,301,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$321,498,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$317,159,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$342,449,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$340,349,000,000.
- (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$331,181,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$330,944,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$372,132,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$372,353,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$395,766,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$395,759,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$420,916,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$420,450,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$449,089,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$449,346,000,000.
- (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$349,218,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$355,125,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$356,381,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$361,033,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$370,455,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$373,930,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$381,030,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$383,313,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$392,106,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$393,720,000,000.
- (14) Social Security (650):
 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 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$73,351,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$71,594,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,849,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$71,561,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$77,093,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,029,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$78,864,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$77,734,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$80,676,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$79,461,000,000.
- (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,840,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,013,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,551,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,249,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,635,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,926,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,741,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,575,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,880,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,599,000,000.
- (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,017,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,308,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,442,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,080,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,549,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,290,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,135,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,673,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,755,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,275,000,000.
- (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$308,584,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$308,584,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$355,775,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$355,775,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$391,505,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$391,505,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$419,077,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$419,077,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$444,335,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$444,335,000,000.
- (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,050,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,050,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,098,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,761,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,146,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,990,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,206,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,113,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,246,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,199,000,000.
- (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 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.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 154, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

□ 1200

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

I am honored to stand here as the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus for the 109th Congress and to offer as this substitute amendment the Congressional Black Caucus' budget for this year.

We believe that a budget is a statement of priorities and in that respect Members should know where the money is coming from that is being budgeted and how the money is being spent.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who has led the task force for the Congressional Black Caucus to put together the budget.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

The Congressional Black Caucus is offering an alternative budget proposal that differs from both the President's budget and the House majority's budget by putting America and Americans

first. Its focus is to reduce disparities that exist in America's communities by investing in the priorities and challenges that Americans face today. It also provides significant support for our troops in Iraq. At the same time, the CBC budget alternative accomplishes these goals in a manner that is much more fiscally responsible than the Republican budget, so much so, as this chart shows, the budget deficit each year is much less, a total of a \$167 billion deficit reduction over 5 years, so much so that it saves just in interest cost alone \$27.5 billion over 5 years.

The Congressional Black Caucus alternative builds for America's future and addresses the domestic challenges our country faces. The bulk of the CBC budget has been applied to a comprehensive approach to education and training. With the intention of closing achievement and opportunity gaps in education, the CBC budget dramatically increases funding for education and training programs by \$23.9 billion over the proposed Republican budget next year alone.

The CBC budget supports public education by fully funding No Child Left Behind, provides critical funding for Head Start, TRIO, IDEA, and elementary and secondary school counseling. To address the education needs of our military families, the CBC budget allocates more funding for Impact Aid. Millions of at-risk students are hoping to succeed in high school and enroll in college, and to make that dream a reality the CBC alternative allocates funding for the GEAR-UP program, raises the maximum amount for Pell Grants, increases funding for historically black colleges and universities and Hispanic-serving institutions. In addition, the CBC budget funds for the Perkins student loan program, as well as job training, adult education, and vocational education programs that are critical in today's global economy.

In order to close the existing economic disparities in the United States and to help entrepreneurs realize the American dream, the CBC alternative funds job creation programs under the Small Business Administration. It supports community development programs, including community development block grants, child nutrition programs, and health programs such as Community Health Centers.

The budget also addresses disparities in housing, and believes that everyone in the United States is entitled to a safe and comfortable home. It supports HOPE VI, section 8 housing programs, housing for the disabled and elderly, and low income energy assistance. The budget also provides funding for Amtrak and public transportation.

The CBC recognizes that advancements in technology and science are necessary to maintain America's competitiveness in today's global economy. The budget supports funding for research and development, particularly in aeronautics and NASA, and increases funding for the National

Science Foundation, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the Department of Energy, as well as measures for space shuttle safety.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget alternative also recognizes the importance of adding to the safety of our communities by funding initiatives such as juvenile crime prevention programs and prisoner reentry programs.

The funding for these important domestic needs comes from rolling back tax cuts for an individual's adjusted gross income that is over \$200,000, and eliminating several abusive tax loopholes, including corporate incentives to move jobs overseas. Moreover, the Congressional Black Caucus budget does not adopt the new tax cuts included in the Republican budget. The CBC revenues are used for the domestic and deficit reduction portions of the alternative budget.

The CBC budget is also committed to making America more secure. The funding for urgent homeland security needs, veterans programs and benefits, and additional support for defense and our troops in Iraq comes from a \$7.8 billion reduction in ballistic missile defense, leaving \$1 billion in the program for continued research.

It is a priority of the CBC to provide American soldiers with the equipment necessary to return home from Iraq in a safe, quick and successful manner. To that end, a portion of these funds have been reallocated to protect our troops in Iraq by providing them with body armor, vehicle armor, and other personal support equipment, as well as for the construction and maintenance of our Navy vessels, which will preserve jobs.

The CBC understands that providing homeland security requires appropriate funding to meet the many pressing needs in homeland security; and, therefore, we have substantial funding for port security grants and rail security grants as well as funding for first responders, Federal air marshals and border patrol agents.

The remainder of these funds are used to restore cuts in veterans' programs and benefits. The CBC understands that today's soldiers are tomorrow's veterans who deserve our respect and sacrifices, not just in word but in deed and in budget. Thus, the alternative budget makes critical increases in veterans' programs and benefits, a substantial portion of which is health care.

It also supports funding for long-term care initiatives, medical and prosthetic research, and mental health care, among others. We believe that the sum of these initiatives will make us more secure as a Nation.

The CBC is committed to reducing disparities in all of America's communities. At the same time, our budget recognizes that we cannot place the burden on our children and grandchildren. A top priority of the CBC is to address the exploding deficit problem, and that is why our budget re-

duces the deficit by \$167 billion and saves \$27 billion in interest payments compared to the House majority's budget.

Members of the CBC have worked tirelessly to create a budget that is fiscally responsible, supports our troops and recognizes the need of American individuals and American communities around the country. We believe this is a sound budget that will reduce disparities in America's communities and promote and protect the best that America and Americans have to offer.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) and his colleagues for bringing forth an alternative budget. We know how difficult it is to put together a budget of this magnitude. As the gentleman said, this is a substitute budget, a true alternative budget to what was passed out of the committee. It highlights the differences between the Democrats' strategy and the Republican budgeting strategy. The Democrats seem to love spending increases and tax increases, and that is exactly what this alternative budget does.

It increases spending compared to the committee budget that is on the floor. It increases spending by \$32.5 billion in budget authority and also \$18.9 billion increased spending in the year 2006. That is just in 1 year. It also increases spending by \$173 billion in budget authority over 5 years and \$149 billion in outlays in the next 5 years. It also massively increases taxes by \$35.1 billion in fiscal year 2006 alone and \$169 billion over the next 5 years as opposed to the budget that was passed by the Committee on the Budget.

Again, these tax increases are above and beyond, on top of enormous spending increases. But that is not the only problem that we have with this budget alternative. It also decreases defense spending. Again, while the Nation is at war, this alternative budget cuts defense spending by \$10.7 billion in budget authority and \$7 billion in outlays just in fiscal year 2006. Again, during fiscal years 2006 through 2010, this alternative budget would reduce defense spending by \$149.5 billion in budget authority and \$129 billion in outlays. So we have very clear differences that have been illustrated by these two budgets.

Once again, I commend the gentleman for doing the hard work and putting an alternative budget together that is being discussed right now. Again these two budgets obviously highlight the difference. This budget that they are proposing increases taxes and cuts spending on defense in a time of war.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), a member of the Committee on the Budget who has done an incredible job and shown incredible leadership on this issue.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

First, I commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) for offering a budget alternative. I know that the gentleman and his staff, along with the other members of the Congressional Black Caucus, worked very hard to put this budget together. Working on the Committee on the Budget this year, I realize how difficult it is to get agreement on the type of budget we need. Even to get a small group of people to agree on a budget is very difficult, so I commend the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus for putting this together and I certainly respect what the gentleman has done.

But on so many issues we have disagreement on the content of the budget. First, I do not think we need to raise taxes at a time when our economy is trying to get its footing back. And at a time of war, we need to fully fund defense and homeland security. We have so many needs in this country that we have to fund and so many priorities that we must fund. I think our budget that we produced out of the Committee on the Budget is well balanced. I think it is appropriate for the time we are living, the time of war, the time of very strong homeland security needs, and we need to properly fund those items, which I believe our House budget that we produced out of the Committee on the Budget does.

So I am very proud of the work that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has done to get a balanced approach for our budgeting.

I would like to talk more about the qualities of our House budget that we have on the floor today. I think that is why we need to pass that budget unamended. First, our House budget fully funds the defense budget request of our President. There is a 4.8 percent increase, which totals \$419 billion in defense spending, and a net increase of 2.3 percent in nonmilitary appropriated accounts for homeland security, including \$32.5 billion for the Department of Homeland Security.

But furthermore, I think it is important that we talk about what it does for veterans. With veterans I have a chart here today discussing, showing our increase in veterans programs and the spending we have increased in veterans programs. There is a rapid increase in veterans spending especially during this time of war. We are funding veterans programs appropriately in this Congress. We are funding more veterans health care programs. We are doing more for those serving to defend our country. The current House budget we have will increase veterans program spending to \$67 billion. I think that is a move in the right direction.

Furthermore, spending per veteran has increased to \$2,700 per veteran. I think it is appropriate to notice the rapid rise in veterans spending. So we are funding priorities. This budget, although restraining nondefense, non-

homeland security discretionary spending, and taking on mandatory government programs and finding savings, although slight, we are finding savings in those programs that will enable us to keep continuing to cut taxes and enable us to avoid raising taxes at the same time.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) for offering this budget alternative. I respect what the gentleman is trying to do, but we have different ways of achieving the same result of funding the priorities and helping the American people.

□ 1215

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for their kind words. If you listened to them, it would make it sound like we have the same budget, but I want to assure you and our colleagues that that is not the case. And I want to assure you that by the end of this debate, you are going to know what the differences are.

We set out at the beginning of this Congress to set an agenda for the Congressional Black Caucus. Our agenda is about closing disparities that exist between African American citizens and other citizens in this country and have persisted over time. They involve closing the achievement and opportunity gaps in education, closing the gaps in health care for every American, closing the gaps in employment and economic security in wealth and business opportunity in our country, closing the gaps that continue to exist in our justice system, closing the gaps that continue to exist in retirement security for our citizens, and closing the inequities that have persisted throughout our history in foreign policy.

Is it true that we have a different set of priorities? You bet we do. To close these disparities, we have set a different course, and we decided that it was more important to devote resources to closing these gaps and closing these disparities than it was to give a tax cut to people who make above \$200,000 a year. We decided that these priorities were more important than continuing to fund a ballistic missile defense program that has already failed every single test that it has undergone. We believe that the education of our children is more important than tax cuts for people over \$200,000.

I am not here to make any excuses about that. I want every Member of this Congress to understand that that is a choice that we have made and that is a choice that we are calling on this Congress to make. The people in my district who make over \$200,000 a year have told me that they would rather educate our children and fully fund No Child Left Behind than they would have a tax cut. So this is a question of what your priorities are, no ifs, ands, butts about it. That is what you will be voting on today.

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

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

There are differences in the two budgets. The budget that we passed out of committee funds our essential services without raising taxes, without cutting defense, without hurting our economy. Unfortunately, this proposed alternative raises taxes and thoroughly cuts defense suspending in a time of war.

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

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT). Their budget and our budget really is the compassionate budget that is fiscally responsible.

I have comments from the American Legion, from the national legislative director of AMVETS, from the national legislative director of the Disabled American Veterans, from the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I just want to paraphrase what they said:

We think cutting veterans benefits, talking about the majority budget, is, and I paraphrase, unacceptable, especially at a time when American soldiers, sons and daughters, are being wounded and killed every day in Iraq.

In addition, it appears that this pattern of shortchanging veterans medical care continues in the 109th Congress. American veterans and their families deserve better.

Let me just give a few examples of how we strengthen one national defense. I will put all of it in the RECORD; but clearly in this House, in closing, only the big dogs eat in this House.

I rise strongly to support the Congressional Black Caucus Budget. We are truly the conscience of this Congress.

This budget represents true compassion with fiscal responsibility. It includes increases in programs that the American people believe in and that the Republicans just give lip service to. Our budget includes increased funding for: education programs, school construction, job creation programs, child nutrition programs, community health centers, and Amtrak, which 800,000 American's use to get to work, and whose budget got Zeroed out by this foolish Administration.

And unlike the Republican's, it doesn't balance the budget on the backs of the veterans, the homeless, seniors, and the poor.

In the Republican's House, the Big Dogs Eat first, and everyone else has to get in line.

Do the right thing for the American people. Support the Congressional Black Caucus Budget.

I would like to thank Mr. WATT and Mr. SCOTT for their hard work on putting the CBC alternative budget together.

If we do not take care of our veterans now, we will not have the boots on the ground in the future to respond to any attack against us or our allies.

This budget straightens our priorities to include both defending our country and the freedom it cherishes and giving our veterans the chance they need to succeed once they leave the service.

All of the funds reduced from Ballistic Missile Defense are reallocated within various functions to provide for additional support for the troops in Iraq and other defense items necessary to maintain our military strength and jobs (\$1.1 billion), homeland se-

curity needs (\$2.05 billion), and veterans programs and benefits (\$4.65 billion). All calculations are for changes above/below proposed Fiscal Year 2006 levels included in the Republican budget.

National Defense:	
Body armor, personal support equipment, and other protective gear for troops, and vehicle armor	\$75 million.
Ammunition for Marine Corps	\$10 million.
Small Arms for Army	\$10 million.
Building/Maintenance of Navy ships	\$1 billion.
To study instances of waste, fraud and abuse within DoD business processes and implement specific GAO recommendations for reform	\$5 million.
Veterans: +\$4.65 billion	
Veterans Health Care	\$1 billion.
Survivor Benefit Plan	\$100 million.
Disabled Veterans Tax ["concurrent receipt"]	\$2.5 billion.
Fund long-term care initiatives for veterans	\$400 million.
Remove proposed \$250 enrollment fee on Priority 7&8 veterans	\$300 million.
Remove proposed increases in co-payments for Priority 7&8 veterans	\$150 million.
Prosthetic needs for veterans	\$100 million.
VA Medical and Prosthetic Research	\$50 million.
Mental Health Care for Veterans	\$50 million.
Allowances (all for purposes of Homeland Security): +\$2.05 billion	
Rail Security	\$100 million.
Port Security, including air cargo screening, preventing nuclear/radiological weapons in cargo containers, research and development, and grants	\$500 million.
Centers for Disease Control	\$250 million.
First Responders	\$900 million.
Interoperable communications systems for first responders	\$85 million.
Federal air marshals	\$65 million.
Internal Customs Enforcement/Border Patrol Agents	\$150 million.
Total Defense Funds Used, All of Which Are Reallocated to Defense, Homeland Security Needs, and Veterans Programs and Benefits	\$7.8 billion.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2005.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, Committee on Budget, House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The American Legion is deeply troubled with and cannot support your Committee's proposed budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 95, with regard to funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), especially the reconciliation instructions targeted at earned Veterans' benefits. Reducing mandatory appropriations for veterans' disability compensation, pensions, and educational benefits at a time of war is inconsistent with the thanks of a grateful Nation.

The American Legion believes VA's own admission that the cost of doing business increases annually about 13-14 percent because of Federal pay increases and inflation in the health care arena. The President's budget request is "scrubbed" by the Office of Management and Budget, so VA's true fiscal requirements to meet the health care needs of America's veterans are somewhat skewed. During the 108th Congress, former VA Secretary Principi reported to your colleagues that The FY 2005 proposed budget was \$1.2 billion short of what he had actually requested. It appears this pattern of short-changing VA medical care continues in the 109th Congress. America's veterans and their families deserve better.

The American Legion recognizes and appreciates the Bradley Amendment adopted by the Committee, but believes it falls well short of the total funding needed in VA medical care. Unfortunately, the Committee rejected the Edwards Amendment that would have provided VA with adequate resources to maintain current services.

The American Legion would encourage adoption of one of the amendments to be offered by Representatives Spratt and Obey with regard to increasing VA funding. Clearly, both of these amendments are in the best interest of veterans and their families. Without adoption of one of these two amendments, The American Legion cannot support this budget resolution.

The American Legion appreciates your leadership and the hard work of your colleagues on behalf of America's veterans and their families.

Sincerely,

THOMAS P. CADMUS,
National Commander.

THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET,
March 17, 2005.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, House Budget Committee, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE NUSSLE: As you know, the President's fiscal year 2006 budget would provide an appropriation for veterans' medical care that is less than one-half of one percent above the FY 2005 appropriation. Because this amount would not begin to cover employee wage increases and other inflationary costs, it amounts to a substantial cut in funding and thus would unavoidably result in a reduction of critical medical care services for our Nation's sick and disabled veterans. Although we appreciate the adoption of the Bradley amendment which added \$229 million to the President's recommendation for veterans' medical care, this is still grossly inadequate.

In addition, we understand that H. Con. Res. 95 includes instructions to cut spending on mandatory veterans' programs, such as disability compensation, by \$798 million. We think cutting veterans' benefit programs is unconscionable, especially at a time when America's son and daughters are being wounded and killed every day in Iraq.

The four major veterans organizations of The Independent Budget, AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, therefore strongly urge support for amendments offered by Representatives Spratt and Obey to increase funding for veterans' programs. Passage of these amendments is crucial if the VA is to maintain an adequate level of health care and other services.

Sincerely,

RICK JONES,

National Legislative
Director, AMVETS.

RICHARD B. FULLER,
National Legislative
Director, Paralyzed
Veterans of America.

JOSEPH A. VIOLANTE,
National Legislative
Director, Disabled
American Veterans.

DENNIS CULLINAN,
National Legislative
Director, Veterans of
Foreign Wars of the
United States.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I do want to respond to only the big dogs eat in this House. I am a small dog, and I think I am doing just fine.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCHENRY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. It is not you; it is your policy. When I say "big dog," I am talking about those huge tax cuts to the rich while we cut veterans programs, programs for health care, programs for the people that need it the most.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, this is an interesting chart on the rapid increase in veterans spending per veteran. I think this is very important. We are spending \$2,773 per veteran. We are fully funding our veterans' needs. That is a priority of this Congress. As a small fellow, I must admit, I do think it is important that we keep our taxes low so that we

can create economic growth and development which will help us fully fund our programs going forward. A strong economy is what is going to move our Nation forward, not tax increases.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), for his steadfast support of the development of this CBC budget alternative and also the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for his leadership. I appreciate and applaud their steady stream of ideas and positions on issues we all care about.

This Republican budget proposal clearly ignores the needs of my State and all working Americans. The \$2.57 trillion budget for fiscal year 2006 that President Bush laid before Congress is more out of touch than all the rest that he has submitted. It fails to include huge costs that taxpayers will have to bear, and its priorities do not match the needs of millions of people. It is, in short, a budget in need of a thorough congressional overhaul.

The level of funding proposed in the President's budget for research and development, especially basic research, is far from adequate. I believe that Federal investments in science and technology make sense. Americans have funded groundbreaking research into disease prevention and amazing new medical breakthroughs, cutting-edge business technology, energy efficiency and educational tools that help our children learn in new ways. But in this budget, funding for the National Science Foundation would struggle to keep up with inflation and programs at most other major agencies are cut.

There is a direct connection between investments in research and development today and economic prosperity and world leadership tomorrow. That is why the CBC budget plan would continue to invest in the National Science Foundation, in NASA, research at schools and universities and new energy technologies to give business consumers more affordable, cleaner energy. Just this week, EPA issued a statement that really rolls us back in protecting our air. We have no clean air in Texas. I do not know about anyplace else.

As lawmakers, we do have the responsibility to ensure that all Americans, including minorities, are able to move ahead to achieve the American Dream. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness meant all people.

Mr. Chairman, it is up to the Congress to inject a dose of realism into this budget debate. Only then will the country get a budget that makes sense.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Mr. WATT, for his steadfast support of the development of this CBC budget alternate. I also want to thank Mr. SCOTT for his leadership. I appreciate

and applaud their steady stream of ideas and positions on issues we all care about. I also would like to thank all of the members of the CBC and their staff for their help in completing this very worthwhile project.

The Republican budget proposal clearly ignores the needs of Texas and of all working Americans. The \$2.57 trillion budget for fiscal 2006 that President Bush laid before Congress is more out of touch than most. It fails to include huge costs that taxpayers will have to bear, and its priorities don't match the needs of millions of people. It is, in short, a budget in need of a thorough congressional overhaul.

Mr. Chairman, the level of funding proposed in the President's budget for research and development, especially basic research, is far from adequate. I believe that federal investments in science and technology make sense. Americans have funded groundbreaking research into disease prevention and amazing new medical breakthroughs, cutting-edge business technology, energy efficiency, and educational tools that help our children learn in new ways. But in this budget package, funding for the National Science Foundation (NSF) would struggle to keep up with inflation, and programmes at most other major agencies are cut.

Bush's science and technology budget would drop from an estimated \$61.7 billion in fiscal year 2005 to \$60.8 billion in 2006. The science and technology includes programs such as space exploration, renewable energy, and agricultural research, as well as technology-related research and development at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST).

There is a direct connection between investments in research and development today, and economic prosperity and world leadership tomorrow. That's why CBC budget plan would continue to invest in the National Science Foundation, NASA, research at schools and universities; and new energy technologies to give business and consumers more affordable, cleaner energy.

As lawmakers, we have the responsibility to ensure that all Americans, including minorities, are able to move ahead to achieve the American dream: life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. Chairman, it is up to Congress to inject a dose of realism into the budget debate. Only then will the country get a budget that makes sense.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. I am full of charts today, my friends.

I do want to address our funding for health and for research. Under a Republican-controlled Congress, we have doubled funding for NIH, the National Institutes of Health. I think it is important to note what we are doing in health research as an American government, and the American people need to know that we are fully funding these programs to look at innovative ways to solve pressing medical issues in our country. We have doubled the funding for NIH over the last 6 years.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, more needs to be done to address the ongoing global challenges of health, poverty, disease, and disasters so that we can end the inequities in foreign policy. Therefore, the CBC budget increases funding for these core development accounts with the overall goals of reducing poverty disparities and improving quality of life.

There is \$3.7 billion in the CBC budget for global AIDS, which is \$500 million more than the President's budget. That is an increase of \$900 million from last year and will support prevention, care and treatment for thousands more people.

Foreign aid to Africa and the Caribbean is increased by \$250 million in the Congressional Black Caucus budget to allow developing countries to participate in the global economy. These funds support strategic priorities in the Caribbean region, improve good governance and reduce corruption, increase economic growth and free trade and reduce narcotics trafficking.

Public health and preventable illness initiatives is increased by \$250 million in the CBC budget. More than one-third of the children in Africa are malnourished. In the last 10 years, approximately 2 million children have been killed in armed conflicts.

AFRICA

Overall disparity—Nearly 1.3 billion people around the world live in poverty and do not have safe drinking water; more than one-third of the world's children are malnourished; within the last ten years, approximately two million children have been killed in armed conflicts, many after being forced to be child soldiers; many poor countries spend 30%–40% of their annual budgets on repaying their foreign-held debt (often more than they spend on health and education combined); and horrific conditions can lead individuals to become more disaffected and susceptible to recruitment by terrorist organizations.

ERADICATING HUNGER, POVERTY, AND DISEASES MUST BE A PRIORITY

HIV/AIDS Solution—AIDS is a global humanitarian disaster that demands robust leadership from the United States. According to the need based numbers advanced by UNAIDS, The Stop TB Partnership, and Roll back Malaria, we believe the US should provide \$6.7 billion next year. And at least \$1.5 billion in funding this year for the Global Fund to operate efficiently and effectively.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Again, what we have not heard from the sponsors of this amendment is part of what is in their amendment. Again, their amendment has massive increases in spending. It also has massive tax increases on the American people. And it also has massive reductions in defense spending in a time of war. Those are huge differences. I just want to make sure that everybody understands what the differences are.

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

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the CBC budget is sane, rational, logical, serious. It recognizes the tremendous need that exists in our country to assist those 2 million people who are currently in jails and prisons and the 650,000 who return home every year. Therefore, it increases juvenile justice programs by \$300 million, \$100 million for the weed and seed drug elimination program, and \$300 million for prisoner reentry programs, and it does not raise taxes. It rolls back the tax breaks that were given in 2001 and 2003 to those individuals with adjusted gross incomes of more than \$200,000. People in my community say, provide the services, don't give to the rich.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) mentioned the fact that our budget does not increase taxes and the alternative budget that we are discussing today does increase taxes.

Does the gentleman know how many jobs are created because of this Republican Congress cutting taxes in the last year?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I think I may have a chart on that.

Payroll jobs have rebounded because of tax cuts. With a weakness of the economy going into the Bush administration from the Clinton years and with the advent of 9/11, we had a weakening of the economy.

□ 1230

But once the tax cuts took hold, we have rebounded. We have got over 3 million jobs because of this.

Beyond that, there has been reference to the fact that tax cuts have created the deficit. That is not true. Actually, that is borne out with statistical proof here. The largest cause of deficits between 2001 and 2004 was the economy. And the best way to address the economy and get the economy to rebound is by cutting taxes, spurring growth, reducing regulations, empowering small businesses and businesses all across the country to create more jobs, to increase earnings.

So what we see here, the largest cause, 49 percent of the cause of the deficit, was the economy. And because of that, we have been able to rebound. Because of the tax cuts and because of the rebound in the economy, we are reducing the deficit. We are taking on this, and we are going to further cut taxes in order to keep spurring the economy.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus's budget that is being presented here today. This budget is

more responsible certainly than the President's budget, certainly than the Republican budget, and it has taken into consideration the real needs of the people of this country. I want to talk a little bit about CDBG; that is, the Community Development Block grant.

By formula, every city, town, State in America receives funds from this Community Development Block Grant program. This money is block granted to these entities in order to assist these cities with everything from infrastructure development, assistance with housing so that people can get into homes, being assisted with down payments, with rental assistance; with 501(c)(3)s, nonprofit organizations, that are providing services for at-risk youth, for seniors, for the kinds of programs that these cities and towns could never fund without this block grant.

In many ways this money that is going to the cities is the last of the moneys to deal with poverty, to deal with the lack of resources because of the inability of these cities and towns to be able to raise the kind of revenue that could help them with the very basic needs of their cities.

This President decided to cut this particular block grant by 35 percent. I think that amounts to about \$1.9 billion. The good thing about what this President has done is he has brought together from both sides of the aisle Representatives who know the value of this program and who are going to work together and support the kind of funding that has been put back into this budget by the CBC budget. The CBC funds CDBG to the 2005 level, and that is the way it should be.

I would urge support for the Congressional Black Caucus's very thoughtful and well developed budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the CBC substitute budget. The CBC budget rejects the failed budget policies of the Bush Administration and would return us to a policy of investing in education, job training, housing, veterans and community development programs that millions of people depend on. It would reduce the deficit and restore fiscal responsibility to a budget process that has run amuck.

Mr. Chairman, because the CBC believes that education is the greatest legacy that we can provide to our children, the CBC's budget fully funds No Child Left Behind. We also provide an additional \$2.5 billion for school construction and an additional \$450 million for Pell Grants which will help thousands more students attend college. We also increase funding for Head Start by \$2 billion over the Republican budget so that we can ensure that more low-income children are properly prepared to enter the first grade.

The CBC budget substitute recognizes the vital role that the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program plays in improving our communities. The Republican budget proposes to cut CDBG by at least \$800 million and the cuts could end up as high as the \$1.9 billion cut proposed by the President. These cuts to the CDBG program will leave a huge hole in the budgets of our local governments,

a hole they cannot and will not be able to fill with their own resources.

The CBC budget substitute rejects these cuts, and instead provides an increase of \$1.2 billion more than the Republican budget for CDBG.

We also reject the \$286 million in cuts proposed for the Hope VI program and instead provide \$500 million for Hope VI so that it may continue its important role in rehabilitating our nation's public housing. The CBC budget also provides an additional \$880 million for Section 8 Housing Programs, preserving and expanding this vital safety net program for millions of people.

Mr. Chairman, the CBC substitute is a strong and compassionate budget that meets the needs of the American people. I urge my colleagues to support it and to reject the Republican budget.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The House budget resolution addresses CDBGs. As a matter of fact, it adds \$1.1 billion aimed specifically at that. The difference between our budget, though, and this proposed amendment is our budget does not raise taxes, does not reduce defense spending in a time of war.

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

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. GILLMOR). The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus's alternative budget.

Among the critical investments it makes are those in health. Mr. Chairman, without these albeit moderate increases, we would do nothing to reduce the almost 100,000 premature preventable deaths that will occur in the African American community this year and every year because of our failure to act.

It is important to note that while the increases in the CBC budget apply specifically to programs that improve minority health, many studies have demonstrated that our lack of access, our poor health, and the failure of this country to focus on prevention in our

communities contribute greatly to escalating health care costs and adversely impacts the quality of health care for everyone.

So the CBC budget through improving the health of African Americans and other people of color improves health and the quality of life for all Americans. And with the additional \$167 billion reduction in our national deficit it provides, this is a budget that everyone can and should vote for.

I proudly applaud the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and this committee for this outstanding budget.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank both our chairman as well as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for their leadership on this most important effort.

I rise to support the CBC budget, the only budget in this Congress at this time that invests in America's families.

There are three things wrong with America and why we are not doing well. The permanent tax cuts cost \$1.2 trillion. On the war in Iraq we have spent \$300 billion, and the deficit is blooming.

Our CBC budget reduces the deficit. Our CBC budget invests in defense, homeland security, and the veterans at the same numbers that were given to this House by the President.

We must support the CBC budget. Americans have to be outraged that we are not investing in their families and their children and their health care. I hope that we will do right. The CBC budget must be adopted.

SUPPORT THE CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS FISCAL YEAR 2006 BUDGET SUBSTITUTE

The Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) fiscal year 2006 budget substitute focuses on the CBC's Agenda (Closing Disparities in America's Communities) and restoring fiscal responsibility to the federal budget process. The disparities that continue to exist in our society in education, health care, economic opportunity, justice, retirement security and foreign policy are addressed in the CBC budget. In addition, our budget focuses on strengthening our efforts at the Department of Homeland Security, meeting some of the critical needs of our troops and improving services to our veterans. And, while making these important investments in our country's future, our budget places a high priority on reducing the record federal budget deficit.

The CBC budget uses the Republican budget as the base budget and makes the following adjustments:

DOMESTIC

It includes a reduction in the tax cuts from 2001 and 2003 for an individual's adjusted gross income that exceeds \$200,000; furthermore, it does not adopt the new Republican tax cuts.

Most of the revenue raised in the CBC budget is used to address disparities in America's communities; a substantial portion is reserved to reduce the deficit.

MILITARY

Ballistic Missile Defense spending is reduced by \$7.8 billion, leaving \$1 billion for research and development.

All of these funds are spent on other defense items to support our troops, homeland security needs, and veterans programs and benefits.

The total for defense, homeland security and veterans is equal to the Republican budget.

BOTTOM LINE

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 five years; this fiscal responsibility is rewarded by a reduction of \$27 billion in interest payments compared to the House majority's budget.

The CBC budget focuses on closing disparities that exist in our society and investing in America's future. We hope you will join us in supporting these efforts by supporting the CBC budget substitute.

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 2006 CBC ALTERNATIVE BUDGET

Total general revenue: \$32.4 billion.
Amount applied to deficit reduction: \$3.9 billion.

FUNCTION 150—INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The United States is facing unprecedented challenges to our national security and broader national interests. Although there is an overall increase in the President's request for international assistance for FY 06, more needs to be done to address the ongoing global challenges of health, poverty, disease, and disasters. Therefore, the CBC budget increases funding for these core development accounts with the overall goals of reducing poverty disparities and improving quality of life. +\$1 billion.

FUNCTION 250—GENERAL SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

The CBC supports the research and development efforts of NASA, the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Institute of Standards and Technologies (NIST), and the Department of Energy. In addition to research and development, the CBC supports additional safety measures for the Space Shuttle program. +\$500 million.

FUNCTION 300—NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

The CBC is concerned about adequate funding for the preservation of Historically Black Colleges and Universities. The alternative budget supports additional efforts to protect the historical heritage and important cultural role of HBCUs in the United States. +\$50 million.

FUNCTION 350—AGRICULTURE

The CBC alternative budget supports farms owned by African-Americans and other minorities. The CBC realizes that these farmers continue to depend on the Department of Agriculture's loan and grant programs and has allocated funding to modify cuts in agriculture programs that affect minorities. The Caucus's priorities also include increasing funding for expanding food and nutrition education programs and for the USDA Office of Civil Rights. +\$300 million.

FUNCTION 370—COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT

The CBC alternative budget works towards eliminating the housing and small business disparities created by the President's FY06 budget. The alternative budget allocates funding to the Small Business Administration and the Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP), 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 U.S. and to help entrepreneurs realize the American dream. +\$1 billion.

FUNCTION 400—TRANSPORTATION

The CBC believes that it is important to provide support for Amtrak. The Caucus is also determined to ease the transportation disparities in the United States by funding public transportation. +\$150 million.

FUNCTION 450—COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The CBC understands that federal support for community and regional development helps promote growth in economically distressed urban and rural communities. To remedy these economic disparities, the CBC would like to ensure that the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program will continue to improve housing conditions in low to moderate income neighborhoods. +\$1.5 billion.

FUNCTION 500—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The CBC alternative budget represents a comprehensive approach to education and training by closing the achievement and opportunity gaps in education. While the Administration proposes eliminating 48 programs (\$4.3 billion cost), the CBC budget dramatically increases funding for education and training programs by \$23.9 billion over the Republican budget. It provides funds for school construction, fully funds No Child Left Behind, and provides critical funding for Head Start, GEAR-UP, TRIO and IDEA. For those in college, the CBC budget raises the maximum amount of Pell Grants. In addition, the CBC budget funds the Perkins Loan Programs as well as job training, adult education, and vocational education programs that are critical in today's global economy. +\$23.9 billion.

FUNCTION 550—HEALTH

The CBC alternative budget makes eliminating health care disparities a top priority by funding health care programs such as Community Health Centers. +\$1 billion.

FUNCTION 600—INCOME SECURITY

Programs that serve children and families in times of need are essential to fixing the disparities that exist in the U.S. The CBC alternative budget supports additional funding for programs such as Hope VI, Section 8 Housing, housing for the disabled and the elderly, Low Income Home Energy Assistance and Child Nutrition. +\$2 billion.

FUNCTION 750—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

The CBC is concerned about the proposed cuts that affect local law enforcement personnel and programs. The alternative budget will help fix these budget disparities and fund the programs that keep our streets and neighborhoods safe. Moreover, the CBC understands the importance of providing adequate funding to Juvenile Justice programs that promote prevention and intervention. These programs support effective local efforts that reduce crime and delinquency, save money, and save lives. +\$1 billion.

Total Defense funds used, all of which are reallocated to Defense (\$1.1 B), Homeland Security needs (\$2.05 B), and veterans programs and benefits (\$4.65 B): \$7.8 billion.

FUNCTION 050—NATIONAL DEFENSE

It is a priority of the CBC to provide American soldiers with the equipment necessary to return home from Iraq in a safe, quick, and successful manner. Therefore, the CBC budget alternative reallocates \$1.1 billion within defense. These funds are used to protect our troops with body armor, personal gear, small arms and ammunition, as well as vehicle armor; for the construction and maintenance of Navy vessels in order to maintain the U.S. Naval fleet and jobs associated with it; and for other defense purposes to maintain our military strength. -\$6.7 billion.

FUNCTION 700—VETERANS

The CBC understands that today's soldiers are tomorrow's veterans who deserve our respect for the sacrifices they made. Thus, the CBC alternative budget aims to make critical increases in veterans programs, especially funding for veterans health care, as well as long-term care initiatives, VA medical and prosthetic research, and mental health care. +4.65 billion.

FUNCTION 920—ALLOWANCES (ALL FOR PURPOSES OF HOMELAND SECURITY)

The CBC understands that providing homeland security requires appropriate funding to meet the many pressing homeland security needs that face our nation. The alternative budget therefore devotes additional resources for guarding against terrorist attacks through our rails and ports, including cargo screening that prevents nuclear or radiological weapons from entering the U.S. It also supports essential funding for the Centers for Disease Control to help us prepare for a possible biological attack. Moreover, America depends on its first responders, federal air marshals, and boarder patrol agents; the CBC alternative budget ensures that they—and our collective homeland security effort—receive the resources that are urgently needed to protect the citizens of the United States. +\$2.05 billion.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank again the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of our Congressional Black Caucus, for their stellar leadership in spearheading this responsible budget. It should not be an alternative. This is the budget we should be voting on.

The Republican budget is fiscally reckless and morally irresponsible. The CBC budget, if we think about it, really is a faith-based budget. The CBC budget is not only fiscally responsible, but it is also morally responsible.

The Republican budget fails to live up to any standard of morality that speaks to the least of these. On the other hand, the Congressional Black Caucus budget acknowledges that in order to have a strong America, we must have all Americans who are not vulnerable. Our people cannot be desperate if, in fact, we want a strong America.

The Republican budget cuts housing, housing for the disabled by 50 percent. Where is the morality in that? That is turning our backs on the disabled. The CBC budget not only restores these cuts but adds \$120 million for housing the disabled.

The Republican budget is an immoral budget, if one asks me. Vote for the CBC budget because it is a faith-based budget that takes care of the least of these.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the Dean of the CBC.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus has carefully considered its responsibility here, and they have asked me to point out a couple of things.

In the Justice Department we need to put more money into three programs

that were cut: First, the programs that investigate gang-related crimes; secondly, the problems of juvenile delinquency; and, third, prison reentry. These are incredibly important.

And I just want to add that this budget that we are trying to replace ours with is one of the most mean-spirited documents that I have witnessed. Over 150 domestic program cuts. The \$81 billion for Iraq was not even included in this budget, as if it was a supplemental consideration.

So I ask the Members to join with us and let us have a great number of people supporting the CBC budget this year.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY), and I would like to wish her a happy birthday today. She thought I did not know that.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and I will not tell my colleagues which birthday it is.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the CBC budget and against the priorities of the Republican budget.

The Republican budget does nothing to decrease the racial disparities that exist in our country. In fact, it exacerbates them. Seventy-six years to close the college graduation gap, 581 years to close the wealth gap, 1,664 years to close the homeownership gap.

But when Republicans talk about growth, it is clear that too many American communities are just not included. It is also clear that the Republicans do not see our constituents because if they did, they would not legislate public policy that hurts them.

Even Alan Greenspan has decried the unsustainable income imbalances in our country. The Republicans continue to ignore him, us, and our constituents. It is a sad day when veterans, children, seniors, small business owners, rural Americans, and poor Americans have to take a back seat to the scions of industry and Wall Street.

I support the CBC budget and reject the priorities of the Republican budget.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, again I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) for offering this alternative budget. I do commend him for his hard work and efforts on behalf of his constituents, which are my neighbors in North Carolina. I am very proud to have him as a neighbor. I am very proud of his leadership and the stature he brings back home to North Carolina.

With that, we do have a disagreement on policy. His version of the budget increase taxes at a time when we are just now recovering from those tough days of the late 1990s and early 2000s when our economy was soft.

I think it is important that we keep cutting taxes for years to come so that

we can keep this economic growth going. And the best way to lift people up, the best way to give people an opportunity, to give them ownership, is by allowing them to keep more of their own money. In the last few years we have seen numerous people falling off the tax rolls because of tax cuts. We have seen strong job growth, new businesses being formed, greater homeownership in America. Across the board every group in America is increasing in homeownership. And I think it is important that we continue those policies to keep growth going while restraining government spending, cutting deficits, and funding national defense and homeland security.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, happy birthday to my colleague.

Let me resoundingly support the Congressional Black Caucus' budget, and let me ask my colleagues what better budget to have than the one that saves \$27.5 billion more in interest than the Republican budget? I cannot imagine that my good friend on the floor of the House would not welcome the opportunity of putting that interest into the needs of the American people.

We need affordable housing. We can go to any city, any rural community, and not see people standing in line to access affordable housing. Section 8 vouchers, which allows affordable housing for families of four and five and six hard-working Americans, there are 25,000 people on the list in Houston, Texas alone. Millions of people are still on the list because they do not have affordable housing.

□ 1245

Finally I congratulate the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) on this budget because it also invests in homeland security. With all of the talk of the Republican budget, they do not fund immigration and customs officers. They do not fund border patrol officers to secure our borders and provide for internal security. The CBC budget does. The CBC budget puts \$150 million in for Border and Customs needs. This is a strong budget for the American people. Vote for the Congressional Black Caucus budget. Save \$27.5 billion in interest. I think you will like that in your pocket and in your savings account!

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer another choice to those Americans who are disheartened by the current budget proposal being offered by this Republican Congress. Today, we offer them the choice of accepting the Congressional Black Caucus's, CBC, alternative budget. Truly, it is the budget of hope and compromise; it is the budget that closes the disparities in America's communities. The CBC alternative budget provides both social

and economic equality for Americans, instead of allowing the richest Americans to pay fewer taxes at the expense of vital programs needed by lower and middle class Americans. Surely, this administration and the Republican leadership in Congress will pay lip service to the needs of these Americans, but this budget does more. It demonstrates in writing that under our current budgetary situation it is possible to maintain necessary social programs while practicing true fiscal responsibility.

The CBC alternative budget is particularly strong in its support of educational programs, the greatest key we possess to close disparities in our society. This administration and the majority in this Congress promised to leave no child behind, but clearly they have reneged on their promise. The Republican 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 Republican 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. In fact, 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.

The CBC alternative budget in stark contrast provides a much needed boost of \$23.9 billion to education and training, including \$2.5 billion for school construction. The CBC alternative fully funds the fiscal year 2006 authorization level for No Child Left Behind, NCLB and provides for an expansion of the Head Start program. In addition, the CBC alternative doubles federal funding for Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Hispanic Serving Institutions; again closing the disparities often witnessed in higher education. In that regard the CBC alternative increases the Pell grant allotment for college students. Because as we all know, a mind, any mind, is a terrible thing to waste. Clearly, the CBC alternative emphasizes this ideal more than the Republican budget resolution.

Few things are more important to Americans than their home and their communities. While the President and this Republican Congress take steps to make it harder for average Americans to reach homeownership, the CBC alternative invests heavily in this vital sector. It funds home ownership initiatives that help families build real wealth. In the city of Houston alone we have 25,000 people waiting on a list to obtain affordable housing. These homes will provide them the stability and equity to build their lives and eventually achieve their own prosperity, we shame ourselves when we deny them the opportunity to do so. The CBC alternative also restores \$1.122 billion for vital Community Block Grants which were gutted in the Republican budget resolution. Without the ability to build up our communities how can we change people's realities? Without community development we allow these disparities to continue unabated.

The CBC alternative budget does not remove any money from the overall Defense and Homeland Security budget. Instead, it

takes \$7.7 billion out of the Ballistic Missile Defense Program, which has so far proven to be a failure and redirects the money to additional support for the troops in Iraq, homeland security needs, and veterans programs and benefits. Among the items of support for the troops in Iraq is \$75 million of body armor, personal support equipment, and other protective gear for troops, and vehicle armor; all of which we know the troops are in urgent need of. The CBC alternative provides an additional \$2.05 billion for Homeland Security including funds for improving rail and port security, which have always been high risk targets for attack. This alternative budget provides \$4.65 billion for veterans funding, so that when our brave men and women return home from fighting the war on terror they will know that their nation is ready and willing to take care of them.

The CBC alternative also funds the important sector of immigration. As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims I worked with the CBC to get funding for \$150 million for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, agents and border patrol agents, truly we are undermanned in this vital sector. In addition, as a member of the House Science Committee I worked with the CBC to fund an additional \$500 million for general science, space, and development and support the research and development efforts of NASA, the National Science Foundation, NSF, the National Institute of Standards and Technologies, NIST, and the Department of Energy. In addition to research and development, the CBC alternative also supports additional safety measures for the Space Shuttle program, which should be at the forefront of NASA's efforts after the *Columbia* Space Shuttle tragedy. Space and Science represent yet another way to eliminate disparities through knowledge and discovery.

This CBC alternative budget is proof positive that we can properly fund social programs while still paying down more of the national debt than the Republican budget. Again, I say that this budget represents hope instead of the despair we feel when looking at the Republican budget resolution. It is a hope for ending the disparities that continue to divide us and keep us to this day from achieving our full potential as a nation.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if I may inquire of the gentleman from North Carolina how many speakers he has left.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I was hoping that the gentleman would give us a little bit more time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if I may inquire of the gentleman how many speakers he has.

Mr. WATT. I have two speakers left.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. And how much time does he have left, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. GILLMOR). The gentleman from North Carolina has 2 minutes.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I believe I have 2½ minutes, Mr. Chairman. Is that correct?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I will, in a spirit of incredible generosity to the opposition, yield another half minute to the gentleman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina now has 2½ minutes. The gentleman from Florida now has 2 minutes.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) who prepared this budget, has his imprint on it and knows more about it than anybody.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me this time. I want to make a couple of comments as we wrap up. One is the massive tax increase. What we did was started with the base budget, the Republican budget. On income we changed the revenue by rolling back the tax cuts to the level they were at in 2001 for income over 200,000. If someone makes more than \$200,000, they get all the income tax cuts up to the 200,000, but no tax cuts after 200,000. Again, we spend \$167 billion less deficit than the Republican budget, creating \$27 billion less in interest payments.

Now, we have heard all of this about massive cuts in defense. Let us be very clear. All of the numbers on defense are exactly the same numbers as the Republican budget, with one exception. We fund missile defense at \$1 billion rather than \$8.8 billion.

If you look at defense, homeland security, and veterans, that total is the same because we use that money to fund defense, homeland security and veterans.

Now, on defense, I hope the gentleman from Florida is working with the Virginia delegation in maintaining a 12-aircraft carrier fleet. This budget, the Congressional Black Caucus budget, has a billion dollars more in shipbuilding than the underlying budget. We have \$75 million more in shipbuilding than the underlying budget. We have \$75 million more in body armor. We have in homeland security, \$500 million for port security; \$100 million for rail security, veterans benefits.

Those charts did not show what the present level of services would cost. It also did not show the fact that the Republican budget has co-pays and deductibles that our budget does not have. We say we have \$4 billion more for veterans, over \$1 billion more for shipbuilding, over \$2 billion more for homeland security. So if you look at that as a group, we are more secure with the Congressional Black Caucus budget than the Republican budget.

I would hope that we would adopt the budget. It saves money and makes us more secure.

I include for the RECORD the fiscal year 2006 CBC alternative budget breakdown:

FISCAL YEAR 2006 CBC ALTERNATIVE BUDGET
BREAKDOWN

Working off the Chairman's Mark, As Amended, all calculations are for changes above/below proposed Fiscal Year 2006 levels.

On behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus, this Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute seeks to offer to Congress and the American people an alternative budget that is fiscally responsible and aimed at reducing disparities in our communities. The CBC alternative budget raises revenue by reducing the tax cuts from 2001 and 2003 for an individual's adjusted gross income that exceeds \$200,000 and not adopting the new Republican tax cuts, eliminating corporate tax incentives for off-shoring jobs, closing tax loopholes, abusive shelters, and methods of tax avoidance, and eliminating the repeal of the limitation on itemized deductions (Pease) and the phase-out of personal exemptions (PEP) scheduled to take place between 2006 and 2010. These funds total an estimated \$36.3 billion in FY 2006. The CBC budget uses nearly \$4 billion of these additional revenues for deficit reduction. The remaining funds are used to restore cuts and fund increases in specific budget function areas. These include full funding for No Child Left Behind and providing funds for school construction and increases for other education and job training programs. The CBC alternative budget allocates additional funding for job creation programs under SBA, community and regional development programs including community development block grants, and law enforcement initiatives such as juvenile justice and prisoner reentry programs. It provides funding for child nutrition programs, community health centers, NASA research and development, Amtrak, Hope VI and Section 8 housing programs, and housing for the disabled and the elderly.

In addition, the CBC alternative budget reduces funding for the Ballistic Missile Defense program by \$7.8 billion. The CBC alternative budget reallocates all of this money for additional support for the troops in Iraq and other defense items necessary to maintain our military strength and jobs, homeland security needs, and veterans programs and benefits.

I. REVENUE RAISERS AND DEFENSE REALLOCATION [IN BILLIONS]

	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10
General (\$36.3 billion):					
Reduce Tax Cut					
Over \$200k	22.9	24.5	25.5	27.6	28.9
Elim Offshoring Incentives	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Closing Tax Loopholes	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Elim Repeal Pease & PEP	1.4	2.0	4.6	6.5	8.5
Defense (\$7.8 billion):					
Reduce Ballistic Missile Def.	7.8				
Total	44.1				

General Revenue Raisers

A reduction in the tax cuts from 2001 and 2003 for an individual's adjusted gross income that exceeds \$200,000; furthermore, the CBC budget alternative does not adopt the new Republican tax cuts.

Eliminating corporate tax incentives for off-shoring jobs.

The closing tax loopholes category includes closing abusive (tax) shelters and methods of tax avoidance.

Eliminating the repeal of the limitation on itemized deductions (Pease) and the phase-out of personal exemptions (PEP) scheduled to take place between 2006 and 2010.

The CBC budget applies nearly \$4 billion out of the general revenue to deficit reduction in Fiscal Year 2006.

Defense Reallocation

The cost of the Ballistic Missile Defense program is \$8.8 billion in Fiscal Year 2006. This budget leaves \$1 billion in that program for research and development.

All of the funds reduced from that program are then reallocated to additional support

for the troops in Iraq and other defense items necessary to maintain our military strength and jobs, homeland security needs (under the general allowances function), and veterans programs and benefits.

II. PROGRAMS (GENERAL): \$36.3 BILLION

All functions except Function 050 (National Defense), Function 700 (Veterans), and Function 920 (Allowances). All calculations are for changes above/below proposed Fiscal Year 2006 levels included in the Republican budget.

Function 150—International Affairs	+\$1 billion
Foreign Aid to Africa and the Caribbean ...	\$250 million
Global AIDS Initiative/State Department ...	\$500 million
Public Health and Preventable Illness Initiatives	\$250 million
Function 250—General Science, Space, and Technology	+\$500 million
NASA Aeronautics Research and Development	\$200 million
NASA Space Shuttle safety	\$100 million
Restore R & D funding for the NSF, DOE and NIST	\$170 million
NOAA Funding	\$30 million
Function 270—Energy	no change
Function 300—Natural Resources and Environment	+\$50 million
Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation Program	\$50 million
Function 350—Agriculture	+\$300 million
1890 Land-grant Historically Black Colleges and Universities	\$75 million
Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program	\$100 million
USDA Office of Civil Rights	\$25 million
Restore/modify draconian cuts in agriculture programs that affect minorities	\$100 million
Function 370—Commerce and Housing Credit	+\$1 billion
SBA Loan Programs—7(a), Microloan, PRIME, New Market Venture	\$145 million
Adult training and dislocated workers program	\$185 million
Manufacturing Extension Partnership	\$70 million
Home Ownership Initiatives	\$600 million
Function 400—Transportation	+\$150 million
Amtrak	\$100 million
Public Transportation	\$50 million
Function 450—Community and Regional Development	+\$1.5 billion
Community Development Block Grants ...	\$1.122 billion

Brownfields Economic Development	\$24 million
Empowerment Zones ...	\$22 million
Community Development Financial Institutions	\$48 million
Economic Development Assistance	\$284 million
Function 500—Education and Training	+\$23.9 billion
School Construction ...	\$2.5 billion
Full Funding for No Child Left Behind, including:	\$12 billion
Title I	
Safe and Drug Free Schools	
21st Century Learning Centers	
Teacher Quality Programs	
Education Technology	
Fund for the Improvement of Education	
English Language Acquisition	
Migrant Education	
Elementary and Secondary School Counseling	\$50 million
Vocational Education ..	\$1.5 billion
Job Training	\$750 million
Adult Education	\$400 million
Pell Grants	\$450 million
Head Start	\$2 billion
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)	\$2 billion
Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)	\$500 million
Hispanic Serving Institutions	\$400 million
TRIO	\$500 million
Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP)	\$350 million
Perkins Loans	\$100 million
Impact Aid	\$300 million
SEOG	\$100 million
Function 550—Health	+\$1 billion
Minority Health and Eliminating Health Disparities	\$490 million
Community Health Centers	\$500 million
Office of Minority Health	\$10 million
Function 570—Medicare	no change
Function 600—Income Security	+\$2 billion
Section 8 Housing Program	\$880 million
HOPE VI	\$500 million
Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program	\$200 million
Child Nutrition Programs	\$200 million
Housing for the Disabled	\$120 million

Housing for the Elderly	\$100 million
<hr/>	
Function 650—Social Security	no change
<hr/>	
Function 750—Administration of Justice	+\$1 billion
<hr/>	
Juvenile Justice	\$600 million
Department of Justice Prisoner Reentry Program	\$300 million
Weed and Seed and Drug Elimination Programs	\$100 million
<hr/>	
Function 800—General Government	no change
<hr/>	
Total General	\$32.4 billion
<hr/>	
Amount to be applied to deficit reduction	\$3.9 billion
<hr/>	

Port Security, including air cargo screening, preventing nuclear/radiological weapons in cargo containers, research and development, and grants	\$500 million
Centers for Disease Control	\$250 million
First Responders	\$900 million
Interoperable communications systems for first responders	\$85 million
Federal air marshals ...	\$65 million
Internal Customs Enforcement/Border Patrol Agents	\$150 million
<hr/>	

Total defense funds used, all of which are reallocated to defense, Homeland Security needs, and veterans programs and benefits \$7.8 billion

III. PROGRAMS (DEFENSE, HOMELAND SECURITY AND VETERANS): \$7.8 BILLION

All of the funds reduced from Ballistic Missile Defense are reallocated within various functions to provide for additional support for the troops in Iraq and other defense items necessary to maintain our military strength and jobs (\$1.1 billion), homeland security needs (\$2.05 billion), and veterans programs and benefits (\$4.65 billion). All calculations are for changes above/below proposed Fiscal Year 2006 levels included in the Republican budget.

Function 050—National Defense	-\$6.7 billion
<hr/>	
Body armor, personal support equipment, and other protective gear for troops, and vehicle armor	\$75 million
Ammunition for Marine Corps	\$10 million
Small Arms for Army ..	\$10 million
Building/Maintenance of Navy ships	\$1 billion
To study instances of waste, fraud and abuse within DoD business processes and implement specific GAO recommendations for reform	\$5 million
<hr/>	
Function 700—Veterans	+\$4.65 billion
<hr/>	
Veterans Health Care ..	\$1 billion
Survivor Benefit Plan Disabled Veterans Tax ("concurrent receipt")	\$2.5 billion
Fund long-term care initiatives for veterans	\$400 million
Remove proposed \$250 enrollment fee on Priority 7&8 veterans	\$300 million
Remove proposed increases in co-payments for Priority 7&8 veterans	\$150 million
Prosthetic needs for veterans	\$100 million
VA Medical and Prosthetic Research	\$50 million
Mental Health Care for Veterans	\$50 million
<hr/>	
Function 920—Allowances (all for purposes of Homeland Security)	+\$2.05 billion
<hr/>	
Rail Security	\$100 million

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify one thing, and then I will just close. I heard a few minutes ago that our budget, the House resolution does not fund the war against global terrorism. In fact, it does. There is \$80 billion for 2004, plus an additional \$50 million for 2005.

Again, I want to thank the chairman for bringing up a budget. The problem with that budget again is that it kills job creation with huge tax increases. But if you believe in huge taxes, you should vote for their amendment and not vote against it. It has, again, huge additional spending of the hardearned money of the American taxpayers. It has huge reductions in defense spending in a time of war. And because of all those reasons, Mr. Chairman, by the way, it also assumes that there is no waste in the Federal budget whatsoever because it does not go after one penny, not one little penny of waste in the Federal budget.

And for those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully request that we vote down this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remaining part of my time.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman have time left that he might be able to yield to me instead of yielding back?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has yielded back his time and the gentleman from North Carolina has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself my remaining time, and I thank the gentleman for his time. I want to thank all of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, and I especially want to thank their staffs who have really gone to a lot of trouble to help us put this budget together. This is the budget, Members, that gives you the choice. And a budget is about making choices. That is really what a budget is.

In our own households, we have to make choices. The choices we have

made favor closing disparities that exist in our society that have been here for years and years. The choice we make is to fund No Child Left Behind fully, and not to fund a ballistic missile system that has been a failure, even though we allow research to continue on that front.

So I would ask our friends to face up to these choices and resolve them in a way that helps us close these disparities that have existed throughout the history in this country.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the CBC Budget, a common-sense framework that embraces our values, that focuses on fiscal discipline and that invests in our nation's future.

To be frank, the budget that President Bush presented us with is a betrayal of the trust that is placed in us as legislators. It violates the commitments that we have made to our children, to our veterans, and to our farmers and it does so while amassing mountains of debt, that we have no means of repaying.

I stand in support of the CBC Budget because it is a fiscally responsible alternative that targets the disparities that plague our communities and puts our priorities where they belong. It lowers the astronomical budget deficit, by eliminating corporate tax loopholes and abusive tax shelters at the same time that it lowers tax cuts for individuals making more than \$200,000 a year.

This adjustment would restore an estimated \$36.3 billion in FY 2006, including nearly \$4 billion for deficit reduction. We will fully fund No Child Left Behind; build and repair schools; increase investment in job training and job creation programs. We will not slash community and regional development programs, rather we will continue to invest in housing for those who need assistance. We provide funding for child nutrition programs, community health centers, NASA research and development, Amtrak, Hope VI and Section 8 housing programs, and housing for the disabled and the elderly. And we keep our commitments to our nation's farmers who are depending on us to keep the promises that we made in the 2002 Farm Bill.

Additionally, the CBC Budget allocates funding for Veterans and Defense above the president's requested level, to support our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, bolster our homeland security needs, and fully fund our veterans programs and benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in fiscal responsibility. I believe that in times of national and fiscal crisis, sacrifices need to be made. But, I also believe that they need to be made by all Americans. It is unfair to scale back government programs that benefit hard working families in order to fund tax cuts that most benefit the wealthiest of Americans. We all need to make sacrifices, but we must also keep our priorities straight.

I believe that the CBC Budget does just that.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, this Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget continues the CBC tradition of advocating for increased federal aid to education as the first priority of the world's only superpower. For the last ten years the Members of the CBC have boldly trumpeted the fact that there is an Education State-of-Emergency in the African American community and in the mainstream of America.

The American people enhanced by universal quality education constitute the greatest Weapon of Mass Construction our nation can have. To maintain this Weapon of Mass Construction, to maximize Homeland Security, education must be our front line of defense. To confront violent fanatics and zealots in the military arena our soldiers must be the best trained and most educated fighting force in the world. To maintain, expand and guide the most complex economic system in the history of our civilization in ways that guarantee continued prosperity we must accept nothing less than overwhelming supremacy in education.

Our budget must reflect this overwhelming quest for supremacy. Members of the CBC have proudly supported an increase of 23.9 billion dollars in the education budget. More specifically we have supported the following restorations and increases:

Function 500—Education and Training	+ \$23.9 billion
School Construction	\$2.5 billion
Full Funding for No Child Left Behind, including: Title I, Safe and Drug Free Schools, 21st Century Learning Centers, Teacher Quality Programs, Education Technology, Fund for the Improvement of Education, English Language Acquisition, and Migrant Education	\$12 billion
Elementary and Secondary School Counseling	\$50 million
Vocational Education	\$1.5 billion
Job Training	\$750 million
Adult Education	\$400 million
Pell Grants	\$450 million
Head Start	\$2 billion
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)	\$2 billion
Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)	\$500 million
Hispanic Serving Institutions	\$400 million
TRIO	\$500 million
Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP)	\$350 million
Perkins Loans	\$100 million
Impact Aid	\$300 million
SEOG	\$100 million

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 134, noes 292, answered “present” 3, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]
AYES—134

Abercrombie	Baldwin	Bishop (NY)
Ackerman	Becerra	Blumenauer
Andrews	Berman	Brady (PA)
Baca	Bishop (GA)	Brown (OH)

Brown, Corrine	Jefferson	Pascarell
Butterfield	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor
Cardin	Jones (OH)	Payne
Carson	Kaptur	Pelosi
Clay	Kennedy (RI)	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rahall
Clyburn	Kucinich	Rangel
Conyers	Lantos	Rothman
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	LaTourette	Ruppersberger
Cummings	Lee	Rush
Davis (AL)	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Davis (FL)	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Sánchez, Linda T.
DeFazio	Lowe	Sanders
DeLauro	Lynch	Schakowsky
Dingell	Maloney	Scott (GA)
Doyle	Markey	Scott (VA)
Emanuel	Matsui	Serrano
Engel	McCollum (MN)	Sherman
Eshoo	McDermott	Skelton
Etheridge	McGovern	Slaughter
Evans	McKinney	Solis
Farr	McNulty	Stark
Fattah	Meehan	Thompson (MS)
Filner	Meek (FL)	Tierney
Frank (MA)	Meeks (NY)	Towns
Gonzalez	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Green, Al	Miller	Van Hollen
Green, Gene	McDonald	Velázquez
Grijalva	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Gutierrez	Miller, George	Schultz
Hastings (FL)	Moore (WI)	Waters
Higgins	Moran (VA)	Watson
Hinchee	Nadler	Watt
Hinojosa	Napolitano	Waxman
Holt	Neal (MA)	Weiner
Honda	Oberstar	Wexler
Hoyer	Oliver	Woolsey
Jackson (IL)	Owens	Wu
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Pallone	Wynn

NOES—292

Aderholt	Conaway	Hall
Akin	Cooper	Harman
Alexander	Costa	Harris
Allen	Costello	Hart
Bachus	Cox	Hastings (WA)
Baird	Cramer	Hayes
Baker	Crenshaw	Hayworth
Barrett (SC)	Culberson	Hefley
Barrow	Cunningham	Hensarling
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (CA)	Herger
Barton (TX)	Davis (KY)	Herseth
Bass	Davis (TN)	Hobson
Bean	Davis, Tom	Hoekstra
Beauprez	Deal (GA)	Holden
Berkley	DeGette	Hooley
Berry	DeLay	Hostettler
Biggert	Dent	Hulshof
Billirakis	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hunter
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hyde
Blackburn	Dicks	Inglis (SC)
Blunt	Doggett	Inslee
Boehert	Doolittle	Israel
Boehner	Drake	Issa
Bonilla	Dreier	Istook
Bonner	Duncan	Jenkins
Bono	Edwards	Jindal
Boozman	Ehlers	Johnson (CT)
Boren	Emerson	Johnson (IL)
Boswell	English (PA)	Johnson, Sam
Boucher	Everett	Jones (NC)
Boustany	Feeney	Kanjorski
Boyd	Ferguson	Keller
Bradley (NH)	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Kelly
Brady (TX)	Flake	Kennedy (MN)
Brown (SC)	Foley	Kildee
Brown-Waite,	Forbes	Kind
Ginny	Fortenberry	King (IA)
Burgess	Fossella	King (NY)
Burton (IN)	Fox	Kingston
Buyer	Franks (AZ)	Kirk
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	Kline
Camp	Gallely	Knollenberg
Cannon	Garrett (NJ)	Kolbe
Cantor	Gerlach	Kuhl (NY)
Capito	Gibbons	LaHood
Capps	Gilchrest	Langevin
Cardoza	Gillmor	Larsen (WA)
Carnahan	Gingrey	Latham
Carter	Goode	Leach
Case	Goodlatte	Lewis (CA)
Castle	Gordon	Lewis (KY)
Chabot	Granger	Linder
Chandler	Graves	Lipinski
Chocola	Green (WI)	LoBiondo
Cole (OK)	Gutknecht	Lucas

Lungren, Daniel E.	Peterson (PA)	Shuster
Mack	Petri	Simmons
Manzullo	Pickering	Simpson
Marchant	Pitts	Smith (NJ)
Marshall	Platts	Smith (TX)
Matheson	Poe	Smith (WA)
McCarthy	Pombo	Snyder
McCaul (TX)	Pomeroy	Sodrel
McCotter	Porter	Souder
McCrery	Portman	Spratt
McHenry	Price (GA)	Stearns
McHugh	Pryce (OH)	Strickland
McIntyre	Putnam	Stupak
McKeon	Radanovich	Sullivan
McMorris	Ramstad	Sweeney
Melancon	Regula	Tancredo
Mica	Rehberg	Tanner
Michaud	Reichert	Tauscher
Miller (FL)	Renzi	Taylor (MS)
Miller (MI)	Reyes	Taylor (NC)
Miller, Gary	Reynolds	Terry
Mollohan	Rogers (AL)	Thomas
Moore (KS)	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (CA)
Moran (KS)	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Murphy	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
Murtha	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiberi
Musgrave	Ross	Turner
Myrick	Royce	Udall (CO)
Neugebauer	Ryan (WI)	Upton
Ney	Ryun (KS)	Visclosky
Northup	Salazar	Walden (OR)
Norwood	Sanchez, Loretta	Walsh
Nunes	Saxton	Wamp
Nussle	Schiff	Weldon (FL)
Ortiz	Schwartz (PA)	Weldon (PA)
Osborne	Schwartz (MI)	Weller
Otter	Sensenbrenner	Westmoreland
Oxley	Sessions	Whitfield
Paul	Shadegg	Wicker
Pearce	Shaw	Wilson (NM)
Pence	Shays	Wilson (SC)
Peterson (MN)	Sherwood	Wolf
	Shimkus	Young (AK)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—3

Capuano	Davis, Jo Ann	Ford
---------	---------------	------

NOT VOTING—5

Coble	Delahunt	Young (FL)
Cubin	Gohmert	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mrs. BIGGERT) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1328

Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. GRAVES, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. LANGEVIN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. CARDIN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. KAPTUR, and MESSRS. DINGELL, LEVIN and DAVIS of Florida changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion to rise offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 101, noes 313, answered “present” 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

AYES—101

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Napolitano
Ackerman	Gordon	Neal (MA)
Allen	Green, Al	Oberstar
Andrews	Grijalva	Owens
Baird	Gutierrez	Pastor
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Becerra	Higgins	Pelosi
Berkley	Hinchee	Rangel
Berry	Holt	Rothman
Bishop (NY)	Hooley	Roybal-Allard
Blumenauer	Inslee	Rush
Boyd	Israel	Ryan (OH)
Brown (OH)	Jackson (IL)	Sabo
Brown, Corrine	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Butterfield	Jones (OH)	T.
Capuano	Kaptur	Sanders
Carnahan	Kennedy (RI)	Schakowsky
Carson	Kind	Serrano
Clay	Kucinich	Sherman
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Slaughter
Conyers	Lee	Smith (WA)
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Solis
Crowley	Maloney	Strickland
Davis (AL)	Markey	Taylor (MS)
Davis (FL)	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Davis (IL)	McGovern	Tierney
DeFazio	McKinney	Towns
DeLauro	Meehan	Udall (CO)
Emanuel	Meeks (NY)	Van Hollen
Eshoo	Millender-	Velázquez
Evans	McDonald	Wasserman
Farr	Miller, George	Schultz
Fattah	Moore (WI)	Waters
Filner	Moran (VA)	Nadler
Frank (MA)	Nadler	

NOES—313

Aderholt	Cubin	Hart
Akin	Cuellar	Hastings (WA)
Alexander	Culberson	Hayes
Baca	Cunningham	Hayworth
Bachus	Davis (CA)	Hefley
Baker	Davis (KY)	Hensarling
Barrett (SC)	Davis (TN)	Herger
Barrow	Davis, Jo Ann	Herseth
Bartlett (MD)	Davis, Tom	Hobson
Barton (TX)	Deal (GA)	Hoekstra
Bass	DeGette	Holden
Bean	DeLay	Honda
Beauprez	Dent	Hostettler
Berman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hoyer
Biggert	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hulshof
Bilirakis	Dicks	Hunter
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Hyde
Bishop (UT)	Doggett	Inglis (SC)
Blackburn	Doyle	Issa
Blunt	Drake	Istook
Boehrlert	Dreier	Jefferson
Bonilla	Duncan	Jenkins
Bonner	Edwards	Jindal
Bono	Ehlers	Johnson (CT)
Boozman	Emerson	Johnson (IL)
Boren	Engel	Johnson, Sam
Boswell	English (PA)	Jones (NC)
Boucher	Etheridge	Kanjorski
Boustany	Everett	Keller
Bradley (NH)	Feeney	Kelly
Brady (PA)	Ferguson	Kennedy (MN)
Brady (TX)	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Kildee
Brown (SC)	Flake	Kilpatrick (MI)
Brown-Waite,	Foley	King (IA)
Ginny	Forbes	King (NY)
Burgess	Ford	Kingston
Burton (IN)	Fortenberry	Kirk
Buyer	Fossella	Kline
Calvert	Fox	Knollenberg
Camp	Franks (AZ)	Kolbe
Cannon	Frelinghuysen	Kuhl (NY)
Cantor	Gallely	LaHood
Capito	Garrett (NJ)	Langevin
Capps	Gerlach	Lantos
Cardin	Gibbons	Latham
Carter	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Case	Gillmor	Leach
Castle	Gingrey	Levin
Chabot	Gohmert	Lewis (CA)
Chandler	Goode	Lewis (KY)
Chocoma	Goodlatte	Linder
Clyburn	Granger	Lipinski
Cole (OK)	Graves	LoBiondo
Conaway	Green (WI)	Lofgren, Zoe
Cooper	Green, Gene	Lowe
Costa	Gutknecht	Lucas
Cox	Hall	Lungren, Daniel
Cramer	Harman	E.
Crenshaw	Harris	Lynch

Mack	Peterson (PA)	Sherwood
Manzullo	Petri	Shimkus
Marchant	Pickering	Shuster
Marshall	Pitts	Simmons
Matheson	Platts	Simpson
McCarthy	Poe	Skelton
McCaul (TX)	Pombo	Smith (NJ)
McCollum (MN)	Pomeroy	Smith (TX)
McCrery	Porter	Snyder
McHenry	Portman	Sodrel
McHugh	Price (GA)	Souder
McIntyre	Price (NC)	Spratt
McKeon	Pryce (OH)	Stearns
McMorris	Putnam	Stupak
McNulty	Radanovich	Sweeney
Meek (FL)	Rahall	Tancredo
Melancon	Ramstad	Tanner
Menendez	Regula	Tauscher
Mica	Rehberg	Taylor (NC)
Michaud	Reichert	Terry
Miller (FL)	Renzi	Thomas
Miller (MI)	Reyes	Thompson (CA)
Miller (NC)	Reynolds	Thornberry
Miller, Gary	Rogers (AL)	Tiahrt
Mollohan	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi
Moore (KS)	Rogers (MI)	Turner
Moran (KS)	Rohrabacher	Udall (NM)
Murphy	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
Murtha	Ross	Visclosky
Musgrave	Royce	Walden (OR)
Myrick	Ruppersberger	Walsh
Neugebauer	Ryan (WI)	Wamp
Northup	Ryun (KS)	Weiner
Norwood	Salazar	Weldon (FL)
Nunes	Sanchez, Loretta	Weldon (PA)
Nussle	Saxton	Weller
Ortiz	Schiff	Westmoreland
Osborne	Schwartz (PA)	Wexler
Otter	Schwarz (MI)	Whitfield
Oxley	Scott (GA)	Wicker
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Wilson (NM)
Pascarell	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (SC)
Paul	Sessions	Wolf
Pearce	Shadegg	Wu
Pence	Shaw	Wynn
Peterson (MN)	Shays	Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Obey

NOT VOTING—19

Boehner	Jackson-Lee	Stark
Cardoza	(TX)	Sullivan
Coble	Larsen (WA)	Watt
Cummings	McCotter	Waxman
Delahunt	McDermott	Woolsey
Doolittle	Ney	Young (FL)
Hinojosa	Oliver	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BISHOP of Utah) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1351

Messrs. MARCHANT, POMEROY, BOREN, HONDA and RUPPERSBERGER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to rise was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote No. 86, on the motion that the Committee rise. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote No. 86.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 109-19.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Acting 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. 4 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SPRATT:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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 2015 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 2015:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,487,366,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006: \$1,616,662,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007: \$1,740,221,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$1,873,635,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$1,998,215,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$2,112,618,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$2,287,981,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$2,494,117,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$2,629,382,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$2,775,362,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$2,927,959,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: \$3,342,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006: \$9,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007: \$20,950,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$37,450,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$42,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$46,250,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$0.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$0.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$0.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$0.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$0.

(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: \$2,073,647,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006: \$2,164,495,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007: \$2,243,088,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$2,363,415,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$2,486,979,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$2,593,294,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$2,717,544,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$2,792,862,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$2,923,694,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$3,051,690,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$3,187,568,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: \$2,055,946,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006: \$2,170,816,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007: \$2,239,707,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$2,340,321,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$2,450,535,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$2,563,060,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$2,693,332,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$2,758,914,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$2,893,409,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$3,019,091,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$3,154,637,000,000.

(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: \$554,154,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$499,486,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$466,686,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$452,320,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$450,442,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$405,351,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$264,797,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$264,027,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$243,729,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$226,678,000,000.

(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: \$7,958,233,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006: \$8,624,174,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007: \$9,240,066,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$9,830,945,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$10,411,560,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$10,995,340,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$11,531,493,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$11,942,708,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$12,347,979,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$12,734,145,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$13,102,135,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: \$4,685,413,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006: \$5,061,151,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007: \$5,364,948,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$5,618,176,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$5,838,595,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$6,040,401,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$6,180,515,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$6,167,267,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$6,142,850,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$6,089,270,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$6,012,424,000,000.

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 2015 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.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$527,137,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$524,649,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$540,658,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$529,197,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$554,406,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$546,731,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$568,726,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$560,789,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$583,342,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$575,262,000,000.
 (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.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,089,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,375,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,251,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,332,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,951,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,770,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,713,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,388,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,377,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,165,000,000.
 (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, \$24,757,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,164,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,181,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,612,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,704,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,038,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,219,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,525,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,738,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,026,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,005,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,415,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,274,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,711,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,547,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,984,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,822,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,257,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,099,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,529,000,000.
 (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, \$3,308,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,128,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,175,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,643,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,327,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,366,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,225,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,717,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,278,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,927,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,910,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,597,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,942,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,839,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,975,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,764,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,006,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,014,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,041,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,255,000,000.
 (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, \$33,382,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,484,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,548,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,740,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,437,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,072,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,111,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,390,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,946,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,269,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,731,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,790,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,704,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,523,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,572,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,235,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,606,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,039,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,620,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,935,000,000.
 (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, \$30,371,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,078,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,115,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,958,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,829,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,771,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,357,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,450,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,383,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,560,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,209,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,449,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,953,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,237,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,015,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,262,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,134,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,390,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,077,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,354,000,000.
 (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, \$11,452,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,860,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,796,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,226,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,817,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,913,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$5,116,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,565,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$6,394,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$11,914,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,973,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,129,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,130,000,000.
(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, \$74,479,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$71,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$76,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$75,331,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$78,975,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$77,196,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$81,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$76,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$82,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$77,820,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$83,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$79,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$83,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$80,694,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$84,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$82,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$85,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$83,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$86,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$85,917,000,000.
(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, \$16,190,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,884,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,837,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,211,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,777,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,099,000,000.
(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, \$100,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$92,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$97,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$95,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$97,765,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$96,341,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$99,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$97,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$102,177,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$99,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$104,062,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$102,156,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$105,630,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$103,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$107,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$105,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$109,127,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$107,224,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$111,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$109,057,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$257,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$252,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$264,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$263,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$279,286,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$277,318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$299,465,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$297,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$322,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$318,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$343,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$341,356,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$368,302,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$365,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$393,878,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$391,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$421,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$418,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$452,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$449,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$485,809,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$482,145,000,000.
(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, \$331,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$331,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$371,899,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$372,191,000,000.
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.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$487,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$487,199,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$511,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$511,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$560,039,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$560,317,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$605,854,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$605,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$656,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$655,599,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$339,184,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$347,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$349,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$355,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$356,831,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$361,653,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$371,394,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$375,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$382,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$384,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$393,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$395,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$408,830,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$410,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$396,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$398,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$412,123,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$412,753,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$423,634,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$422,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$434,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$433,325,000,000.
(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.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$27,837,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,837,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,885,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$36,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$36,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$39,528,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$39,528,000,000.
(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, \$70,467,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,468,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,989,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,394,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,368,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$72,077,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,049,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$73,591,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$75,768,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,213,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$80,114,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$79,717,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$77,261,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,588,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,351,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$81,772,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,597,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$84,014,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$86,855,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$86,257,000,000.
 (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, \$41,980,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,148,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,697,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,381,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,786,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,066,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,896,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,723,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,041,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,753,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,241,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,828,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,455,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,032,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,714,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,282,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,014,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,575,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$54,212,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,760,000,000.
 (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, \$18,164,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,999,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,024,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,054,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,325,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,296,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,545,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,705,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,929,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,172,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,412,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,890,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,944,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,311,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,457,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,890,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,995,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,548,000,000.
 (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, \$310,255,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$310,255,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$358,985,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$358,985,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$395,851,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$395,851,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$424,099,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$424,099,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$450,267,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$450,267,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$474,290,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$474,290,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$494,088,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$494,088,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$508,705,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$508,705,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$524,530,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$524,530,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$538,755,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$538,755,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 (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, -\$55,351,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$55,351,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$63,253,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$64,378,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$65,171,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$65,983,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$61,868,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$61,243,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$64,440,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$63,815,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$67,045,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$66,545,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$69,168,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$68,980,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$72,566,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$72,566,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$74,924,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$74,924,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$76,984,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$76,984,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS AND CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE

Subtitle A—Reserve Funds

SEC. 201. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR THE UNINSURED.

In the House, if legislation is reported, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides affordable, comprehensive health insurance to the uninsured and builds upon and strengthens public and private coverage, including preventing the erosion of existing coverage under Medicaid, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations and aggregates to the extent such measure is deficit neutral (whether by changes in revenues or direct spending) in fiscal year 2006 and for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2015.

SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR NEGOTIATION OF LOWER MEDICARE DRUG PRICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Energy and Commerce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides for a reduction in new budget authority and outlays under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act through authority described in subsection (b), insofar as such measure does not provide for new budget authority in the form of a reduction in beneficiary cost-sharing (which may include the partial or complete elimination of the so-called donut hole) under such part, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall revise the appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations of new budget authority and outlays to reflect any resulting new savings from such measure.

(b) AUTHORITY DEFINED.—For purposes of subsection (a), the authority described in this subsection is authority for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate prescription drug prices under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, which may include either or both of the following:

(1) Authority to negotiate prescription drug prices similar to the authority used by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Defense, and the heads of other Federal agencies and departments in the purchase of prescription drugs.

(2) Other methods that lower the price of covered part D drugs under such part D.

Subtitle B—Contingency Procedure

SEC. 211. 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 III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE.

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

- (1) The budget year.
- (2) The period of the budget year and the next 4 fiscal years.
- (3) The period of the 5 fiscal years following the period specified in paragraph (2).

(b) **ON-BUDGET DEFICIT.**—

(1) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, the term “on-budget deficit” means a budget deficit that occurs in any year in which total outlays exceed total revenues, counting Federal revenues and outlays, except those of the old age, survivors and disability insurance trust funds established under title II of the Social Security Act, as provided in subtitle C, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

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

(d) **EXPIRATION.**—This section shall expire on December 31, 2015.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

SEC. 401. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON DEFENSE PRIORITIES.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) increasing Service members Group Life Insurance (SGLI) coverage to \$400,000 and providing free coverage to those in combat, and increasing the death gratuity to \$100,000, are high priorities which should not have been omitted from the President's budget request;

(2) continuing targeted pay increases for enlisted personnel and increasing reenlistment bonuses are also high priorities which should not have been omitted from the President's budget request because they are critical to the retention of experienced personnel;

(3) increasing funds for family service centers to support families of deploying service members is a high priority, and the President's budget should have requested sufficient funding for this purpose;

(4) increasing funds for community-based health care organizations is a high priority to enable injured service men and women to receive the care they need close to home, and the President's budget should have included sufficient funding for this purpose;

(5) funding cooperative threat reduction and nuclear nonproliferation programs at a level adequate to the task and the risks to our nation is also a high priority and was recommended five years ago by the Baker-Cutler Commission, and the President's budget should have requested sufficient funding in this area;

(6) funding the Missile Defense Agency at a substantial but lower level will ensure a more measured acquisition strategy, yet still support a robust ballistic missile defense program;

(7) funding satellite research, development, and procurement at a level above the amount enacted for 2005 but below the amount requested for 2006, which represents an increase of more than 50 percent, will provide adequate funding for new satellite technologies, while ensuring a more prudent acquisition strategy;

(8) improving financial management at the Department of Defense should identify billions of dollars of obligations and disbursements which the Government Accountability Office has found that the Department of Defense cannot account for, and should result in substantial annual savings;

(9) all savings that accrue from the actions recommended in paragraphs (6) through (8) should be used to fund higher priorities within the national security function of the budget, function 050, and especially those high priorities identified in paragraphs (1) through (5), as well as a strong ship force and defense-related homeland security activities.

SEC. 402. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON EXTENSION OF THE PAY-AS-YOU-GO RULE OF 1997.

It is the sense of the House that in order to reduce the deficit, Congress should extend PAYGO in its original form in the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, making the rule apply both to tax decreases and to mandatory spending increases.

SEC. 403. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING FUNDING FOR THE MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) this resolution provides a total of \$110 million for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership for 2006, \$63 million more than the President's request, and supports adequate funding throughout the period covered by this resolution; and

(2) this funding protects the viability of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership and provides the necessary resources for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership to continue helping small manufacturers reach their optimal performance and create jobs.

SEC. 404. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON EDUCATION.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the resolution rejects the President's cuts to elementary and secondary education, as well as the President's proposals to increase student costs for college loans and to cut or eliminate programs that help students obtain a post-secondary education;

(2) the resolution provides a \$100 annual increase in the maximum Pell Grant award in each of the next ten years, and assumes increased efficiency in the student loan programs; and

(3) the mandatory levels in this resolution provide the \$4.3 billion needed to eliminate the current shortfall in the Pell Grant program, restoring the program to a sound financial basis.

SEC. 405. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) this resolution provides additional homeland security funding above the President's requested level for 2006 and every subsequent year;

(2) this resolution provides \$9,800,000,000 above the President's requested level for 2006, and greater amounts in subsequent years, in the four budget functions (Function 400, Transportation; Function 450, Community and Regional Development; Function 550, Health; and Function 750, Administration of Justice) which fund most nondefense homeland security activities; and

(3) the homeland security funding provided in this resolution will help to strengthen the security of our Nation's transportation system and other critical infrastructure, including our seaports, and help secure our borders, increase the preparedness of our public health system, train and equip our first responders, and otherwise strengthen the Nation's homeland security.

SEC. 406. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING PAY PARITY.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) compensation for civilian and military employees of the United States, without whom we cannot successfully serve and protect our citizens and taxpayers, must be sufficient to support our critical efforts to recruit, retain, and reward quality people effectively and responsibly; and

(2) to achieve this objective, the rate of increase in the compensation of civilian employees should be equal to that proposed for the military in the President's fiscal year 2006 budget.

SEC. 407. POLICY.

It is the policy of this budget resolution to balance long-term deficit reduction with middle-income tax relief. To this end, this resolution assumes tax relief, subject to the PAYGO requirements as imposed in section 301, which includes the following:

- (1) extension of the child tax credit;
- (2) extension of marriage penalty relief;
- (3) extension of the 10 percent individual bracket;

(4) modification of the alternative minimum tax to minimize its impact on middle-income taxpayers;

(5) elimination of estate taxes on all but the very largest estates by reforming and substantially increasing the unified credit;

(6) extension of the research and experimentation tax credit;

(7) extension of the deduction for State and local sales taxes.

To meet the revenue requirements of this resolution and to comply with the PAYGO requirements imposed in section 301, this budget resolution assumes revenue measures such as: strengthening tax compliance; imposing measures to close corporate tax avoidance devices; and continuing the current limitations on personal exemptions and itemized deductions (so-called “PEP” and

“Pease”)—the repeal of which disproportionately benefits taxpayers with annual incomes exceeding \$1 million.

SEC. 408. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION.

It is the sense of the House that the budget should reject the cuts to Amtrak in the President's budget and should provide sufficient resources to allow Amtrak to carry forward its mission.

SEC. 409. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON TAX SIMPLIFICATION AND TAX FAIRNESS.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the current tax system has been made increasingly complex and unfair to the detriment of the vast majority of working Americans;

(2) constant change and manipulation of the tax code have adverse effects on taxpayers understanding and trust in the Nation's tax laws;

(3) these increases in complexity and lack of clarity have made compliance more challenging for the average taxpayer and small business owner; and

(4) this budget resolution contemplates a comprehensive review of recent changes in the tax code, leading to future action to reduce the tax burden and compliance burden for middle-income workers and their families in the context of tax reform that makes the Federal tax code simpler and fairer to all taxpayers, and ensures that this generation of Americans does not force future generations to pay our bills.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 154, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to personally thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) so much for the work that he has done in having the record make it clear that we in the House of Representatives did have an alternative to what was presented to us.

There is a lot of talk about moral values that we hear about politically; but I do not care what your religious background is, there are always these stories about the sick and the poor in need; and on the other side, the option is for the rich and the greedy and the insensitive.

You do not have to be a Republican or a Democrat when you look at the document that was placed before us by the majority and then to take a look at the compassion and the common sense that is involved in the alternative that the gentleman from South Carolina and his team have brought to us. But I am not here to talk about compassion. I am too old to believe that it is going to change.

I am here to talk about national security, national security at a time that we are going through these economic deficits. It would just seem to me that

it would make a lot of sense if we invested in our young people that are going to school, to make them more productive and make them tax-paying. It seems to me it would make a lot of sense to invest in someone's health so that they would not have to go to community centers, which are being cut back, that they would not have to go into the hospitals.

It seems to me that we would have a sense of national security by thanking our veterans who fight the war, keep the spirits up and not tax them for getting sick or having ailments. It seems to me that in the final analysis, what we have done is borrow money and ask that we make these tremendous tax cuts permanent and whatever our kids get and our grandchildren get will be the debt that this body can possibly place on them.

I just hope that somewhere along the line someone would say that if you really care about this country, that you will care about all of its people, you will be concerned about its working people and be concerned in making Social Security something that will be guaranteed for them because we promised them that it would be.

But I do not think that anyone takes this budget seriously, not if you leave out of it the alternative minimum tax, which no one would want to be able to tell their constituents that this \$600 billion tax increase that we are going to place on them, that we did not mean to do it; and no matter how many cities the President goes to, no one would believe that he was sincere about reforming the Social Security system when he knows, Republicans know, Democrats know, that it is going to take money to do this and that is not in the budget. And there are so many other things that are left out. Even the money that is paid into Social Security, that is not counted as a part of our debt.

But one day, just one day, historians or maybe our kids and grandkids are going to ask each and every one of us, when this country was going into this deficit hellhole and when the poor were becoming poorer and the sick, we were cutting their benefits, what were you doing and how were you voting, and I am glad that we will have an opportunity just not to be able to vote against what the majority has given us, but that we have an alternative that the gentleman from South Carolina and the minorities on the Budget Committee and so many others have worked together to say that we are proud to be Americans, we are proud to be Members of Congress, and we are proud that we voted the right way.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), a member of the committee.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in strong opposition to the Spratt amendment. I respect the ranking member and the work that he has

put into the Budget Committee, but I have to clarify a number of points that have been made by the prior speaker.

This budget goes a long way toward laying out priorities for this Nation. We have through this process been afforded the opportunity to see a variety of different sets of priorities. Members have had the opportunity to vote on four different blueprints for this Nation, across the ideological and political spectrum. I think that is a healthy thing. I do not think that happens enough in this House where we have good solid debate like this. The differences amongst those priorities, though, are stark.

Our budget lays out a blueprint that invests in defense and invests in homeland security, two things that we find to be most urgent at a time when our Nation has come under attack recently and where we are engaged in conflict against terrorism around the world. We create in this budget blueprint an opportunity for policies to move forward that create jobs, that allow for continued economic expansion, that allow us to build upon the fact that homeownership is at its highest rate ever, that Americans are enjoying a lower tax burden that allows them to make decisions about their children's higher education, about their small business, about their opportunity to carve out their piece of the American Dream.

It does not raise taxes on those same small business men and women who are taxed at the individual rate because they are an S corporation, because they are a small business, because they are the neighborhood barber or diner or farmer. We lay out a policy that also calls for fiscal restraint, and we balance the approach to fiscal restraint on both the discretionary side of the ledger and the mandatory side of the ledger.

For those who are uninformed about Washingtonese, the mandatory side of the ledger now consumes over half of the Federal budget and soon will consume over two-thirds. It is on automatic pilot. You cannot get your arms around the deficit without tackling mandatory spending. Our side knows that. The other side knows that.

You cannot be serious about budget reform without simultaneously addressing discretionary spending and mandatory spending. We do that. We shave the rate of growth by one-tenth of 1 percent. Yet the New Testament is invoked on a regular basis from the other side's talking points to claim that there will be blood in the streets, that there will be mass pandemonium and starvation because one-tenth of 1 percent of mandatory spending's rate of growth has been shaven off.

On the discretionary side, we bring eight-tenths of a percent cut to programs that have experienced double-digit increases over the last decade. You cannot look at the spending history of this House and this Congress' budget in veterans, in students with disabilities, in HUD, in education, in

homeland security and defense and find anyone who has experienced real pain or real cuts in the last decade. There have been substantial increases. Our budget lays out that priority, investing in defense, creating economic opportunity and beginning that long process of making tough decisions, the decisions we are paid to make to get our arms around the deficit so that future generations are not burdened and that the current generation, current workers, current employers, current small businesses are not seeing their tax burden go up.

Vote for the underlying House budget and defeat the Spratt amendment.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, 5 years ago, the budget was in surplus. Hard to believe, but it was in surplus by \$236 billion. We are here today grappling with a deficit of \$427 billion, the deficit expected this year, basically because of policy choices that were made since 2001, made since President Bush came to office.

□ 1400

The Bush administration bet the budget on a blue sky estimate and went for huge tax cuts that left no margin for error. I stood here in the well of this House in 2001 and warned that those projections of \$5.6 trillion surplus could disappear in a blink of an economist's eye. When the surpluses of \$5.6 trillion failed to materialize, the budget sank into deficit: \$375 billion in 2003, \$412 billion in 2004, and an expected \$427 billion this year and on and on and on.

I know there have been random events that no one foresaw, terrorism, and recession, but that is part of budgeting, reserving for such contingencies. The Bush Republican budgets of the last 4 years not only failed to provide for such contingencies, by budgeting right to the margin, but when deficits replaced surpluses, nevertheless they kept coming with tax cuts, tax cuts after tax cuts. This budget has \$106 billion in additional tax cuts included in it, knowing full well that all of those tax cuts will go straight to the bottom line and will add dollar for dollar to the deficit. That is one reason that the CBO says, in yesterday's production of the President's budget, that the President's budget makes this deficit worse, not better, by \$1.6 trillion. In other words, if we left it on autopilot, at current services, it would be \$1.6 trillion more in implementing the President's budget.

So let us be clear. We are here because of policy choices that Republicans have made, the White House and the Congress, over the last 4 years, and you were forewarned and took the risk. Given the thrust of this budget that is before us, we will be back grappling again for years to come with deficits as far as the eye can see.

Sitting here for the last 2 days I have heard their budget praised warmly by

Members on the other side, and there are features of it, frankly, that I would praise too. For example, it includes \$50 billion, as a rough cost, for our forces in Iraq and Afghanistan for another year, which is more than one can say for the President's budget, which does not include a dime. But this budget excludes the likely cost, according to CBO, in 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, which CBO estimates to be \$384 billion. This budget stops abruptly in 2010, running out 5 years of numbers instead of 10 years of numbers. That is a convenient place to stop because it avoids recognizing the cost of Social Security privatization, which the administration acknowledges will be \$754 billion between 2009 and 2015, but which it omits from the budget altogether. And while it calls for renewal of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, with the revenue impact of \$1.6 trillion, not a dime of that revenue loss is included because it falls after 2010, but it clearly affects the outyears. Add back these omitted items, and it is clear there is no way, no way, that we are going to cut the deficit in half in 4 years, 5 years, 6 years. Indeed if we pass Social Security privatization, as the President proposes, it will add \$4.9 trillion, as this chart shows, to the deficits of the United States over the next 20 years. In that case we will not see the budget balanced again in our lifetime. That is an undeniable fact, but it is a fact that this budget avoids acknowledging.

Sitting here for the last 2 days, I have also heard the claim that this budget takes on entitlements. In fact, the gentleman who was in the well just before me emphasized this as one of the sterling features of this amendment. But let us be clear. It does not take on Social Security. I do not think it should, but it does not. It does not take on Medicare. It does not do anything to the farm program.

The chairman here has made it clear that these are not to be the objects of reconciliation savings. Reconciliation will mainly fall on Medicaid and on other programs like Medicaid, Medicaid being the health care program of last resort for the least among us. The President has proposed cutting Medicaid over 10 years by \$60 billion, but when the Congressional Budget Office scored his savings and said we cannot find \$20 billion of savings here, maybe 13, maybe 14, but not \$20 billion in these proposals, nevertheless, the committee has said to the Committee on Energy and Commerce to cut \$20 billion anyway. Three Governors were here to speak with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and me and to plead with us, "Please do not subject us to an arbitrary budget savings number. This program needs to be reformed. It needs to be restructured, but do not let reform be driven by an arbitrary number."

That is exactly what this budget resolution does. It lets reform be driven by an arbitrary savings number. It cannot tell us what, where, or how those

savings will be achieved. When what is off limits in the \$68 billion of reconciliation is made clear, we can see where the cuts are likely to fall. Medicaid for sure, big-time cuts, but also the earned income tax credit, the child care and development block grant, food stamps, TANF, veterans benefits. In other words, the safety net. These cuts will shred the safety net. They are not intended for the major entitlement programs but for the smaller ones that are for the least of these who need the help, the most vulnerable among us.

It will be argued, I know, that this is necessary to balance the budget, but, in truth, none of the \$68 billion in reconciliation savings goes to balance the budget. That is because it is more than offset by the \$106 billion in additional tax cuts. When we net these out, there is no spending reduction to put on the bottom line. There is no net reduction to the bottom line. The bottom line actually gets worse. Instead of using these mandatory spending cuts in Medicaid to reduce the deficit, as they would have us assume, these cuts actually are used to offset tax cuts. For whom we do not know, but, nevertheless, we do know they do not go to the bottom line and they do not mitigate the deficit.

So there are major problems in this budget, particularly when it comes to the key objective, and that is reduction of the deficit. And I will return to that in a minute.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished whip on the House Democratic side.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this Republican budget conclusively demonstrates one thing: that when it comes to audacity, our friends on the other side of the aisle have an unlimited supply.

Yesterday Republican leaders, including the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), majority leader; and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules, claimed on this floor that the policies adopted by the Republican Party last year reduced last year's budget deficit by \$109 billion. What an extraordinary Lewis Carroll "Alice in Wonderland" representation.

You incurred over \$350 billion of deficit, as you well know. The only thing you reduced was the inflated figure the White House came with at the beginning of the year. A figure that, by the way, was supposed to be zero, as I recall, the 2001 budget.

On the Republican Party's watch, the Federal Government recorded the worst budget deficit in American history, \$412 billion in fiscal year 2004. Four hundred and twelve billion dollars of deficit spending, and that is counting using every nickel of Social Security, which you said you were not going to do, which the President said you were not going to do. And you had a "lockbox." It is a sieve box.

Our Republican friends, it appears, are the only people who believe that a \$412 billion deficit is something to brag about. For years they have preened as fiscal conservatives, but in less than 48 months they have turned the projected 10-year budget surplus, a \$5.6 trillion surplus that they were handed, that President Bush from this rostrum said we had as a result of the 8 years of the Clinton administration, \$5.6 trillion, into a deficit today in 48 months. I will put up 8. Forty-eight months, \$4 trillion dollars. That is a \$9.6 trillion turnaround or \$2 trillion plus a year.

We ought to be ashamed of that. We ought to be ashamed to tell our children that that is what we have done to them. We ought to be ashamed to tell our grandchildren, of which I have three, that that is what we have done to them and their generation. We have added more than \$2.2 trillion to the national debt in 48 months. The entire debt of the United States of America from 1789 to 1981, when I came to Congress, was \$985 billion, cumulative debt. From 1789 to 1981, \$985 billion. Last year we raised the debt \$984 billion in one year. That is the height of fiscal irresponsibility, and I suggest it is also a fiscally immoral act and is the abuse of our children and grandchildren and generations yet to come, who in their time will face a challenge perhaps like Iraq, perhaps like AIDS, perhaps a tsunami or other natural disaster, and they will look around for resources to respond to their crisis in their time and say, oh, my goodness, the resources were spent by this Congress and by the previous Congress. What a shame.

The Democratic budget that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) offers has balance by 2012. It has the PAYGO system, which Mr. Greenspan is for, but you are not for because you do not want to pay. You talk about cutting taxes or raising taxes, but what you are really saying is you do not want to pay for what you are buying. And you buy because all the spending that we have incurred is in your budgets. All of the spending is in budgets. We cannot control the budgets. So all of the spending, but there is very little of the pain. That is fiscally irresponsible.

I would like to see who is going to vote for the bankruptcy bill when it comes on the floor that want responsible borrowers.

I will vote for the Spratt alternative because it is a responsible alternative, and I will enthusiastically and proudly and morally vote against the Republican alternative.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), our distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for his hard work on this budget and for yielding me this time to talk about his budget and this alternative.

Certainly his committee and he under his leadership have worked hard to bring us a fiscally responsible budget. The base bill we are debating today is the most fiscally conservative budget resolution we have considered since we joined the Congress.

The cuts we are hearing about in Medicaid are really a reduction of the growth. The cut in Medicaid, as I read the base budget, is a cut in the growth rate of 7.5 percent to a growth rate of 7.3 percent. Where I live, and I suspect where most of us live, 7.3 percent growth would not be seen as a cut.

The committee's budget permits us to extend recently enacted tax relief so that American families will not see a tax increase. What we have found is that if we trust the American people and American families, our economy grows again and it is growing. Passage of the committee's budget will provide for a real reduction of nearly 1 percent in nonsecurity discretionary spending. After holding the line on that category of spending at almost no growth in the last budget year, we hope to do even better this year and actually have a reduction of 1 percent below last year's spending.

Furthermore, the budget calls for a reduction in the rate of growth of mandatory spending. In addition to reducing spending, this bill will ultimately save taxpayers almost \$69 billion over the next 5 years. Only rarely has the Congress even been willing to discuss looking at mandatory spending. Almost all of our debate about spending is about the increasingly declining percentage of the budget that is discretionary. We are increasingly losing our control over the budget because we have not been willing to tackle mandatory spending.

□ 1415

The chairman's budget, the committee's budget, says that mandatory spending can be, must be, and will be dealt with. It sets the targets for the authorizing committees to do their work and find the places to make this process more efficient and cut the growth in spending in those mandatory categories that the chairman's budget, the committee's budget, sets out. That does put us on a path to cutting the deficit in half within 5 years.

The chairman's budget, the committee's budget, Mr. Chairman, is a good budget. I am proud of the work the Budget Committee and the chairman have done. I urge we move this budget forward today, we do the tough things in discretionary spending and mandatory spending it asks us to do, that we defeat the substitute and get on with our work.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire how much time is remaining on both sides.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), a member of the committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have now come down to two budgets: one offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) and the majority and the most fiscally responsible budget we have seen in quite some time here; and another budget that wants to tax more and spend more, and that is their answer to the Nation's fiscal woes.

Clearly, we agree that this Nation has a deficit and a deficit that is too large. But those on the other side of the aisle seem to act like spending has nothing to do with the equation in the deficit. We have been spending money here at over twice the rate of inflation, 50 percent faster. The Federal budget has been growing 50 percent faster than the family budget. We are on an unsustainable growth path on the growth of Federal Government. We must do something to control the growth of Federal Government.

Now, previous speakers, I believe, have used the term "auto pilot," that this budget puts the Nation on auto pilot. Well, let me tell you about the auto pilot that their budget puts this Nation on. That is an auto pilot that, if we do not do anything about spending, according to the General Accounting Office we are heading to a future where we will have to double Federal taxes or cut Federal spending by 50 percent.

Well, they do not want to cut any Federal spending. So what that means is we are on auto pilot to double Federal taxes on the American family.

Now, frankly, on our side, we have done our part. Tax revenues are up. We listened to the other side, and they talk about all the massive tax cuts. Well, I am sitting here, Mr. Chairman, and I have the latest reports out of the Congressional Budget Office. And guess what? We have cut marginal tax rates on the American family on small businesses. And guess what? Tax revenues have increased. Tax revenues are up. People go out and they save more and they invest more and they start small businesses.

I was in Jacksonville, Texas, a small town in my district, not too long ago and visited with a small business there that does aluminum die casting. Prior to the Bush tax relief package, they were getting ready because of competitive pressures to have to lay off two people. But because of tax relief, they were able to modernize their plant and equipment, and instead of laying off two people, they hired three new people. Now, that is five people that could have been on welfare, five people that could have been on unemployment. But instead, five people who represent part of that over two million new jobs that have been created in America, five people that are paying in taxes, as opposed to taking out. And that is why we see that tax revenues have increased.

And so, frankly, tax relief has been part of the deficit solution. And even if it were not, we are talking about a \$2.6 trillion budget. And if you look at the line item, tax relief is \$17 billion. Now, if you do the math, that means that tax relief is less than 1 percent of this Federal budget. So even if it was not bringing in new revenues to the government, how could tax relief amount to all of this problem?

The challenge has been on the spending side. Just look over the last 15 years: international affairs up 93 percent, agriculture up 165 percent, transportation 78 percent, education 95 percent. And the list goes on and on and on.

Now, often we get good things for our tax expenditures. We can have student loans; we can have Kevlar vests for our soldiers. But, unfortunately, quite often we do not get good things for our tax expenditures. Sometimes we get wheelchairs from Medicare that cost five times as much as those of the VA. Sometimes we get multimillion dollar studies of how college students decorate their dorms.

We are talking about reducing the growth rate of government. And I cannot believe, and no American family would ever believe, that you cannot find seven-tenths of 1 percent, less than 1 percent, of waste or fraud or abuse or duplication. American families would laugh at that.

And if we do not do this, Mr. Chairman, we are looking at this future, this auto pilot future that I believe is fiscally immoral, that will double taxes on our children and grandchildren. We need a budget, not for the next election; we need a budget for the next generation. And that is why I so strongly support the committee budget, the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE's) budget, because it is that fiscally responsible budget for the next generation.

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

Mr. Chairman, before yielding to the gentleman from Texas, I would simply like to say that I have here a copy of the CBO's report on the budget, January 2005, which shows that in the year 2000 we had revenues of \$1,004 trillion under the individual income tax. Last year, in the year 2004, revenues were \$809 billion. That is not an increase. That is a \$200 billion decrease.

One of the big differences between us and them is that we provide more for veterans health care and for veterans benefits. And now on that point, I recognize and yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I just went back to my office after I spoke, and I heard the gentleman speaking just now. And he talked about waste, fraud and abuse. And my question to the gentleman is, you have been

through the budget hearings. Why do you suppose it is that the Bush administration over the last 50 months has not rooted out that waste, fraud, and abuse?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, the opportunity is certainly theirs, having run the government for 4 years and having direct hands-on opportunities to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, that occurred to me as well. I thank the gentleman for his response.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, the American people and America's veterans deserve to know the fact. The fact is that the Republican budget being pushed during a time of war would cut veterans benefits compared to today's services by \$14 billion over 5 years. This bill is inadequate, and it is unconscionable in its treatment of veterans. But do not believe me; that is what America's veterans leaders have said about it.

They have called it "grossly inadequate" and "unconscionable." This came from the Disabled American Veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, two nonpartisan organizations. Maybe Republican leaders do not like it when veterans leaders point out the truth, but it is the truth.

I am deeply disappointed that during a time of war we would have Members of this House pay lip service to the service of our veterans; but yet when it comes to what really counts, supporting medical care, they are going to cut it by \$14 billion. That is 2 million veterans who will not receive health care under this budget.

Vote for the Spratt amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following correspondence for the RECORD:

THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET,
March 17, 2005.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, House Budget Committee, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE NUSSLE: As you know, the President's fiscal year 2006 budget would provide an appropriation for veterans' medical care that is less than one-half of one percent above the FY 2005 appropriation. Because this amount would not begin to cover employee wage increases and other inflationary costs, it amounts to a substantial cut in funding and thus would unavoidably result in a reduction of critical medical care services for our Nation's sick and disabled veterans. Although we appreciate the adoption of the Bradley amendment which added \$229 million to the President's recommendation for veterans' medical care, this is still grossly inadequate.

In addition, we understand that H. Con. Res. 95 includes instructions to cut spending on mandatory veterans' programs, such as disability compensation, by \$798 million. We think cutting veterans' benefit programs is unconscionable, especially at a time when America's sons and daughters are being wounded and killed every day in Iraq.

The four major veterans organizations of The Independent Budget, AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of

America, and Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, therefore strongly urge support for amendments offered by Representatives Spratt and Obey to increase funding for veterans' programs. Passage of these amendments is crucial if the VA is to maintain an adequate level of health care and other services.

Sincerely,

RICK JONES,
National Legislative
Director, AMVETS.

RICHARD B. FULLER,
National Legislative
Director, Paralyzed
Veterans of America.

JOSEPH A. VIOLANTE,
National Legislative
Director, Disabled
American Veterans.

DENNIS CULLINAN,
National Legislative
Director, Veterans of
Foreign Wars of the
United States.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2005.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, Committee on Budget, House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The American Legion is deeply troubled with and cannot support your Committee's proposed budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 95, with regard to funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), especially the reconciliation instructions targeted at earned veterans' benefits. Reducing mandatory appropriations for veterans' disability compensation, pensions, and educational benefits at a time of war is *inconsistent with the thanks of a grateful Nation*.

The American Legion believes VA's own admission that the cost of doing business increases annually about 13-14 percent because of Federal pay increases and inflation in the health care arena. The President's budget request is "scrubbed" by the Office of Management and Budget, so VA's true fiscal requirements to meet the health care needs of America's veterans are somewhat skewed. During the 108th Congress, former VA Secretary Principi reported to your colleagues that The FY 2005 proposed budget was \$1.2 billion short of what he had actually requested. It appears this pattern of short-changing VA medical care continues in the 109th Congress. America's veterans and their families deserve better.

The American Legion recognizes and appreciates the Bradley Amendment adopted by the Committee, but believes it falls well short of the total funding needed in VA medical care. Unfortunately, the Committee rejected the Edwards Amendment that would have provided VA with adequate resources to maintain current services.

The American Legion would encourage adoption of one of the amendments to be offered by Representatives Spratt or Obey with regard to increasing VA funding. Clearly, both of these amendments are in the best interest of veterans and their families. Without adoption of one of these two amendments, The American Legion cannot support this budget resolution.

The American Legion appreciates your leadership and the hard work of your colleagues on behalf of America's veterans and their families.

Sincerely,

THOMAS P. CADMUS,
National Commander.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY), a member of the committee.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, this budget values the service of our veterans. It not only values their service, but it meets the needs of our country, a strong defense, a growing economy, while we also reduce our deficit. I would like to talk about where veterans spending has gone over the last 10 years for just a moment.

As you can see from this chart, this is the overall spending on veterans programs over that period of time, from 1995 to 2005. We talk about veterans health care, perhaps we could bring that chart up, that has increased from about \$16.2 billion to \$29.9 billion. That is substantial progress in honoring the commitment of our Nation's veterans.

We have done a number of other things for veterans over the last several years, and perhaps if I could have the last chart. We have allowed Guard and Reservists to qualify for medical benefits; we have increased the GI education benefit over those years; we have opened up the VA system for all veterans to participate in and have funded it enough so that at least Priorities 1 through 7 are able to participate in that; and we have gone from 2.5 million veterans served under the VA to 4.8 million.

We have increased survivor benefits. We finally dealt with the whole issue of concurrent receipts, so that a disabled veteran is able to collect either his or her disability benefit, as well as their retirement benefit. We have reduced the wait times to get into the VA hospitals, and the VA has maintained its excellent care.

Let me talk about this budget, because under the leadership of the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE), we started at the President's mark, which was about \$30.8 billion for veterans health care, and the chairman's mark increased that to \$31.5 billion. Working with the chairman, I introduced an amendment that raised that by \$229 million. So as a result of the hard work of the veterans and the Committee on the Budget, we have increased from the President's baseline by \$877 million, which in these difficult fiscal times is a 2.8 percent increase.

Further under the leadership of the chairman, we have reduced the reconciliation number to a number I believe is very manageable. If you recall, the President assumed copayments on drugs and an enrollment fee. But the chairman's mark, because it is so much lower, going from \$424 million to \$155 million, I believe working together in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with the Committee on the Budget that we can in fact look for waste, fraud, and abuse and eliminate those types of things, without having to have an enrollment fee, without having to have drug copayments. Let me repeat that. The chairman's budget does not assume either enrollment fees or those drug copayment fees.

I look forward to working to make sure that we honor our commitment to our Nation's veterans. This is an excellent budget. It maintains a strong defense; it allows our economy to grow; and it meets critical needs for those who have defended our liberties, our Nation's veterans.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, if I were voting for a budget that cut veterans benefits by \$14 billion over the next 5 years, I guess I would want to talk about the past rather than the future as well.

The difference is very clear, and it is very simple. Republicans voting for this bill say that it is okay to cut veterans health care benefits by \$14 billion over the next 5 years. Democrats and national veterans organizations say it is wrong. In fact, the DAV, the VFW say it is a grossly inadequate budget, it is an unconscionable budget, especially at a time when America's sons and daughters are being killed and wounded every day in Iraq.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, before voting on this budget resolution, everyone should ask, what does it do to education, what does it do to the development of our communities, what does it do for veterans health care, and what does it do to the bottom line?

In seeking an answer to those questions, I would recommend that you look no further than a publication which came to your offices yesterday from the CBO, fresh off the press. Read table 1.1, page 2, and look in the far upper right-hand corner, and you will see the amount of debt we will incur over the next 10 years if this budget, which is essentially the President's budget, is adopted and implemented: \$5.135 trillion in additional debt.

□ 1430

But that is without funding the war in Iraq after 2005. It is without fixing the alternative minimum tax estimated to cut revenues by \$640 billion. And it is without reflecting one cent for Social Security privatization which the administration acknowledges to be a cost of \$754 billion between 2009 and 2015.

Adjust for these additional costs and this budget will add \$7 trillion to the national debt over the next 10 years. It will double the debt.

If that is the legacy you want to leave your children and your grandchildren, then vote for this bill. But if you want to put the budget back on a path to balance as it was in the year 2000, if you want to avoid the accumulation of that mountain of debt, then vote for the Spratt or Democratic alternative.

Our budget resolution gets to balance by the year 2012. It accumulates \$1.7 trillion less in debt over the next 10 years than the Republican budget base bill.

Ours also protects priorities, our children's education, our veterans, health care, our communities' development, and it supports defense, fully funds it at the same level as theirs, and it applies a rule proven to work called the pay-as-you-go rule.

This rule rigorously applied will do more for deficit reduction, exponentially more than the Republican resolution for all its huffing and puffing can ever purport to do. The right vote here is for the Spratt amendment or substitute, the Democratic substitute, and against the base bill, the Republican budget resolution.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we are coming to the end of the debate on the final amendment in the way of a substitute. I want to congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the Democrats for coming forward with a substitute. It is never an easy thing to write a budget, as we all know. But I appreciate the fact that so many of our colleagues came forward with a budget.

The prime argument that is being made here today is, first of all, that the Republicans seem to have caused the deficit, number one, and, number two, that the only way to get out of the deficit is to listen to the Democrats and increase taxes and increase spending.

So let me just take those because that is basically what the argument is. First of all, with regard to the deficit. Now, maybe my memory is just fading but I am trying to remember back to before the world changed on September 10 of 2001, and we were running a surplus. We had more money in the Treasury, in the Federal Treasury than we were paying out, but we also discovered something that next morning.

On September 11 of 2001 we discovered that we were running some deficits that we did not know about because the balance sheet did not give us much perspective on it. We were running a deficit in homeland security. We were not protecting the country. We were running a deficit in national defense. We were not able to project our strength around the world and protect freedom. We had a deep recession that we needed to climb out of that got a gut punch that morning and it lasted for quite a while longer.

So we made some very deliberate decisions that next day and days after. In a bipartisan way we said, it is time to reduce taxes, stimulate the economy. It is time to protect the country, do whatever it takes. It is time to fund our national defense. It is time to protect our borders. It is time to do all of these things and let us not ask the question today how we are going to pay for it. Let us do it. And we did it. And you voted for every one of those bills, every single one.

Do not shake your head. I will show you the votes. You voted for every single one of those bills to protect the

country. You protected the country with every single one of your votes.

So instead of coming down here today and blaming the Republicans for partisan purposes, why do you not remember the history you know, that it is Osama bin Laden that had as much to do with this deficit as anybody in this country. And instead of trying to get political points, you ought to just relax and try and figure out a way to get out of it.

So this is how we decided to get out of it. We said, let us control spending. Let us stimulate the economy. And look at what has happened as a result of that. Not only did the tax cuts not get us into that deficit, but because of the work that we have done, we are climbing out of it, because we are protecting the country, because we are stimulating the economy and are creating jobs. Because of all of that we have the opportunity in this budget to reduce the deficit and build on the progress we had from last year.

Last year we cut the deficit 20 percent, 20 percent in one year with a growing economy and controlling spending. And so we are starting on a glidepath, reducing that deficit every year. The deficit was not caused overnight. It is going to take some time to get it down and we have a plan to accomplish that.

Now, I also want to put this deficit in some perspective. You have got to compare the deficit to something. You cannot just say \$500 billion is a lot of money or \$200 billion is a lot of money. Of course it is a lot of money. But compared to what is it a lot of money? Compared to our economy is the measure that every single economist says you have got to compare it to.

And as you look at the deficit as it is compared to our economy, you can see here that this year we are at 3.6 percent of our economy. If we stick to this belt tightening that is responsible over time, we will be able to get down to 1 percent of the economy.

And why is that important? Well, first of all let me show you deficits in the past. This is not even the biggest deficit we have ever run. This is not the biggest deficit. Look back in 1946 after World War II, we were running a deficit that was 7 percent of our economy. Let us look to the year I first came to Congress. It was 3.9 percent of the economy back in 1990 when the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and I came to Congress. Let us look back to the early eighties when we complained. It was 5 percent.

We are talking about an economy that is chugging along and growing. We are talking about a deficit plan that gets us below the rate of growth that we need to get to in order to have a responsible budget, and we need to pass this plan and get on with business. We do not need tax increases and we do not need more spending.

Vote down the Spratt substitute.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, we are here today in this Chamber to consider a fantasy budget.

It is ludicrous for the House leadership to move forward with this budget debate by ignoring the issues of the day merely to lock in huge tax cuts and offer damaging spending cuts to health care, education, veterans' services and much more. We need a better plan. The Democratic alternative that I support would reinstate the pay-as-you-go rule and balance the budget by 2012, just as the Baby Boomers begin their massive retirement, while maintaining significant support for our national defense, veterans programs, education, and health care, which will help grow our economy and create jobs.

I do commend the President for recognizing the importance of the Milk Income Loss Compensation (MLLC) Program as a safety net for America's dairy farmers and including an extension of the program in the Administration's proposed budget. The Republican budget, however, recklessly zeros out this important program, placing struggling family farmers across this nation in peril.

We know that the budget has not included the long-term cost of Iraq, which already cost the country \$275 billion, the estimated \$5 trillion in the next 20 years for privatizing Social Security, and the full costs of the tax cuts. In fact, it does not even include a full ten-year budget report. The report lacks detail and leaves many programs vulnerable to steep cuts. I would expect a complete and full report in a document as important as the United States Budget. As the campaign in Iraq continues, our thoughts and prayers go out to the young men and women in uniform as well as to their families. May they complete their mission quickly and decisively so they can return home soon and safe.

Our veterans are returning home as we speak. These are the fine men and women who fought to help bring democracy to Iraq. The budget plan calls for cuts in veterans' health care benefits and reduces medical personal by more than 3,000, along with cutting \$9 million from other areas in the already overstretched VA. While the budget cuts to veterans' programs, Medicaid grants, and other important programs represent a very small amount of the overall budget, they will make a large difference to the families who depend on them.

The projected budget deficit of \$427 billion for FY06 is revolting. Perhaps the worst aspect of this budget is that it is not paid for. This is the classic recipe for exploding budget deficits as far as the eye can see; it's the height of fiscal irresponsibility occurring at exactly the wrong moment during our Nation's history when 80 million Americans, the so-called baby boomers, are rapidly approaching retirement. This is a demographic time bomb ready to explode. That is why the Republican budget proposal, in effect, constitutes taxation without representation because it will be our children and our grandchildren who will be asked to pay for this fiscal mess. I couldn't think of doing anything more unfair to them. The children are our future, and we owe it to them to give them a stable foundation.

As the father of two little boys, I did not come to this Congress to leave a legacy of debt for them or future generations to climb out of. Our Democratic alternative, however, anticipates this demographic time bomb by achieving balance, while offering an economic stimulus plan now that is fair, quick, and responsible. It supports our troops, but it also

supports our nation's veterans, our seniors, and our children's education programs.

So I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic substitute. I would call on the leadership in the House to pull their budget resolution so that we can have an honest debate with honest figures, factoring in a realistic cost of the Iraq operation.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSSELLA). All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 264, answered "present" 1, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

AYES—165

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

NOES—264

Aderholt	Bachus	Barrow
Akin	Baker	Bartlett (MD)
Alexander	Barrett (SC)	Barton (TX)

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

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

 Capuano

NOT VOTING—4

Coble	Ryun (KS)
Delahunt	Young (FL)

□ 1515

Messrs. GRAVES, CHOCOLA and COX changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSSELLA). Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider a period of final debate on the concurrent resolution.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, during much of this debate, as I noted earlier, my Republican colleagues have taken the attitude that today's deficits were unforeseeable, unavoidable, beyond their control. But we warned here in 2001 and in every year thereafter when this resolution came before this House that the other side of the aisle was betting the budget on a blue sky forecast and leaving no margin for error. It is their policy choices made in the face of our objections that have brought us to the point we find ourselves today.

In deficit this year by \$427 billion, last year by \$412 billion, the year before by \$375 billion, each year has broken a record for a bigger and bigger deficit.

□ 1515

You control the House, you control the Senate, you control the White House; but you have not been able to control the budget, and you cannot escape responsibility for its dismal condition.

As we stand here at the threshold of passing another budget resolution, I want to forewarn you, you will not take the deficit away, this resolution will not. You will not move the deficit down. It will only move it up and out, year after year after year to come.

But do not take my word for it. I am partisan. I am the Democratic ranking member on this committee. Read what our neutral, nonpartisan budget shop, the Congressional Budget Office, has to say in a report that we request every year as a matter of law, analysis of the President's budgetary proposals for fiscal year 2006. Every Member has one of these in his or her office. You only have to read to the second page and look in the upper right-hand corner, and you will see there that the Congressional Budget Office says if the President's budget is passed and implemented over the next 10 years, it will accumulate \$5.135 trillion in additional debt of the United States. Table 1.1, it is laid out there.

But as you all know and understand the way CBO does these estimates, they do not include all the costs. Since the President does not have costs in his budget for Afghanistan and Iraq after 2005, this resolution, this estimate does not assume it, even though CBO estimates that the additional costs will be

\$384 billion. It does not include a dime for fixing the alternative minimum tax, even though we are warned that by 2010 there will be 30 million taxpayers paying it rather than the regular tax schedule. And CBO says the cost of fixing it over 10 years is \$640 billion.

It includes nothing for the President's signature initiative, the one he is pushing hardest and first and that is to partially privatize Social Security. The President has indicated himself that the cost of doing that, the additional deficits we will add if we do that between 2009 and 2015 will be \$754 billion.

When you add all of these additional costs into the mix, then the debt incurred through 2016 will be \$7 trillion. We will double the debt of the United States. If indeed we do what the President is proposing and allow workers to peel 4 percentage points off FICA and put those payments into a private account, we will incur \$4.9 trillion in debt over the next 20 years. We will not see the budget balanced again in our lifetime.

CBO is our forecaster, our neutral, nonpartisan budget shop. They are warning us this budget will not bring the deficit down. This budget will not do away with the deficit. It will make the deficit worse. Indeed, they tell us in this report, same page, page 2, that the President's budget, basically your budget, the President's budget, makes the situation \$2 trillion worse than if we just left things on automatic pilot for current services.

I would simply close by saying, vote against this resolution. Let us go back to the drawing board. We can do better.

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

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

If I might take just a brief moment in introducing my first speaker, I would like to just say on behalf of our side in particular but I think on behalf of the entire Congress, we always respect Members who go on to bigger and better things and today the President made a wise announcement in nominating the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) to become our U.S. Trade Representative.

The applause meter made it look pretty good for confirmation there, I say to my very good friend, and he is my friend. He has been the vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget, and he has been a great wing man and personal friend to so many.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I promise I will not talk about trade. But I will talk about this budget. I want to start by saying this budget is not all the details. It is a blueprint. The authorizing committees, the appropriating committees, will fill out those details. But it is a blueprint

that says something about who we are. And the three pillars in this budget, I think, reflect the principles and the priorities of this House.

First, we believe that our country ought to be protected and strength is emphasized. That is our national security and our homeland security. Second is to be sure we have a strong economy. The tax relief has worked: 4.4 percent growth last year; 3 million jobs added to our economy in the last 21 months alone. The economy is strong and growing. We need to be sure that continues and that is why tax increases are not part of this budget.

And, third, to be sure that we do as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) says appropriately, keep our spending under control, we take responsible steps to restrain spending both in domestic discretionary and in the entitlement area.

Those are the three pillars. By doing so, we reduce the deficit in half within 4 years. I commend the chairman for coming up with this budget.

The process by which we got here also says something about who we are. I want to commend the ranking member from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his civility. I want to commend the members of the Committee on the Budget for the great debate that we had over the last month or so, I want to commend the Members on the floor who have had a great debate here, and I want to commend, finally, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget. The gentleman from Iowa has conducted himself in the Committee on the Budget and here on the floor through an open, honest process where people have had the opportunity to say their peace. He has done a great job in listening carefully to the concerns of so many of us in this conference and in the entire Congress to be sure we come up with a document that does indeed reflect the priorities, I believe, of our House, the strength of our country, the growth of our economy, and getting spending under control.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this budget which is, although just a blueprint, the appropriate statement of who we are and does indeed get us to the point where we are reducing our deficit, which is so important, but also funding the key priorities in our country. I urge a "yes" vote on the resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his great leadership in putting together a budget that is a statement of our values, that is balanced in terms of our priorities and balanced fiscally. He has always conducted the process of creating a budget in a way that has informed Members, has done so with great dignity and great fairness and great re-

spect for all points of view. I wish we would all join in acknowledging the great leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina, our ranking member on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, in 1994, the first item in the Republicans' Contract with America was the Fiscal Responsibility Act. Republicans pledged "to restore fiscal responsibility to an out-of-control Congress, requiring them to live under the same budget constraints as families and businesses." More than 10 years later, an out-of-touch Republican majority has taken fiscal responsibility to a new low. It is clear that in the 10 years the Republicans have become addicted to deficits.

The budget deficit for this year is a record \$427 billion. The February budget deficit, my colleagues, of \$114 billion for the month of February, a deficit of \$114 billion, is the highest monthly deficit ever and the first time it ever went over \$100 billion in one month. In 2001, President Clinton left President Bush with a projected \$5.6 trillion in surplus. In just 4 years, President Bush has turned that record surplus into a record deficit of nearly \$4 trillion, a \$10 trillion swing in the wrong direction.

Make no mistake, these deficits are the direct result of Republican policies, huge tax cuts for the wealthy, a refusal to pay as you go, poor planning for a war of choice in Iraq. The list goes on and on and on. America is awash in red ink because of Republican budget irresponsibility.

Tragically, this Republican budget is yet another missed opportunity to return to fiscal discipline. Not only is this budget fiscally irresponsible; the Republican budget is dishonest. It does not cut the deficit in half as Republicans claim. In fact, it makes the deficit worse. Republicans leave out the realistic cost of the war, the cost of expiring tax provisions, the true cost of fixing the alternative minimum tax and the cost of any changes to Social Security. The budget is dishonest in another way: it fails to show any deficit figures at all after 2010.

In our New Partnership for America's Future, Democrats have made a commitment to honor the value of accountability, including eliminating deficit spending and holding those in power accountable for their actions with a high ethical standard. Democrats support honest, accountable budgets that pay as you go. The Democratic alternative offered by the gentleman from South Carolina achieves balance by 2012. The Republican budget never reaches balance. It heaps tons of debt onto our children and grandchildren, and it will eventually lower our standard of living. We cannot let that happen to our country. And on top of all that, the Republican budget undermines the solvency of Social Security.

While Republicans ignore the real crisis of ballooning budget deficits, the President falsely claims there is a crisis in Social Security. But just because the President says it does not make it

so. He is simply wrong. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, Social Security's trust fund will grow every year until a high of \$8.3 trillion in 2032 and continues to be solvent until 2052.

I want to call your attention to this chart, my colleagues. The left bar represents the deficit in the general fund between now and 2035, a staggering \$15 trillion. The Bush administration has taken us onto a trajectory of reckless budgeting that will take us to \$15 trillion in deficit in 2035. From 2006 to 2035, \$15 trillion in deficit.

This bar here, the second bar, Social Security, 2006 to 2080, twice as long, more than twice as long, the Social Security deficit is \$2 trillion. It is clear that there would be plenty of money to deal with the Social Security trust fund if the President were not using the Social Security trust fund as a slush fund to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in America. Instead of doing that, we have a moral and legal obligation to pay back to the trust fund the money the President has taken out. We cannot let the President do this.

By running enormous deficits, the Republicans want to force the government to break its promises to the elderly. How on Earth are they going to pay the Social Security trust fund back if they have gone broke on the other side by running up these deficits in the general fund? Democrats will keep America's promises to our seniors. Democrats have done it before, and we will do it again. When Bill Clinton was President, we had 3 years of surpluses.

□ 1530

And with the surpluses, imagine, think of it. Zero deficits. \$427 billion in deficit for this year, over \$100 billion in deficit for the month of February alone, this year. And when President Clinton was President, the 3 years at the end of his term, we had zero deficits. And with the surpluses that were produced he was able to pay nearly \$400 billion off of our indebtedness, strengthening the solvency of Social Security.

Likewise the Democratic alternative that was offered today included pay-as-you-go rules that would block new tax or spending legislation that is not paid for.

Not only is the Republican budget fiscally reckless and dishonest, it is morally irresponsible. The leaders of five Protestant denominations, the Episcopal Church USA, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the Presbyterian Church USA, the United Church of Christ and the United Methodist Church recently called President Bush's budget unjust. They reminded us of the words of the prophet, Micah, who said, "What does the Lord require of you but to do justice, to love mercy and to walk humbly with your God?" Does this budget do justice for Americans? You be the judge. Is it doing justice to our children to give tax cuts to

people making more than \$500,000 a year, while underfunding Head Start, No Child Left Behind, student loans and grants and other education initiatives by \$2.5 billion? Is that doing justice to our children? Is it doing justice to our communities to give tax cuts to the wealthy while funding for community police and local fire fighters who are vital to our homeland security by cutting them by \$280 million? Is that justice? Is it doing justice to those who serve in uniform to give those tax cuts while underfunding health care benefits for veterans by \$14 billion short of what is needed over the next 5 years? Is that justice for our veterans? And is it doing justice to give tax cuts to the wealthy while launching a shameful attack on the poor? This budget cuts \$20 billion from Medicaid, a cut that Governors, on a bipartisan basis, oppose, and which the other body today has just rejected.

Let us hear it for the other body. It undermines the Community Development Block Grant Initiative with all considered restructuring and a massive 35 percent cut. It makes huge cuts to the earned income tax which takes 2 million children, lifts 2 million children out of poverty. But this budget, the Republican budget, makes cuts there. No. The Republican budget does not do justice, it does great damage to our country. Instead of being a statement of our values, the Republican budget is an assault on our values. And it is a blueprint for financial disaster.

I urge my colleagues to return to fiscal discipline, to honor our values and to oppose this disgraceful Republican budget. Thank you, my colleagues. Vote "no" on this budget.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, for those of you who have read the prophet Micah, I know that he was not speaking to the Congressional Budget Office. He was speaking to the human heart, and that is the biggest difference between the policies that we have before us today. We believe that the individual should be free and should be allowed to determine their destiny. We do not believe that government should make decisions that people can make better for themselves. We do not believe that money equals compassion. We do not believe that money often equals success. Money is not getting us results. And all that is offered on the other side is more money, more spending, higher taxes, more government, more bureaucracy, more regulation, more laws, more politicians making decisions that individuals and families and communities should be making for themselves in the freest nation on the face of the Earth. And that is why our budget calls for strengthening our country, growing our economy, giving power to individuals, and recognizing that if we do not control the size of government, government will take our

freedom, and it will not succeed the way we want to be able to allow people to succeed.

My friends, government is growing out of control. What we are asking for in this budget is something that we should do every day in Washington, and that is look at the results of the programs that we have put in place. Government, we believe, should be there to help people who cannot help themselves. And oftentimes, we have invented more government to try and take the place of families, take the place of neighbors, take the place of communities in order to solve problems. And too often we are not getting the results for all the extra money that we are spending. And too often, in this well of the House, we debate between percentages and dollar increases as if, if I spend \$6 and you spend \$7 you must care \$1 more. And that is not the way our debate should evolve. Our debate should be based on results. We need a results revolution in government. We need to look at the results we are getting from the programs we have put in place. If they are not working, we should reform them, and that is what this budget calls for. It says we are going to slow the rate of growth. It gives instructions to the committees to go through the budget of the Federal Government and look for ways to ensure that programs deliver the results that we require in order to help people who are truly in need and, at the same time, make sure we are defending the country, growing the economy and controlling spending.

Just like last year, the House will lead. We led last year. We led when we got to a balanced budget in the late 1990s, and we will lead again today by passing what I believe is the strongest budget, the best blueprint, to get out of deficits, to make sure that we get results from the programs and the dollars that we are spending and make sure we get back on a path to freedom in this country.

I urge adoption of this budget.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I will oppose this ill-advised budget proposal and I urge my colleagues to join me. Every year, we set our priorities through our budget. The priorities in this budget are all wrong. Our priorities should focus on helping those who need help before we begin to help those who don't. However, although we may not all agree with these concerns, one priority which we can all agree on is that we must reduce the deficit. Incredibly, the proposal before us does absolutely nothing to accomplish this goal. Despite all the assurances I have heard from my colleagues and the Administration, this legislation actually increases the deficit!

With record deficit levels, how is it possible that the majority has completely ignored fiscal responsibility? By passing tax giveaways, over half of which go to households earning over \$1 million—that's 0.2 percent of the population. Although many of us find this appalling, unfortunately, it has become predictable behavior of the majority party.

How can we justify this fiscal recklessness to our children and grandchildren? How can

we justify it to hard-working Americans who live paycheck to paycheck, unable to save money for emergencies or even just to see the doctor? Can we honestly look them in the eye and tell them that we are more concerned with millionaires and billionaires than with struggling middle-class Americans, brave soldiers, the sick, the poor and the hungry? I, for one, dread the thought. Yet, that is the message this budget sends. And, although my colleagues try to cloud its destruction with their transparent gimmicks, the message shines through crystal clear.

The resolution before us provides for total tax giveaways of \$106 billion over five years. Every child in America knows that you must save first before you splurge. They know that they must patiently fill their piggy banks with coins until they have enough to buy that toy they have been eyeing for weeks.

My colleagues do not seem to understand this common notion of balancing income and spending. They continue to splurge on our national credit card, racking up astronomical bills which our children and grandchildren will be obliged to pay. Soon they will ask for their fourth credit increase in four years, to enable the continuation of this reckless abuse of hard-earned taxpayer dollars.

The pay-as-you-go rule, or PAYGO, would solve the issue of unlimited spending by requiring new spending to be offset in other areas of the budget. Again, common sense would dictate that tax giveaways, totaling \$106 billion over five years, would count as new spending. The money is being removed from the country's revenue without replacement. The PAYGO rule would essentially require us to stop and think about how we are going to pay for things before we hastily enact them and end up in this ill-fated fiscal jam. Not surprisingly, however, many of my colleagues have insisted on exempting the billions of dollars in tax giveaways from the PAYGO rule. They do so without an explanation of how they plan to restore the lost revenue. There is no good reason, particularly when we are running record deficits, to reject the very successful practice we used in the 1990's to produce record surpluses.

Unlike the federal government, states are not permitted to spend without restraint. States cannot run up their credit card bills or repeatedly increase their credit limits. Yet, this budget increases the financial burden on the states. The federal government has an agreement with the states—we will help pay for programs which we mandate—programs vital to America, including education, healthcare and job training. And we have been successful in our partnership with the states, ensuring that millions of Americans are able to go to school, to the doctor and to work.

However, in their spending schemes, my Republican colleagues neglect our obligation to the states. More and more, states are picking up the tab for unpaid federal bills.

At a time when states are struggling under the burden of Medicare cost shifts and a growing number of uninsured, I find it particularly disturbing that the Republicans have chosen to cut funding for Medicaid—a critical safety net for our most vulnerable citizens.

The Republicans are specifically proposing to cut an unprecedented \$60 billion from the program, which is the equivalent of completely eliminating the Children's Health Insurance Program over 10 years.

These cuts would roll back health care coverage and protections for millions of Americans including the elderly in nursing homes, individuals with disabilities, infants and working families. Also, hospitals, physicians and other safety net providers will face payment reductions threatening their viability—and these reductions will mean more lost jobs in our communities.

The assault on the environment also continues, including a massive, unjustified cut to the Superfund program. The Inspector General has identified, and senior EPA officials have acknowledged, that in FY2003 there was a funding shortfall of \$174.9 million, and it has been widely reported that the funding shortfall for FY2004 reached approximately \$250 million. This leaves dozens of highly contaminated Superfund sites where cleanups are being delayed due to inadequate funding. Public health is endangered and local economic redevelopment hurt, yet this budget irresponsibly seeks to reduce cleanup funding.

These are just two examples of critical programs this budget neglects and two examples of why I will oppose this legislation and I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Republican budget.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the FY06 budget resolution, and reluctant opposition to the Democratic alternative.

Unfortunately, I do not believe that the choices before us today adequately confront the serious deficiencies in our budget process. The congressional budget process is broken, and badly in need of real reforms that will reinstate fiscal responsibility into Congress. The Blue Dog Coalition, of which I am a member, has introduced a twelve-step plan that takes the necessary first steps toward reforming our budget process.

While I support many of the provisions in the Democratic budget, including a partial restoration of “pay-as-you-go” [PAYGO] rules and level funding for domestic priorities such as education, veterans’ health care, and local law enforcement, I am disappointed that this alternative did not include any of the Blue Dog budget process reforms.

The Blue Dog twelve-step plan would stop Congress’s recent borrow-and-spend practices by reinstating PAYGO rules for the *entire* budget, including spending and revenue measures. Budget enforcement rules that apply to only certain parts of the budget will not have a significant impact on our rising deficits, as Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan mentioned in his recent testimony before the House Budget Committee.

Additionally, the Blue Dog budget process reform plan would: create a “rainy day” fund for emergency spending, which forty-five states currently have; require a roll call vote on any bill calling for more than \$50 million in new spending; repeal the House rule that allows the House to avoid a direct, up-or-down vote on debt limit increases; and require cost estimates by the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] for every bill that Congress votes on.

These reasonable, common-sense reforms are necessary for a functioning budget process and long overdue. The fiscal situation in our country is now out of control, and only tough budget discipline will get us back on track.

On February 17, 2004, the national debt of the United States exceeded \$7 trillion for the

first time in our country’s history. One year later, our national debt is \$7.7 trillion. In the past year, our country has added \$700 billion to our national debt.

The out-of-control rise in our national debt over the last year is just another sign of the astonishing fiscal turnaround that our country has experienced over the last four years, and another sign of the terrible fiscal position that we now find ourselves in.

In 2001, we had ten-year projected surpluses of \$5.6 trillion [2002–2011]. Now, over that same time period, we have likely ten-year deficits of \$3.9 trillion. That’s a \$9.5 trillion reversal in our ten-year fiscal outlook.

Whether intentional or otherwise, our country’s current fiscal policies are depriving the Federal Government of future revenue at a time when we ought to be preparing for an unprecedented demographic shift that will strain Social Security and Medicare. Our current fiscal irresponsibility will eventually land squarely on the shoulders of our children and grandchildren, who will be forced to pay back the debt we are accumulating today with interest.

This “debt tax” that we are imposing on our children and grandchildren cannot be repealed, and can only be reduced if we take responsible steps now to improve our situation.

Both parties need to work together in a bipartisan fashion to bring our budget back into balance so we can avoid the higher long-term interest rates and weakened dollar that are a consequence of rising deficits and a high national debt.

This fiscal year alone, interest on the national debt is expected to rise to \$178 billion, and the administration projects that that figure will increase to \$211 billion during the next fiscal year.

To put that figure in perspective, projected interest on our national debt next year will be \$75 billion more than projected spending on education, public health, health research, and veterans’ benefits combined [\$138 billion].

In addition to assuming an ever-larger share of our annual budgets, the interest on our debt, and the debt itself, is increasing our reliance on foreign borrowers, which will weaken our position in the world and increase the risk that another nation will be able to assert greater leverage over America.

Finally, our deficits and debt threaten the Social Security and Medicare programs that have lifted so many of our seniors out of poverty and helped sustain the strongest middle class in history.

Unfortunately, the administration’s FY06 budget, which was released last month, would spend \$2.6 trillion of the projected Social Security surplus over the next ten years.

With a projected 75 year unfunded liability of \$3.7 trillion, both parties in Congress need to work together to address Social Security’s solvency problem.

It is time for Congress to stop playing games with our national debt, with Social Security, and with our kids and grandkids’ futures and take a commonsense, bipartisan approach to solve our budget problems.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the Republican majority’s ill-sighted budget resolution.

This budget goes beyond bad all the way to dangerous. It’s dangerous for our country, and it’s dangerous for Florida. This budget cuts the COPS program by 96 percent, a program which has put over 7,000 police officers on

Florida streets. Their budget cuts more than \$40 million from homeland security formula grants in the state of Florida alone. The President is clearly unaware there is more to defending our homeland than invading foreign countries.

But the addled decision-making in the Republican budget doesn’t stop there. The Majority is proposing to decimate countless invaluable social welfare programs from Medicaid to Head Start and Even Start. It cuts almost \$200 million in funding for Florida housing, employment counseling, transitional assistance, and small business loans. This budget also includes significant cuts to veterans’ health care. What a great message to send to our troops: Thanks for serving your country, but now you’re on your own.

The Republican budget also fails our nation’s youth. The budget cuts TRIO funding by over \$700,000 in my district, and over \$10 million just in the state of Florida. These costs will result in a loss of over 11,000 students to the TRIO program in the state of Florida. Without these programs, these students will not make it to college. This is not a prediction, it’s a fact.

I meet with representatives from various organizations in my district every day. Yesterday, I met with 31 people from different types of organizations. Every one of them told me their programs are being cut, and they don’t know how they are going to survive because it is going to affect their programs ranging from children to the elderly to people without housing.

I’ve met with local officials telling me the same thing. These budget cuts are forcing them to seek alternative means of revenue. In other words, taxes. I don’t know if citizens will be taxed here in Washington or in Ft. Pierce or Riviera Beach, but somewhere along the line we are going to have to learn to share the responsibility for giving our communities the support they need.

Where will all this money supposedly trimmed from the national budget go? Well, clearly not to balance the budget or solve the federal deficit crisis. The Republican budget will result in a spending deficit of \$376 billion in 2006 alone. Unbelievably, this figure does not include the costs of several ill-conceived Republican initiatives such as the costs of privatizing social security or the President’s war in Iraq.

We have all heard President Bush tout his grand scheme to privatize social security, yet not only has he put forth no coherent plan to do so, but he has failed to include the financial requirements of such a plan. Vice President CHENEY has suggested “transition costs” of up to \$2 trillion or more. How can this cost not be included in any budget proposal?

But there are alternatives. Both the Congressional Black Caucus and Representative SPRATT have suggested sane alternatives to the Republican madness. Both of these budgets represent an approach to meeting the needs of regular Americans while maintaining the fiscal responsibility this nation needs.

Mr. Chairman, I was going to stand here and tell you that the Republicans are balancing the budget on the backs of the poor, but they are not balancing this budget on anyone’s backs because this budget doesn’t reach that far! The people that are hurt by this budget are not only the poor but the average American. As Members of Congress, we have

a solemn responsibility to protect the welfare of all our nation's citizens, and the Republican budget fails to meet that responsibility.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this damaging and devastating attack on the social welfare of this country masquerading as a budget.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the Spratt Substitute and in opposition to H. Con. Res. 95, the House Republican budget. A budget is a blueprint of values and priorities—a road map for where we want to move the country. It is no surprise that the Republican budget for fiscal year 2006 is more of the same: continued tax cuts for the wealthy paid for by slashing programs that Rhode Islanders depend on. However, the Spratt Substitute contains thoughtful policies to balance the budget by 2012 without individual tax rate increases or harmful cuts to security, health care, education, veterans' benefits, and other programs that improve the quality of life for Rhode Island's working families.

While the Republicans claim that budget cuts are needed to return to fiscal discipline, they forget their own policies caused today's financial problems. Without the tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans enacted since 2001, our nation's fiscal health would be much rosier, and the neediest and most vulnerable Americans would not be forced to sacrifice. Their fiscal year 2006 budget proposal continues to move in the wrong direction, and next year's deficit will likely be the largest in history, with at least \$400 billion added to the national credit card.

How does this blueprint make us safer? While the Department of Homeland Security receives an overall increase in funding, the budget largely follows the President's request, which cuts needed resources for the first responders who risk their lives every day to protect us. The Spratt Substitute contains \$1.1 billion more than the Republican budget for vital law enforcement programs such as COPS, FIRE grants, and Byrne Grants. These programs provide Rhode Island's police and fire departments with the equipment and training to keep us safe.

How does this blueprint make us healthier? The Republican budget requires \$20 billion in cuts to Medicaid. This reduction will jeopardize a critical health care safety net for seniors, children and people with disabilities and shift more of the burden to states. Medicaid cuts would result in \$80 million less for Rhode Island. The loss of federal funding places an enormous burden on states like Rhode Island, by pressuring them to cut eligibility for Medicaid. My state has successfully leveraged federal Medicaid dollars and currently offers coverage to many vulnerable, low-income pregnant women, parents of young children, and other groups not included in the federal mandate. Without Medicaid, these people would likely join the increasing ranks of the uninsured. Lacking proper preventative care, these patients will be forced to go to emergency rooms, leading to long waits and higher costs for everyone. These cuts will also threaten programs such as Rite Share, an employer buy-in program, funded in part by Medicaid. The Republican Medicaid cuts are restored in the Spratt Substitute.

How does this blueprint prepare children for the future? Again, the Republican budget matches the President's proposal to eliminate 48 education programs that provide assistance

with vocational education, education technology, civic education, and school counselors. In contrast, the Spratt Substitute provides \$4.5 billion in additional funding for No Child Left Behind and other valuable programs such as student loans and school lunches, giving students the resources to succeed.

How does this blueprint honor those who serve our country in uniform? Perhaps most egregiously during this time of war, the Republicans want to cut veterans' health care by \$14 billion over five years, impose new fees, and increase copayments for veterans' health care, adding an undue burden to those who have served their country so bravely. The Spratt Substitute provides \$17 billion over five years to provide veterans the services they have earned through their patriotism and sacrifice.

The Republican blueprint does not make us safer or healthier, prepare children for the future, or honor veterans. By continuing failed tax policies while cutting effective programs that Rhode Islanders depend on, their proposal is a misguided and unjust starting point. As Democrats show, it is possible to create a realistic blueprint that is fiscally responsible and builds on the needs of the American people. I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt Substitute and reject H. Con. Res. 95.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget resolution is a body blow to Oregon and the country. I have heard from constituents, school teachers, local government officials, medical professionals, housing advocates and many others throughout the communities in my district, all with detailed stories about how this budget will have devastating impacts.

The budget cuts both ways. First, by exploding the federal deficit, adding \$376 billion to the national debt and spending every penny of the \$185 billion Social Security trust fund surplus coming in during the year. Then, by eliminating and reducing key domestic priorities, such as cutting \$4.3 billion of education programs, slashing \$1.5 billion for affordable housing and development programs, and underfunding veterans' programs by nearly \$800 million.

How do we face both increased deficits and program cuts? By continuing to focus on tax cuts for those who need them the least. This is unnecessary and, frankly, dangerous as we continue to create an abyss between the haves and have-nots in society, and are putting our financial markets on edge by borrowing trillions from foreign investors. This is not a budget representative of the priorities and values of Oregonians.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget. It's dishonest. It's immoral. It's wrong for America's future.

Republicans dishonestly proclaim their budget is fiscally responsible. The only way their numbers work out is if you use slick accounting gimmicks or fuzzy math.

Let me give you some examples of their clever sleight of hand:

The Republicans' top priority to privatize Social Security through private accounts will cost billions of dollars. You'd think that'd be accounted for in this budget? No.

The billions of dollars that will be needed for the Iraq war. In the budget? No.

The cost to our children of extending the massive Bush tax cuts to the wealthy that will

balloon our massive deficit? You guessed it. Not in the budget.

Even as they leave out all this massive spending, Republicans still claim fiscal responsibility. Don't be fooled. They're lying to the American public. The true costs of this budget are far higher than Republicans claim and our children and grandchildren will pay the tab for this deceit for decades to come.

This budget isn't just dishonest—it's immoral. It imposes deep cuts to vital programs that Americans depend upon.

As our weak economy is forcing more people to rely on Medicaid's health safety net, Republicans are cutting the program by \$20 billion. Income support programs that keep low-income families afloat economically are being axed. Some 48 education programs, vital environmental protections, community development grants and veteran's health care programs are being gutted.

If you're an average American family this will affect you and your economic security. But, while you're tightening your belt watching funding for child's education and your family's health care diminish, billions of dollars are going to big business and special interests. While every other priority is sacrificed in the GOP budget, billions of dollars more are being funneled into the bloated defense contracts or frittered away in corporate tax giveaways.

Mr. Speaker, the federal budget is supposed to be a statement of our nation's priorities. This budget is a punch line to a sick joke being played on the American people.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this dishonest, immoral and irresponsible budget.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about the current state of our Nation's budget woes.

I've been running the family ranch for several years and I know what it means to work within a budget. You may have to count your pennies, but you spend your money where it matters the most to you and your community.

This Administration proposes to cut funding for agricultural programs in addition to denying promised benefits to veterans and military widows. These are the wrong priorities for our country. We cannot pass the burden of the debt onto the backs of our farmers and veterans.

Agriculture is the backbone of this great nation. I have always said that there are only two things that can bring this country down—our dependence on other countries to produce our food and our dependence on foreign oil. Agriculture must become a real part of our renewable energy supply. Research and education are the only way we can grow and develop these new technologies. This is the worst time to cut agriculture research programs.

Desperate times call for desperate measures, but turning our backs on our country's service personnel and veterans isn't desperate, it's crazy. We need to put our resources toward meeting the promises we have made to our veterans, servicemen, and their families—in rural Colorado, that means making sure that veterans don't have to drive five hours to get the health care they were promised.

I will never support breaking the promise to the brave men and women who served our country in the name of freedom and democracy.

BLUE DOG 12 POINT PLAN

I am a proud member of the Congressional Blue Dog Coalition, a group of Democrats that

fighters for fiscal responsibility. Fiscal responsibility means spending your money where it matters most. We can do that without increasing taxes.

First off—our Nation's taxpayers deserve an honest budget that gives an account of all future spending. If this Administration wants to privatize Social Security, then the budget should have included the trillions of dollars it would take to change the system.

Secondly—we need to reduce the deficit. As a farmer, I know this firsthand—you can't spend money you don't have. Congress is already facing a \$589 billion dollar deficit—increasing the amount of our national debt to \$1 trillion dollars. The Blue Dog Coalition created a 12 Point Reform Plan to cure the Nation's addiction to deficit spending. For starters, the Blue Dog Plan would require that any new spending would have to be paid for. This common-sense rule, "pay-as-you-go" is mandatory in Colorado. In the 1990's, "pay-as-you-go" brought the budget into surplus and is supported by Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan. Our plan also includes a provision for a "rainy day fund" in case there is a need for emergency spending.

Neither the Administration's budget, nor the Democratic alternative, incorporate a single component of the Blue Dog 12 Point Plan. As Members of Congress, we must discuss a budget that has included input from both parties. It is for that reason, I voted "No" on both budget proposals. I will not vote for an increase in taxes. And I will not vote to cut the programs that matter to our communities.

The Federal Government and this Congress need to take a lesson from small business owners and get back to creating a budget where all the numbers add up.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, the federal budget should be a statement of our country's values. It should reflect the priorities of the American people: good jobs, safe communities, quality education, and access to health care. The Republican budget, H. Con. Res. 95, is not aligned with these priorities; and I, therefore, rise in opposition to its passage.

Like President Bush's budget proposal, the Republican budget calls for sweeping cuts in mandatory and non-defense discretionary spending that could harm the effectiveness of vital Federal programs.

Perhaps in an effort to obfuscate the truth, House Republicans fail to provide the specificity the President does in his budget, so we are left to wonder which programs may get slashed or eliminated.

But we do know this: the Republican budget resolution instructs various House committees to make almost \$69 billion in cuts to mandatory spending programs. The Energy and Commerce Committee, for example, would be forced to find \$20 billion in savings over five years. All indications are that Medicaid, which provides health coverage for more than 52 million low-income Americans, will take the brunt of the cuts.

The proposed budget will also cut veterans' health care by \$14 billion, education programs by \$2.5 billion and clean water programs by \$700 million. It will slash economic development programs by \$1.5 billion, possibly leading to the elimination of the extraordinarily successful Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program. The CDBG provides Federal funding for locally-identified projects, like affordable housing, economic redevelopment, roads and public libraries.

The Republican budget, in fact, neither adequately funds our national priorities, nor does it offer a strategy for achieving fiscal discipline. The resolution calls for a \$376 billion deficit in FY 2006, but the deficit is worse than it appears. In calculating the deficit, House Republicans use surpluses in the Social Security trust funds to offset spending on other programs. If the Social Security surpluses are not counted, the projected deficit for FY 2006 would be \$564.5 billion.

Democrats, on the other hand, will be offering an alternative proposal today that reflects the priorities of the American people. The Democratic budget provides \$4.5 billion more for education and training programs, \$1.6 billion more for veterans programs, \$2 billion more for community and regional development and \$1.1 billion more for law enforcement and justice programs. It does all this while instituting a plan to balance the budget by 2012 and protecting Medicaid and Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the Republicans have chosen to neglect the needs of the many in order to maintain and extend tax cuts for the elite few; it is clear where their priorities lie. I urge my colleagues to align their priorities with those of the American people, and vote against the Republican budget resolution and for the Democratic alternative.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this budget. The budget should encourage fiscal, personal and social responsibility at the same time it moves us further down the road to making opportunity real for people. In that sense, it should reflect the values and priorities of Americans. But by deepening income inequality and raising the barriers for those working to do better, this budget does neither. If anything, it reflects priorities that are out of step with ordinary Americans.

By calling for \$1.8 trillion in tax cuts, primarily to the wealthiest Americans, the president's budget compromises both our ability to face our most pressing challenges and strengthen the social safety net that might rescue those living in poverty. Experts estimate that over the next 75 years, the cost of the tax cuts for the top 1 percent of households alone is nearly equivalent to the shortfall in Social Security—this at a time when another 1.3 million Americans fell into poverty last year.

And with this budget's cuts to Medicaid, job training, veterans health care, and child care will only exacerbate those startling figures. The decision to eviscerate Medicaid by as much as \$20 billion will leave many low-income families with nowhere to turn for medical care, and many seniors with no way to afford long-term care. Its growth in recent years is simply a reflection of its success in providing care for the thousands of Americans who would otherwise have joined the ranks of the uninsured during the economic downturn.

And states are already struggling to keep up. This year, the governor in my state of Connecticut proposed increased co-payments and premiums for families receiving SCHIP. If the president succeeds in cutting Medicaid, there will be no way for states to make up the shortfall. We cannot let Medicaid fall victim to its own success.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of this Administration's poor decisions should not be borne by those least able to afford it. Budgets are moral documents. They should promote, first and foremost, the common good of the Nation.

And turning our backs on that now as this budget does is not only bad policy—it is immoral.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I cannot vote for this budget resolution. It does reflect the priorities of the Republican leadership, but I do not think those are the right priorities for our country.

Over the last five years the federal budget has gone from projected surpluses to undeniable deficits. The result has been to reverse a decade of progress that saw the budget go from the \$290 billion deficit when President Clinton took office to a surplus of \$236 billion in 2000, which was where things stood when the current President Bush came to office.

Unfortunately, the combination of recession, the need to increase spending for defense and homeland security, and excessive and unbalanced tax cuts have taken us to the largest deficits in our Nation's history—a \$375 billion deficit two years ago, a deficit of \$412 billion last year, and for this year, according to the Bush Administration itself, a deficit of \$427 billion. That is three record-setting years in a row.

And, regrettably, the budget resolution before us reflects the proposals of the Bush Administration—and we know, or should know, what that means.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, following the path suggested by the Bush Administration and this budget resolution will add \$5.135 trillion to our national debt over the next 10 years. I do not think this is the right way to go.

That is why I voted for the more responsible and better balanced alternative offered by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT.

That alternative budget combined a balanced budget, real budget discipline, and protection for Social Security while still providing the same resources for Defense and Homeland Security as the Republican budget.

The alternative also would have provided more resources for important priorities and would have laid the basis for more responsible tax policy. It was better fiscally and better in terms of the education of our children, the health care of our veterans, the development of our communities, and the quality of our environment.

It would have brought 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 any significant increase.

Unfortunately, that alternative was not adopted, and the only remaining choice is to vote for or against the Republican leadership's proposal. Because I am convinced that it is not right for our communities or our country, I must vote against it.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the Republican's 2006 budget resolution makes the wrong choices for our Nation. It reflects skewed priorities and runs counter to our deepest held beliefs. The budget embraces disastrous economic policies while at the same time failing to put forward a vision of what the United States should be. What America needs instead is responsible policies that reflect our values, help bring our Nation together, and invests in the future by expanding opportunity. Many programs important to Georgia are cut, including \$800 million from the Centers for Disease Control, funding for

firefighters by 30 percent and \$26.7 million in Homeland Security Funding for Georgia. These programs provide front-line protections to Georgia communities. Further, this budget hurts my state's military installations and veterans by cutting \$60 million from last year's spending for military construction projects and cutting healthcare for 2 million Georgian veterans.

Communities are harmed by cutting Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) by \$211.9 million over the next four years. Representatives from the cities of Riverdale and Powder Springs told me this week that their plans for building community centers depend on funding of CDBG. The budget will also eliminate the HOPE VI program, which is revitalizing public housing in Georgia. The Section 8 housing vouchers cut would remove 8,700 families from the program in Georgia.

This budget proposes to cut vital domestic investments and services for the middle class and poor, while continuing to accumulate huge budget deficits. Education is cut by \$366.8 million affecting 91,050 Georgia children by under funding the No Child Left Behind Act. TRIO programs by almost \$13 million for Georgia, affecting 13,000 students and vocational and adult education in Georgia would be reduced by \$173.7 million from 2006–2010. Healthcare would be affected by an estimated \$7.9 million cut to Southern Regional Hospital. These Medicaid cuts hurt Clayton County where 24.2 percent of the population in 2003 utilized Medicaid. About 10 percent of Clayton County is below the Federal Poverty Level.

Despite these cuts, every Georgia family's share of the national debt has been increased by \$38,281.

The federal budget should be an honest blueprint for the spending priorities of the government. However, this budget is not honest. It is passing our obligations, responsibilities and challenges to our children and grandchildren, while cutting programs that benefit the poorest among us.

We need not accept a federal budget that singles out hard-working middle-class families, those who have served our Nation, and our society's most vulnerable citizens. Americans deserve an honest budget that reflects their priorities and that honors their hard work. I urge my colleagues to reject these unnecessary cuts and work to improve the capacity of programs to address critical community needs.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition of H. Con. Res. 95, the Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2006.

This budget contains painful spending cuts to critical programs, continued large deficits, and a spiraling debt.

It is fiscally reckless, morally irresponsible and is a clear failure of leadership.

This budget is a sham. It fails to include funding for many of the President's key programs—such as Social Security privatization, the war in Iraq, and the cost of the Alternative Minimum Tax. It does not cut the deficit in half, as the Administration claims. When all omitted costs are included, it will raise the deficit by \$2 trillion over five years.

This growing debt will be passed on to our children and grandchildren, leaving them to shoulder the burden of our fiscal irresponsibility.

This budget cuts critical programs that working families depend on, like Medicaid, education, community development and veterans' health care.

We have soldiers fighting for us in Iraq, and this budget doesn't even provide enough funding to pay for their health care when they return.

The budget will also endanger the health of millions of Americans, by proposing a \$1.1 billion cut to food stamps, the Nation's number one investment in nutrition and defense against hunger.

If this budget passes, we will be forcing working families to make hard choices between buying groceries and paying their bills.

The budget also spends every single penny of the \$1.1 trillion Social Security trust fund. We need to return to pay as you go budget rules, so that we can provide a solid source of funding for Social Security.

What is most disturbing, is that the resolution before us today is even more dangerous than the version the President sent to Congress.

The budget fails to offer the specifics of the President's budget. It proposes large cuts in funding, but without targeting specific programs, it leaves a myriad of programs vulnerable to cuts.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no." We need a plan that is fiscally responsible and will fund the programs working families depend on.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, the proposed reductions in Medicaid under this Budget Resolution plan are unacceptable. For 40 years Medicaid has always been a crucial support system for low-income individuals. Medicaid has made health care available to millions of Americans who have no other access to health care.

The Budget Resolution will require \$14–\$20 billion in cuts from the program over the next five years and it will almost certainly lead to changes to state funding rules, administrative payment cuts, and prescription drug payment changes. This comes at a time when poverty is up, wages are down, and the number of uninsured Americans is at a record in our nation's history.

The Medicaid program serves nearly 50 million Americans. As people lost jobs and income during the recent economic downturn, Medicaid enrollment increased by nearly one-third. The decreasing number of those who receive health care benefits through employment adds additional burdens to the Medicaid system. States and local governments rely on federal assistance to help provide a safety-net to these individuals. Any cuts to the Medicaid program will shift the burden entirely onto state and local governments that are already straining to meet increasing demands on the program and severe budget pressures of their own. In many states, Medicaid costs exceed education costs.

In California, our Medicaid program, Medi-Cal, matches every dollar of federal funding with a dollar in state funding. This shared commitment is critical since the state receives \$20 billion in federal funding. Reducing federal Medicaid funding to states at a time of rising health care costs, increased numbers of uninsured, and states' increasing difficulties in paying their share of Medicaid costs, is bound to force states to reduce coverage and increase the numbers of uninsured. Uninsured patients without access to care will instead seek treatment in emergency rooms, further burdening an already overtaxed system.

The Medicaid program is not only critical for low-income individuals, but it's also funda-

mental to the operation of California's safety-net hospitals. The President's budget calls for eliminating the use of intergovernmental transfers for hospital funding. This means there will be at least \$11.9 billion in direct cuts to safety-net providers nationwide. Many states rely on IGTs to fund their Medicaid budgets. The low-income and uninsured rely on these hospitals to receive access to needed health care services. Without the continuation of federal Medicaid funds targeted to safety net hospitals, millions of Californians will not have access to necessary health care services. This budget resolution advances this march to folly for so many Americans and that's why 242 national groups and 785 state groups, including the National Governors Association and the National Association of Counties oppose changes in Medicaid.

We have an obligation to care for the less fortunate, and the Congress should not be cutting critical health care and other services from those in need. Rather, we should maintain our partnership with the states to ensure that Medicaid benefits remain available for the most vulnerable in our society.

I urge all my colleagues in the House to oppose the Budget Resolution.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget of mass destruction and in support of the Democratic and Congressional Black Caucus alternative budgets which recognize the true needs and values of our Nation.

We do not need to call in weapons inspectors to find the threat to the majority of Americans in this budget, nor do we need a warning system. We know exactly what, when, and where the damage will be because the Republican budget, once again, puts the tax cuts of the few above the needs of the many.

Under the Republican budget, the vast majority of Americans are asked to sacrifice, with one exception: the wealthy who can most afford to give something up. Their tax cuts—the same tax cuts that brought us unprecedented deficits—are protected and even extended under this proposal. They will cost our country an additional \$106 billion, of which 75 percent will go to people making over \$200,000 a year.

In order to pay for those tax cuts, the Republicans are literally proposing to take away food and health care from low-income families, kill 48 education programs by eliminating the \$4.3 billion that funds them, slash veterans' health care—including cutting \$9 million from medical and prosthetic research, and undermine community development in struggling neighborhoods by cutting \$1.5 billion in grant programs. Despite Republican claims, these cuts will do nothing to help our country's bottom line, but they will be devastating for the children, working families, veterans and seniors who will be asked to go without. This is not only irresponsible, but immoral.

In the that state of Illinois, we could see the Earned Income Tax Credit—the most effective anti-poverty program—cut by \$164.2 million, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families and child care grants lose \$84.3 million, and Supplemental Security Income—which helps poor seniors and people with disabilities—slashed by \$174 million. Thousands of vulnerable people's lives will be destroyed if the Republican budget passes.

The House Republican budget is even worse than the President's proposal. For instance, they propose even greater cuts to

Medicaid than under his plan. The \$20 billion in Medicaid cuts included in this budget resolution are unwise, unjustifiable and almost certainly lethal. As health care costs continue to rise, the number of uninsured Americans exceeds 45 million, and employers continue to cut back on coverage, Medicaid has provided a guarantee of support for pregnant women and children, persons with disabilities, persons living with AIDS or mental illnesses, and senior citizens needing medical care or long term care services. Without those services, millions of Americans will no longer be able to get the physical health, mental health, and long term care services they need to remain healthy and productive.

In my state of Illinois, Medicaid covers 40 percent of all births, 30 percent of all children, and 65 percent of all nursing home residents. In Illinois, under the leadership of our governor, we are working to expand Medicaid to cover more children and more families in face of a growing crisis in health care. This is not just the right thing to do, it is the cost-effective course to take. Medicaid costs less than private health insurance and its per capita costs are growing more slowly than private insurance premiums. But, if the Republican budget cuts re enacted, it may no longer be there for the millions of Americans who have no other source of care—other than bankrupting their families or mortgaging their futures to pay for their parents' long term care needs or their children's medical services.

Budgets are not just about numbers, they are about values and priorities. Based on the Republicans' proposal, maintaining and making permanent tax cuts for millionaires has been and continues to be a higher priority than meeting the needs of the majority of Americans. And, they are shifting the responsibility of their fiscal mess onto the backs of our children who will see decreased services and will be asked to deal with deficits for years to come.

The Democratic and CBC budgets recognize that this is the wrong thing to do and a great threat to our nation's future well-being and prosperity. It is time to reverse course so that we do not continue to mortgage our country's future and our children's prosperity in order to pay for tax cuts for the rich that we cannot afford and that they do not need. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Republican WMD and for the Democratic and CBC budgets.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the House of Representatives' budget plan and thank Chairman NUSSLE and his committee for their dedicated work on this legislation.

I think many of us agree that a federal budget of more than \$2.5 trillion dollars provides enough resources for the government. As I tell my constituents, we don't have an income problem herein Washington; we have a spending problem. Even as our economy has grown and revenues have increased in the past year, we continue to spend more than we take in. Our House budget takes important steps to address this spending problem while ensuring that our nation's most pressing needs are being met.

We are at war, so defense and security funding remain a priority. Much of the increased spending in the past few years has gone toward national defense and security, including \$258 billion in extra funding since Sep-

tember 11, 2001. Our House budget matches President Bush's commitment to our national defense needs with a 4.8 percent increase.

Beyond national security, this budget provides sufficient funds to meet our priorities, but it also take important steps to begin addressing Congress' spending problem.

First, our budget does not raise taxes in order to pay for more spending, as some are proposing in their alternatives. Second, our budget actually reduces non-defense and non-homeland security discretionary spending by .8 percent. Third, this budget will set us on course to reduce the growth in mandatory spending, which is growing far faster than our economy and comprises nearly two-thirds of all federal spending.

By maintaining the tax relief and not allowing for tax increases, our House budget ensures that the economy will continue to grow and create jobs. Sustained economic growth resulting from sustained lower taxes also narrows the budget deficit.

While non-defense discretionary spending is only about 20 percent of federal spending, it is the area in which Congress exercises the most direct annual control. We know there are programs that are wasteful, duplicative or unnecessary. By reducing spending in this area by .8 percent, we force ourselves to do better at finding the waste and consolidating or eliminating the programs we don't need in order to make the best use of the resources available.

For the first time in eight years, Congress is finally dealing with the unchecked growth of mandatory spending in this budget. Let's be clear—despite what we are hearing from some on the other side, this budget does not "cut" any programs that help those in need. More will still be spent this year than was spent last year, and by my West Texas definition, that is not a cut. What this budget does is set on the track to slow the rate of growth on the mandatory side, which is currently unsustainable. In the last ten years, federal Medicaid spending has nearly doubled, growing at an average of 8 percent each year. Even with the savings called for in this budget, Medicaid will still grow by 7.3 percent over the next 10 years, as opposed to increasing by 7.6 percent.

With regard to the mandatory spending reduction set for agriculture. I am concerned that the target in this bill is more than agriculture's total share of mandatory spending. As we conference with the Senate, I ask that the Budget Committee work toward a number that is more in line with agriculture's 4.7 percent share of mandatory spending.

What we are doing here with respect to agriculture is allowing the Agriculture Committee to look at all mandatory spending at USDA and have full discretion on how we reach our savings total. We can do this without "reopening" the Farm Bill. All USDA mandatory spending, including nutrition programs, must be considered.

During the first three years of the 2002 Farm Bill, farm programs have cost \$14 billion less than the Congressional Budget Office predicted when the legislation passed. The 2002 Farm Bill has proven to be a very effective safety net for our producers, providing support in times of lower prices, and reducing support when it is not needed. And even though spending will increase somewhat this year due to lower prices, total spending over the life of this Farm Bill is still projected to be less than was predicted.

Changing the rules of the game now, and then again in two years, is not sound policy. Budget decisions we make in agriculture today will not only affect the 2007 Farm Bill, but they will also affect our negotiating position in the World Trade Organization. If we take all of our chips off the table now, we will not have anything left to negotiate with as our trade representatives continue efforts to open new markets and reduce other barriers to U.S. products.

During meetings with constituents throughout my district, farmers understood the importance of balancing the budget, and they are willing to do their part to reduce the deficit. However, they do not support agriculture bearing a disproportionate share of the burden. Neither do I, and I am committed to working in conference to ensure our final budget outline for the year treats agriculture fairly.

Our constituents are looking to us to make responsible decisions about the use of their hard-earned tax dollars. They are counting on us to set the right priorities and follow through on past commitments. I believe our House budget sets us on the right path toward reducing spending, keeping our economy growing and protecting our nation.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, a federal budget is a statement of values. It says more about our values than any speeches, any rhetoric, any time.

Sadly, this partisan budget reflects the failed values of fiscal irresponsibility. And misplaced priorities. It locks in massive deficits for as far as the eye can see, adding hundreds of billions of dollars to a huge national debt that will slow our Nation's economic growth, put Social Security benefits at risk and bury your children in a sea of red ink for the rest of their lives.

Large deficits and underinvestment in education, research and health care are not prescriptions for a healthy economic future—they are prescriptions for economic stagnation and decline.

In my opinion, this budget is immoral. It asks the most from those who have the least and asks the least from those who have the most. That fails the values test of every major religious faith in our society.

This budget makes it harder for millions of students to attend college by increasing the gap between college costs vs student financial aid.

This budget says to veterans, including Iraqi war veterans that pensions for disabilities, compensation checks and G.I. education benefits will be cut by \$795 million over five years, thus making a mockery of the American principle of shared sacrifice during time of war. 14 billion over 5 years. I would imagine that budget item won't be discussed by supporters of this bill in their Veterans Day speeches this November.

This budget says to thousands of seniors who need nursing home care under the Medicaid program that you'll just have to go without that care. In my book, that's not a very respectful way of honoring thy father and mother.

To the working woman I met yesterday who works hard to help troubled youth in my hometown in Texas, this budget says your housing program will be cut, making it more difficult for her to find decent housing on a limited income.

Yet, to the fortunate person who makes one million dollars this year on dividend income,

this budget says you can keep every dime of the \$220,000 tax break you have received recently.

Asking seniors, students, veterans and hard-working families to sacrifice so those in the top one-tenth of one percent of income in America can keep all of their recent tax cuts does not pass the fairness test.

If this is a faith-based initiative, I would like to know on which faith it is based.

By refusing once again to require tax cuts to be paid for, my House Republican colleagues are endorsing the largest deficits in American history for the third year in a row. They have preached to us for five years the all gain, no pain budget built on the free lunch philosophy.

Unfortunately, the bill collector is now calling and the deficits caused by that failed philosophy have been financed by the Japanese and Communist Chinese who own tens of billions of our national debt and with it, the ability to wreck our American economy.

If House Republican leaders want to preach fiscal responsibility to individuals by toughening our bankruptcy law, then they had better start practicing what they preach. It is ironic that those who are condemning the personal debt of citizens have been the architects of three consecutive years of the largest federal deficits in American history.

Burdening America's middle class with greater debt and under investing in education and health care for working families is neither fair nor fiscally responsible.

Vote no on this budget. We can do much better, and the American people and our children deserve much better.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I would like the RECORD to reflect my views on the horrendous and deliberate deficits our Nation faces—these articles appeared today in Roll Call and last week in the New York Times.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 11, 2005]

RESCISSION TIME IN CONGRESS

(By Jim Cooper)

President Bush regularly calls on Congress to restrain spending. But he has yet to put his pen where his mouth is by using his veto—a blunt instrument, to be sure, but one that very few American presidents have failed to wield, especially during times of high deficits. Mr. Bush says he prefers a sharper veto power; the ability to cut spending programs within larger bills. He called for line-item veto power in his first press conference after his re-election and in his 2006 budget.

But such a statute is not only out of reach—it would probably require a constitutional amendment—it is also unnecessary. Why? Because Mr. Bush can already cut individual programs out of larger legislation with a scalpel that's almost as sharp as the line-item veto. An obscure law passed during the Nixon administration gives the president extraordinary power to stop any discretionary spending. All he has to do is persuade Republicans on Capitol Hill to go along.

It's called rescission. Under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, the president can select any appropriated Federal program for reduction or elimination by sending a message to Congress, which then has 45 days to approve his decision with a simple majority in each house. If Congress agrees, the president can reshape Federal government to his liking. If Congress disagrees, or fails to act, the cut disappears.

This law gives Mr. Bush more power than he has sought for his battles on trade pro-

motion or new Federal judges. With it, he can pick his targets, put fast-track pressure on Congress to respond, and win by gaining a simple majority approval—in other words, rescission is filibuster-proof.

So why haven't presidents been vigorously using the Impoundment Act to manage the budget in the last 31 years? The reason is that different parties usually controlled the White House and Congress, making large cuts impossible. For example, President Clinton won 111 of the 163 rescissions he requested from a divided Congress, but was able to save only several billion dollars.

Although Republicans now control both the House and Senate, Mr. Bush has not asked for any rescissions, large or small. Why has Mr. Bush kept this knife in a dusty drawer, especially given the staggering deficit, his public stance on the need to curb spending and his close ties with the Republican Congressional leadership? Surely he knows how often Mr. Clinton resorted to it.

Perhaps his unwillingness stems from the knowledge that, with rescission, Americans know who wielded the knife and what programs were cut or kept. But to govern is to choose. If Republicans really want to cut spending and reduce the deficit, they have more weapons than any political party has had in decades.

Jim Cooper, Democrat of Tennessee, is a member of the House Budget Committee.

[From the Rollcall, Mar. 17, 2005]

THE MISSING-IN-ACTION PRESIDENT

Today Congress will vote on a 5-year budget for the Nation. Usually contentious, this year's debate is relatively quiet as the richest nation in the world begs foreigners to finance our lifestyle.

Most Americans can name the President's top four policy priorities—tax cuts, war in Iraq, Social Security reform, and Medicare drug legislation. What Americans don't know is that these were either omitted from, or low-balled in, the President's own budget and his \$82 billion supplemental request. It's as if Bush budgeted for someone else's presidency.

The President's budget pays for only six months of the war in Iraq and completely overlooks the transition costs of Social Security reform. The Administration always lied about the cost of the Medicare drug bill. Extending the tax cuts will produce a sea of red ink just beyond the Bush budget's five-year window.

The House Republican budget is based largely on the President's, adding a tiny bit of compassion and \$50 billion for the war. Its deficits are still so large that, by the last year of the Bush administration, we will be paying more money to our Nation's creditors than to our own citizens in non-defense domestic discretionary spending. According to the GAO, by 2040 our current policies will result in creditors getting *all* of our defense, Social Security, Medicare, veterans' benefits, or any other program to help Americans.

Republican control of the executive and legislative branches means that they have the power to budget honestly for our Nation and reduce our deficits. President Clinton was able to achieve budget surpluses despite a divided government.

Take the veto. Bush is the first president since James Garfield in 1881 not to veto a single bill. Garfield only had six months in office; Bush has had over 4 years.

Bush did threaten to veto any effort to repeal the 2003 Medicare drug law that added \$8.1 trillion in unfunded liabilities to our Nation. This one entitlement program will twice as hard for future generations to afford as the alleged "crisis" in Social Security.

Bush brandished his veto pen to force Congress to spend money we do not have.

Take the rescission power. Few people realize that Bush could slash any program in Federal government with the approval of a simple majority in the Senate and the House. He has "fast-track" authority and no worries about filibusters. In other words, Republicans already have the "nuclear option" top cut spending, they've never used it. They don't even want you to know they have it.

President Clinton was able to pass 111 of his 163 rescission requests, saving taxpayers billions of dollars. President Bush has requested no rescissions.

Bush himself repeatedly calls for line-item veto power in order to tame spending. But why wait years for a constitutional amendment when he has never used the power he already has? Every second counts. Delay costs us over a billion dollars a day in additional borrowing.

Bush may be a strong leader in the war on terrorism, but on budget deficits he is missing-in-action. Conservative think tanks like the Heritage Foundation and Cato Institute have criticized Bush for his big increases in spending, which far exceed those of the Clinton era. Meanwhile tax revenues as a percent of GNP are the lowest since Eisenhower days.

Democrats are accustomed to Republicans routinely violating their term-limits pledges, and forgetting their Contract-with-America idealism (including the Balanced Budget Amendment), but Republicans are doing serious damage to the Nation with their irresponsibility on budget issues. As Head of State and Party, the President is being particularly irresponsible.

Is government spending the problem, as Republicans claim? If so, they have all the tools to stop it—more tools than any political party in modern times. Why won't Bush use his budget, his veto, his rescission, or simple restraint? Could it be that Republicans have fallen in love with "big government"? They are just refusing to pay her expenses.

Jim Cooper, a Democrat from Tennessee, serves on the House Budget Committee and as Co-Chair of the Blue Dog Coalition, a group of Democratic fiscal and defense hawks.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments to the concurrent resolution, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. FOSSELLA, Acting 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, pursuant to House Resolution 154, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

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

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 214, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—218

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

NAYS—214

Abercrombie	Brady (PA)	Crowley
Ackerman	Brown (OH)	Cuellar
Allen	Brown, Corrine	Cummings
Andrews	Butterfield	Davis (AL)
Baca	Capps	Davis (CA)
Baird	Capuano	Davis (FL)
Baldwin	Cardin	Davis (IL)
Barrow	Cardoza	Davis (TN)
Bean	Carmahan	DeFazio
Becerra	Carson	DeGette
Berkley	Case	DeLauro
Berman	Chandler	Dicks
Berry	Clay	Dingell
Bishop (GA)	Cleaver	Doggett
Bishop (NY)	Clyburn	Doyle
Blumenauer	Conyers	Edwards
Boren	Cooper	Emanuel
Boswell	Costa	Emerson
Boucher	Costello	Engel
Boyd	Cramer	Eshoo

Etheridge	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Evans	Lofgren, Zoe	Ruppersberger
Farr	Lowe	Rush
Fattah	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Filner	Maloney	Sabo
Ford	Markey	Salazar
Frank (MA)	Marshall	Sánchez, Linda
Gerlach	Matheson	T.
Gonzalez	Matsui	Sanchez, Loretta
Goode	McCarthy	Sanders
Gordon	McCollum (MN)	Schakowsky
Green (WI)	McDermott	Schiff
Green, Al	McGovern	Schwartz (PA)
Green, Gene	McIntyre	Scott (GA)
Grijalva	McKinney	Scott (VA)
Gutierrez	McNulty	Serrano
Gutknecht	Meehan	Shays
Harman	Meek (FL)	Sherman
Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Simmons
Herseth	Melancon	Skelton
Higgins	Menendez	Slaughter
Hinchey	Mitchaud	Smith (NJ)
Hinojosa	Millender-	Smith (WA)
Holden	McDonald	
Holt	Miller (NC)	Snyder
Honda	Miller, George	Solis
Hooley	Mollohan	Spratt
Hostettler	Moore (KS)	Stark
Hoyer	Moore (WI)	Strickland
Insee	Moran (VA)	Stupak
Israel	Murtha	Tanner
Jackson (IL)	Nadler	Tauscher
Jackson-Lee	Napolitano	Taylor (MS)
(TX)	Neal (MA)	Thompson (CA)
Jefferson	Oberstar	Thompson (MS)
Johnson (IL)	Obey	Tierney
Johnson, E. B.	Olver	Towns
Jones (NC)	Ortiz	Udall (CO)
Jones (OH)	Owens	Udall (NM)
Kanjorski	Pallone	Van Hollen
Kaptur	Pascarell	Velázquez
Kennedy (RI)	Pastor	Vislosky
Kildee	Paul	Wasserman
Kilpatrick (MI)	Payne	Schultz
Kind	Pelosi	Waters
Kucinich	Peterson (MN)	Watson
Langevin	Pomeroy	Watt
Lantos	Price (NC)	Waxman
Larsen (WA)	Rahall	Weiner
Larson (CT)	Rangel	Wexler
Lee	Reyes	Woolsey
Levin	Ross	Wu
Lewis (GA)	Rothman	Wynn

NOT VOTING—3

Coble	Delahunt	Young (FL)
-------	----------	------------

□ 1603

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. DOGGETT changed their vote from “yea” to “nay”.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio changed her vote from “nay” to “yea”.

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXPRESSING CONCERN REGARDING VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS BY SYRIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 18, as amended.

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. 18, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 3, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—402

Abercrombie	Doolittle	Kind
Ackerman	Doyle	King (IA)
Aderholt	Drake	King (NY)
Akin	Dreier	Kingston
Alexander	Duncan	Kirk
Allen	Edwards	Kline
Andrews	Ehlers	Knollenberg
Bachus	Emanuel	Kolbe
Baird	Emerson	Kuhl (NY)
Baker	Engel	LaHood
Baldwin	English (PA)	Langevin
Barrett (SC)	Eshoo	Lantos
Barrow	Etheridge	Larsen (WA)
Bartlett (MD)	Everett	Larson (CT)
Barton (TX)	Farr	Latham
Bass	Fattah	LaTourette
Bean	Feeney	Lee
Beauprez	Ferguson	Levin
Berkley	Filner	Lewis (CA)
Berry	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lewis (GA)
Biggert	Flake	Lewis (KY)
Bilirakis	Foley	Linder
Bishop (GA)	Forbes	Lipinski
Bishop (NY)	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Bishop (UT)	Fossella	Lowey
Blackburn	Fox	Lucas
Blumenauer	Fox	Lungren, Daniel
Blunt	Frank (MA)	E.
Boehlert	Franks (AZ)	Lynch
Boehner	Gerlach	Mack
Bonilla	Gibbons	Maloney
Bonner	Gilchrest	Manzullo
Boozman	Gillmor	Marchant
Boren	Gingrey	Marshall
Boswell	Gohmert	Matheson
Boustany	Gonzalez	Matsui
Boyd	Goode	McCarthy
Bradley (NH)	Goodlatte	McCaul (TX)
Brady (PA)	Gordon	McCollum (MN)
Brady (TX)	Granger	McCotter
Brown (OH)	Graves	McCrery
Brown (SC)	Green (WI)	McDermott
Brown, Corrine	Green, Al	McGovern
Burgess	Green, Gene	McHenry
Burton (IN)	Grijalva	McHugh
Butterfield	Gutierrez	McIntyre
Buyer	Gutknecht	McKeon
Camp	Hall	McMorris
Cannon	Harman	McNulty
Cantor	Hart	Meehan
Capito	Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)
Capuano	Hastings (WA)	Meeks (NY)
Cardin	Hayes	Melancon
Cardoza	Hayworth	Menendez
Carnahan	Hefley	Mica
Carson	Hensarling	Michaud
Carter	Herger	Millender-
Case	Herseth	McDonald
Castle	Higgins	Miller (FL)
Chabot	Hinojosa	Miller (MI)
Chandler	Hobson	Miller (NC)
Chocola	Hoekstra	Miller, George
Clay	Holden	Mollohan
Cleaver	Holt	Moore (KS)
Clyburn	Honda	Moore (WI)
Cole (OK)	Hooley	Moran (KS)
Conaway	Hostettler	Moran (VA)
Conyers	Hoyer	Murphy
Cooper	Hulshof	Murtha
Costa	Hunter	Musgrave
Costello	Hyde	Myrick
Cox	Inglis (SC)	Neal (MA)
Cramer	Insee	Neugebauer
Crenshaw	Israel	Ney
Crowley	Issa	Northup
Cubin	Istook	Norwood
Cuellar	Jackson (IL)	Nunes
Culberson	Jackson-Lee	Nussle
Cummings	(TX)	Oberstar
Cunningham	Jefferson	Obey
Davis (AL)	Jenkins	Olver
Davis (CA)	Jindal	Ortiz
Davis (FL)	Johnson (CT)	Osborne
Davis (IL)	Johnson (IL)	Otter
Davis (TN)	Johnson, E. B.	Owens
DeFazio	Johnson, Sam	Oxley
DeGette	Jones (NC)	Pallone
DeLauro	Jones (OH)	Pascarell
Case	Jones (OH)	Pastor
Dicks	Kanjorski	Payne
Dingell	Kaptur	Pearce
Doggett	Keller	Pelosi
Doyle	Kelly	Pence
Edwards	Kennedy (MN)	Peterson (MN)
Emanuel	Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (PA)
Emerson	Kildee	Petri
Engel	Kilpatrick (MI)	
Eshoo		

Pickering	Sanders	Terry
Pitts	Saxton	Thomas
Platts	Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)
Poe	Schiff	Thornberry
Pombo	Schwartz (PA)	Tiahrt
Pomeroy	Schwarz (MI)	Tiberi
Porter	Scott (GA)	Tierney
Price (GA)	Scott (VA)	Towns
Price (NC)	Sensenbrenner	Turner
Pryce (OH)	Serrano	Udall (CO)
Putnam	Sessions	Udall (NM)
Radanovich	Shadeeg	Upton
Rahall	Shaw	Van Hollen
Ramstad	Shays	Velázquez
Rangel	Sherman	Visclosky
Regula	Sherwood	Walden (OR)
Rehberg	Shimkus	Walsh
Reichert	Shuster	Wamp
Renzi	Simmons	Wasserman
Reyes	Simpson	Schultz
Reynolds	Skelton	Waters
Rogers (AL)	Slaughter	Watson
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)	Watt
Rogers (MI)	Smith (TX)	Waxman
Rohrabacher	Snyder	Weiner
Ros-Lehtinen	Sodrel	Weldon (FL)
Ross	Solis	Weldon (PA)
Rothman	Souder	Weller
Roybal-Allard	Spratt	Westmoreland
Royce	Stark	Wexler
Ruppersberger	Stearns	Whitfield
Rush	Strickland	Wicker
Ryan (OH)	Stupak	Wilson (NM)
Ryan (WI)	Sullivan	Wilson (SC)
Ryun (KS)	Sweeney	Wolf
Sabo	Tancredo	Woolsey
Salazar	Tanner	Wu
Sánchez, Linda	Tauscher	Wynn
T.	Taylor (MS)	Young (AK)
Sanchez, Loretta	Taylor (NC)	

NAYS—3

Kucinich	McKinney	Paul
----------	----------	------

NOT VOTING—29

Baca	Davis, Jo Ann	Leach
Becerra	DeGette	Lofgren, Zoe
Berman	Delahunt	Markey
Bono	Dicks	Miller, Gary
Boucher	Evans	Nadler
Brown-Waite,	Frelinghuysen	Napolitano
Ginny	Gallely	Portman
Calvert	Garrett (NJ)	Smith (WA)
Capps	Harris	Thompson (CA)
Coble	Hinchev	Young (FL)

□ 1621

Ms. MCKINNEY changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 65

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 65.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 103) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 103

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, March 17, 2005, Friday, March 18, 2005, or Saturday, March 19, 2005, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, April 5, 2005, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and then when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, March 17, 2005, through Saturday, March 26, 2005, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, April 4, 2005, or at such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

Sec. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 2005

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, April 6, 2005.

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

There was no objection.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE TO MONDAY, MARCH 21, 2005

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, March 21, 2005, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 103, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. FRANK R. WOLF OR HON. TOM DAVIS OF VIRGINIA TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH APRIL 5, 2005

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

WASHINGTON, DC, March 17, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable FRANK R. WOLF or, if he is not available to perform this duty, the Honorable TOM DAVIS to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through April 5, 2005.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF SPRING HILL MAYOR RAY WILLIAMS

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I rise to mourn the loss of Spring Hill, Tennessee, mayor Ray Williams.

He was elected in 1999 and proved to be an effective and dedicated public servant during his years as mayor.

Mayor Williams both managed Spring Hill's tremendous growth over the past few years and helped preserve the wonderful standard of living the community enjoys. He ran an efficient government and lowered property taxes every year that he was in office.

He set a standard many of my colleagues here in Congress should adopt when he instituted the Spring Hill Taxpayer Bill of Rights. It is a resolution that requires any proposed property tax increase to be approved by the taxpayers and that surplus funds be returned to the taxpayers.

It is clear that Ray was a wonderful public servant, a loving, devoted husband and father; and we thank his family for his service to our community.

WASHINGTON NATIONAL GUARD RECOGNITION

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the soldiers of Washington State's 81st Brigade Combat Team.

The men and women of the United States Armed Services are the finest in the world. Some of them have given the ultimate sacrifice, and those that are serving across the world today and serving in our country and other countries across the world today sacrifice time with their families, and we should recognize that and understand that they are giving up a lot to fight for us and protect our country and preserve our freedom.

The 81st Brigade Combat Team made history as the largest deployment of a National Guard unit from Washington State since World War II; and last month, the first group of soldiers from the 81st Brigade have begun to return home.

There are no words that we can really say to thank them; but today I just

want to say thank you to the 81st Brigade from Washington State.

HONORING DAVID EMERSON
HOUSEL

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Mr. David Emerson Housel on the occasion of his retirement as Auburn University Director of Athletics. I am honored to stand before this body of Congress and this Nation to recognize his many accomplishments.

David is truly a man who embodied American principles of hard work, dedication to one's family, and service to one's community.

On April 1, 1994, David Housel became Auburn University's thirteenth Director of Athletics. Upon accepting the job, he stated that his one goal was to leave Auburn and the athletic department better than he found it. This goal was achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on much longer about this gentleman who was born and grew up in Pickens County, Alabama in the Fourth District but time does not permit this morning.

It is a great privilege to honor David Emerson Housel for his many accomplishments and his enduring impact on his country, his community, friends and of course family. He is a man of great dignity and character who takes pride in the accomplishments of those he has helped over the years. David continues to be an inspiring role model for all of us and is the embodiment of the Auburn creed.

I know I join the Auburn faithful and all Alabamians in wishing David God's richest blessing in his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, today I have the privilege to honor Mr. David Emerson Housel on the occasion of his retirement as Auburn University's Director of Athletics. I am honored to stand before this body of Congress and this Nation to recognize his many accomplishments. He is truly a man who embodies the American principles of hard work, dedication to one's family, and service to one's community.

David Emerson Housel was born on October 18, 1946 and grew up in the small, west Alabama town of Gordo. In 1956, at the age of ten, David attended his first Auburn University football game, a 34-7 victory over the University of Alabama at Legion Field in Birmingham. After the game he wrote letters to both schools asking for information about their football teams. David told the story to Mr. Neal Sims of the Birmingham News in the December 26, 2004 issue: "Auburn sent a football guide, along with a note thanking me for being an Auburn fan. I got an Alabama media guide and a bill for two dollars". As Mr. Sims reports: "Alabama got its two bucks. Auburn got his heart, and together school and devotee have been linked ever since he grew from child to man."

David graduated from Gordo High School in 1965 and enrolled in Auburn University on June 9 of the same year. He graduated with

a degree in journalism in 1969 and, after eight months with the Huntsville News (during which time he maintained a mailing address in Auburn) he returned to his Alma Mater to accept a job in the Ticket Office, where he worked from 1970 to 1972. He taught journalism from 1972 to 1980 when he rejoined the athletic staff as Assistant Sports Information Director. He was named Director in 1981 and Assistant Athletic Director in 1985.

On April 1, 1994 David became Auburn's thirteenth Director of Athletics. Upon accepting the job he said, "People may agree or disagree with decisions that are made, but they will never be able to question the reasons for those decisions. There will be no agenda other than the betterment of Auburn." His one goal was to leave Auburn and the athletic program better than he found it. This goal was achieved. Under David's leadership Auburn won seven team national championships (in the previous thirty-eight years Auburn had captured only one national championship). Auburn has won twenty-nine Southeastern Conference titles in the last ten years (in the previous ten seasons, Auburn had won eight titles). During David's tenure, the Athletic Department has posted its highest graduation rates ever. Also, the Department operated in the black financially every year, one of the very few Division 1A programs to do so on a consistent annual basis.

Being the humble man that he is, David refuses to take credit for these accomplishments. Instead he gives credit to the Board of Trustees, the President, and above all, to the Auburn people. "This is the work of Auburn people," he says. "Whatever we have been able to accomplish is a direct reflection of Auburn people and their support of the school they love."

David is a past president of the SEC Sports Information Directors, a former chair of the NCAA Public Relations and Communications Committees. He served on the District III Post-graduate Scholarship Committee and has served as chair of the Dean's Council for Auburn's College of Liberal Arts. He also served as a member of the NCAA Championships Cabinet and the Executive Committee of the Southeastern Conference.

He serves on the Board of Directors for Auburn Bank, the Auburn Wesley Foundation, the Lee County Red Cross and is a member of the Birmingham Pledge Advisory Board. He is an honorary member of the Auburn Football Lettermen Club and the University Singers. He is a member of the Sports Information Directors' Hall of Fame, the Tony Brandino Hall of Fame and the Gordo Athletics Hall of Fame. He is also an award winning free lance writer and has written two books, "Saturdays to Remember" and "From the Desk of David Housel, A Collection of Auburn Stories."

In 1982 the Alabama Chapter of the National Football Foundation recognized David with their Contribution to Amateur Football Award. He has also received the Distinguished Service Award from the Walter Camp Foundation of New Haven, Connecticut and the Birmingham Monday Morning Quarterback Club for his career contributions to the sport of college football.

Of all of David's accomplishments, perhaps his greatest achievement was convincing the former Susan McIntosh to marry him. Susan is a retired third grade teacher at Wright's Mill Road Elementary School in Auburn and they

were married on June 15, 1985. David and Susan are faithful members of Auburn First United Methodist Church.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to honor David Emerson Housel for his many accomplishments and his enduring impact on his country, community, friends and family. He is a man of great dignity and character who takes pride in the accomplishments of those he has helped over the years. David continues to be an inspiring role model for all of us and is the embodiment of the Auburn Creed. I know I join the Auburn faithful in wishing David God's richest blessings in his retirement.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). 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 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.)

THE BLUE DOG BUDGET

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, just a few minutes ago the House passed a budget that puts this body on record as effectively turning our back on future generations, saddling our children and grandchildren with mounting deficits and debt, with no end in sight.

The majority's management of this Nation's finances has resulted in more than \$2.2 trillion in additional debt since 2001. With this budget, the majority party has made a bad problem worse.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who control the House, the Senate, and the Presidency are in total command of our economy. The majority continues to talk about fiscal responsibility, about waste, about fraud, and about the abuse of the American people's money. Yet they have proposed a budget that is fundamentally dishonest, a budget that omits the cost of the war in Iraq and masks the costs that we will incur down the road as the deficit continues to explode.

Our men and women in uniform sacrifice each day. They leave behind their jobs and their families, often on very short notice, and at great personal and financial cost. Unfortunately, too many of them have made the ultimate sacrifice for this Nation. Yet this Congress continues to demonstrate a complete lack of fortitude to ask the American people to also make a sacrifice during this time of

war; and it has the indignity to ask our children to bear the burden alone.

For years, members of the Blue Dog Coalition have warned that we were spending money we did not have; that the administration had no economic plan; and that tax cuts were not a substitute for an economic program for our country's future; but the majority in Congress continue to reject our budget reform proposals, efforts to budget in the same way that your family and mine do, by paying as you go.

This year the Blue Dog Coalition developed a clear 12-step plan to put our fiscal house back in order by restoring discipline and accountability to the budget process. A few days ago, a proposal to include 11 of these 12 steps in the budget resolution was wholly rejected by the majority in the House Committee on Rules.

By rejecting consideration of the Blue Dog reforms, the majority turned its back on the call to return to some measure of fiscal discipline. Since no debate was permitted, I would like to take this opportunity to share some of the key features of this plan with the American people.

The Blue Dog 12-point reform plan embraces the first rule of holes: when you find yourself in one, stop digging. Our plan takes the shovel away from Congress by imposing tough new rules to restrain congressional spending. The plan also stops Congress from buying on credit and restores PAYGO, strongly supported by Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan.

The Blue Dog plan also puts a lid on spending by holding down discretionary spending to the levels proposed by the President in this year's budget. It closes a giant loophole that allows almost any spending to be designated an emergency by requiring Congress to have a separate vote on items designated as such.

Every day, I hear from my constituents who ask me where are their tax dollars going. The Blue Dog plan answers this call with a number of commonsense reforms to keep the taxpayers better educated about where their hard-earned dollars go.

□ 1630

The plan says that if Congress wants to increase the national debt we should do it completely out in the open with a separate vote. The plan says that if Congress wants to call for more than \$50 million in new spending, that bill gets a roll call vote. It says if Congress wants to push through earmarks for pet projects we should require clear written justification for those projects.

Madam Speaker, this year's deficit is projected to be at much as \$589 billion, not counting the Social Security surplus, almost 5 percent of the Gross Domestic Product. By 2009 interest payments alone on our national debt will exceed what we spend on discretionary spending on national parks, public schools, fire fighters, law enforcement and our veterans.

We owe it to the American people to stop imperiling the Nation's economic future by borrowing money to pay for irresponsible policies.

Yesterday the Judiciary Committee on which I sit spent an entire day working on the massive bankruptcy bill. During the debate revolving around issues of debt and finances, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle often talked about the importance of personal responsibility.

If your family or mine budgeted in the same way this House demonstrated today, we would all go bankrupt. Our constituents know exactly what it is like to balance a checkbook at the end of each month and at the end of the year. It is now time for the majority to exercise some of the personal responsibility they are so fond of and balance our Nation's books.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). 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.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

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

There was no objection.

HONORING OUTSTANDING CONSTITUENTS FROM TENNESSEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, we have a wonderful gentleman who was a Tennessee resident, citizen and someone we are terribly proud of. His name is Alex Haley, and many around the world know of his writings. And one of the things that Mr. Haley would often say is "Find the good and praise it". And that is something that we have more or less adopted in Tennessee, when folks do things that should be praised. And today I want to recognize some of our outstanding citizens in our State.

One is Mr. Hubert Seaton of Henderson, Tennessee. And he was recognized during the annual Henderson, Tennessee Membership and Awards Banquet, and the Chester County Chamber of Commerce named him as their 2004 citizen of the year. What an outstanding honor for an outstanding man who was the first citizen of Chester County to be drafted during World War II.

He devoted himself to serving his country with honor and dignity and was awarded both the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart.

In 1960 he was elected to the Chester County Quarterly Court and faithfully served his community for 42 years. While presiding as a county judge and chairman of the court he continued to demonstrate his devotion to the citizens of Chester County, a life well lived, an honor well deserved.

We also honor today Mr. Ed Rufo. He is the recipient of the Army Public Service Award, and it is the second highest distinction granted to a civilian by the Secretary of the Army.

As founder and president of Operation Eagle's Nest, Mr. Rufo has contributed enormously to providing both financial and moral aid to Fort Campbell soldiers and their families.

This started out as a fund raising endeavor to assist the families of soldiers deployed to Iraq. Operation Eagle's Nest rapidly obtained support from the Military Affairs Committees of Hopkinsville and Oak Grove, Kentucky and Clarksville, Tennessee, which is in my 7th Congressional District. To date contributions total more than \$250,000. It is clear that Eagle's Nest is having a substantial positive impact on the lives of our soldiers.

When our Nation called Fort Campbell and the 101st Airborne to Operation Iraqi Freedom, they responded with enthusiasm and with dedication.

When Mr. Rufo saw an opportunity to thank the men, women and their families, he answered with Operation Eagle's Nest, and we thank him for that.

We have got a couple of educators that are doing great work. Since 1990 Dr. Ronald Griffeth has dedicated himself to the students and the faculty of Battle Ground Academy in Franklin, Tennessee. He was the academy's president and headmaster. And while everyone in our community is sad to see him retire, we know that he is leaving a lasting legacy in the community. And in recognition of that legacy, the Tennessee Association of Independent Schools honored him with the distinguished Sawney Webb Award.

Not only has he helped to lead and expand the academy, he has been actively involved in the community with Boys and Girls Clubs and with working with young people in so many endeavors.

Mrs. Pam Stackhouse also works with young people. She has been recognized as the Wal-Mart Tennessee Teacher of the Year Award Winner. She received a \$10,000 education grant to benefit her school, Selmer Elementary.

She has demonstrated tremendous enthusiasm for learning for her students, and for more than three decades she has devoted her energy and her talent to Selmer students. As a music teacher for the last 8 years she has given her students appreciation for all things good. The Selmer community is truly blessed to have her enriching the lives of their children.

And Madam Speaker, I rise to wind up talking about our Chester County girls basketball team. They have had a tremendous season, and Saturday night these young women won the Tennessee AA State Championship.

We know that great basketball brings small towns together across Tennessee, and in Henderson they have been coming together for years to watch the Eaglettes hit the hardwood. And while dedicated to their team, the fans have been waiting nearly 3 decades to take another shot at that title. The wait is over.

After 27 years the Eaglettes carried home the State championship trophy and had three players make the State All tournament team. One was the MVP, the other Tennessee's Miss Basketball. Congratulations to all of the team members.

Madam Speaker, we want to say congratulations to all these outstanding constituents who allow us to see their good and to praise it.

RECORD TRADE DEFICITS

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, the United States set a new record officially, and that is something, unfortunately, which will haunt us for decades to come, a new record trade deficit of \$665.9 billion. We have two growing categories of exports as the leading industrialized nation in the world, and one is waste. We are exporting more waste paper, bottles, cans and things to the world's fastest growing industrial giant, China, which they turn into high value added goods and ship back to us.

Our second greatest export, or actually the greatest export is U.S. dollars. We are borrowing \$665.9 billion from overseas producers to bring goods into this country without adding to the economic industrial base, in fact to the detriment of the economic industrial base of the United States.

Japan today holds \$820 billion, China \$610 billion. China will soon eclipse Japan. Within 3 years, China will have a trillion dollars of IOUs from the United States Government. They will have not only a stranglehold over the production of goods, because we are buying so many things from them and so many U.S. companies have put capital into China instead of jobs here, but they will have a stranglehold over the dollar.

Let us image a confrontation over Taiwan, and the Chinese say we are not going to take you on militarily yet, it is 10 or 15 years until we have eclipsed you militarily, although we have eclipsed you industrially, but we are going to dump dollars tomorrow. We are going to take the dollar down to the value of a rupee or even less. They could threaten to dump that trillion dollars onto the world market, cause an economic catastrophe here at home

and around the world. They would not have to fire a single shot.

This administration thinks it is just peachy. They say the U.S. is growing so fast, that is why we have these huge trade deficits. Yes, we are growing so fast on borrowed money and purchasing products made overseas. That is not exactly my idea of adding to the economic industrial base might of the United States of America and putting our own people into productive work. Members wonder why wages are dropping in the U.S. and people are not doing so well, because the good jobs, the manufacturing jobs, the high-paying jobs, the jobs with benefits, are going to China and other unfair trading nations.

And this administration, and to give them some due, the last administration was afraid to take on China on their unfair trade practices. They can steal products, like they have from companies in my own district, clone them in China, including translating the U.S. patents into Chinese, and this administration and the last will not lift a finger to stop that. This administration said bring them to the WTO, rules-based trade, and then we will go after them. They have only filed one complaint against China. The billions that they are pirating from our companies, one complaint and who was it for, Pfizer, the big drug company, the only company that this administration would file a complaint at the WTO on behalf of, not the electronics company in my district, not the wood products company in my district, not other companies all across America who are being pirated by the Chinese, just Pfizer who could probably take care of themselves, but these other little guys cannot.

We have a failed trade policy in this country. We cannot continue to borrow here at home, \$1.3 million a minute with our current account deficit to run the government, and borrowing \$2 billion a day from overseas from countries that are potential future enemies, or at least competitors, like China. It is crazy. It is not sustainable.

Even the great guru, Alan Greenspan, the head political economic hack in this town, has said it is not sustainable. When will this administration wake up?

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.)

COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

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

Mr. MURPHY. Madam Speaker, let me talk about something good for

America. Community health centers offer primary and preventive health care services to everyone, including low-income, underinsured and uninsured families. While low-income individuals have access to Medicaid and the elderly and the disabled have access to Medicare, uninsured and underinsured families often delay seeing a doctor or turn to emergency departments where treatment is several times more expensive.

Community health centers, however, provide comprehensive and preventive care that adjusts charges for patient care according to family income. The Federal Government spends over \$23 billion a year to offset losses incurred by hospitals for patients unable to pay their bills, and the Department of Health and Human Services tell us that medical care at community health centers cost only about \$1.30 per pay per patient served. In fact, medical care at community health centers is around \$250 less than the average annual expenditure for an office-based medical provider.

In short, community health centers offer an affordable source of quality health care, but the problem is we need more of them. The President has proposed a \$304 million increase for community health center programs to create 1,200 new or expanded sites to serve an additional 6.1 million people by next year. In order to meet that goal, the centers must double their workforce by adding double the clinicians by 2006. Hiring that many doctors would be costly, but encouraging more to volunteer would help to meet this need. While many physicians are willing to volunteer their services at these centers, they often hesitate due to the high cost of medical liability insurance. As a result, there are too few volunteer physicians to meet our health care needs.

By comparison, volunteer physicians at free health clinics and paid physicians at community health centers already receive comprehensive medical liability coverage under the Federal Tort Claims Act, or FTCA.

Accordingly, I am introducing the Community Health Center Volunteer Physician Protection Act of 2005 to extend the medical liability protections of FTCA to volunteer physicians at community health centers. These protections are necessary to ensure that the centers can continue to play an important role in lowering our Nation's health care costs and meeting the needs for affordable and access quality health care. The Community Health Center Volunteer Physician Protection Act of 2005 is supported by the National Association of Community Health Centers, the American Medical Association and the American Osteopathic Association. I would encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this important piece of legislation to ensure access to health care for those who need it most.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 415

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 415, and my name be added to H.R. 414.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman's name will be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 415.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The primary sponsor of H.R. 414 will have to add the gentleman's name as a cosponsor.

□ 1645

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). 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.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

SMART SECURITY AND FUNDING
PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, between the \$81 billion supplemental appropriations bill passed by the House yesterday and the outrageous budget resolution that came on the floor today, the Bush administration's funding priorities are dangerous, dishonorable, and downright hazardous to the safety of our Nation. The \$81 billion supplemental and the fiscal year 2006 budget will do little more than continue the President's arrogant foreign policies, particularly his shameful misadventures in Iraq which have made Americans much less safe over the past 2 years by creating a new generation of terrorists whose common tie is their hatred of the United States.

The supplemental appropriations bill that passed the House yesterday underscores the lack of planning and arrogance that have characterized this war. \$200 billion will have been appropriated for Iraq after this latest bill clears through the Senate. That is about \$675 for every man, woman, and child.

The most disturbing thing about the President's request for more Iraq funding is the lack of accountability. Why did Congress approve another check for a mission that has been so badly botched? Who is being held accountable for the misuse of the \$150 billion we appropriated over the last 2 years? By once again funding the war in Iraq

through a supplemental spending bill, the Bush administration is continuing to pull a fast one on the American people. Instead of spending billions to build permanent bases in Iraq, our funds should go towards the National Guard and Reserve forces who have left their families and their homes to serve their country and who have been abandoned as sitting ducks in Iraq.

Despite the President's solemn promise to fight terrorism, the Bush administration has overwhelmingly concentrated the country's resources on developing bigger and more expensive weapons at the expense of other more suitable security tools which will truly keep Americans safe. Even Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld has stated that there is \$22 billion of waste in the Pentagon's budget every year.

The fiscal year 2006 budget that passed the House today is just the latest example of questionable Republican spending priorities. This budget wastes billions of dollars in outdated Cold War-era weapons systems that fail to address America's true security needs. We do not need millions of dollars for the outdated F-22 fighter jet which the military no longer relies on during combat. We do not need millions of dollars for a new generation of nuclear weapons, the so-called "bunker buster bomb," and we certainly do not need another \$8 billion for a missile defense system that has never been proven to work.

The proper response to the supposed threat of a missile attack from North Korea is not to build a multibillion-dollar missile defense system. We should be addressing this situation through aggressive diplomacy and country-to-country talks. Certainly the nonmilitary approach will not cost the United States taxpayers \$8 billion a year, and ultimately the non-\$8 billion approach will keep America safer. In fact, if the Bush administration spent even 1 percent of the time on diplomacy that it does on trying to develop a missile defense shield, we would probably be on good terms with Iran and North Korea by now.

We need a new approach to security that places a greater emphasis on non-military security. Only by shifting our spending priorities accordingly will we be able to address today's true security challenges. That is why I have developed a SMART security platform for the 21st century. SMART is a Sensible, Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. SMART security will ensure that our spending priorities match the security threats that we face.

Madam Speaker, this Congress needs to stop signing blank checks to a fiscally reckless administration. If we are going to spend billions and billions of dollars, let us at least spend it on the people who deserve it, the brave troops in the field who have sacrificed so much for their country. Let us spend it on our Nation's veterans, like 24-year-old Tim Goodrich who came to my office yesterday and shared stories about

his service in Afghanistan. One of Tim's friends was supposed to come with him, but he was so troubled by his experience in Iraq that he was not able to make it to our meeting because he has trouble sleeping at night.

Let us spend it on the 32-year-old naval officer who was in my office who had no prior experience in rebuilding war-torn regions before he was put in charge of the reconstruction of an entire city in Iraq.

This officer told me he couldn't in good conscience recruit Iraqis to work on his projects, because he knew their lives would be in danger if they worked with the American military.

It's time we honor the commitment of young veterans like Tim and others by providing them the resources they need and deserve, and by promising not to send our military in harm's way unless the very security of our nation depends on it. It's time to refocus our fiscal priorities on the true security needs of the American people.

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

(Mr. WELDON of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN DEFENSE OF CHAIRMAN
GREENSPAN

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

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today to bring up a subject that is of great concern to me and that is the tarnishing of a gentleman's reputation in this town and that is Alan Greenspan, the head of the Federal Reserve. I do not always agree with Alan Greenspan; but over the last couple of days, he has been called a political hack, he has been called a lot of things, and I think it is important to come to the floor to defend somebody's credibility in this town that has been largely responsible for the tranquil waters we find ourselves in on the financial markets.

Alan Greenspan has been reappointed by Republican and Democratic Presidents because of his ability to manage our national economy, his ability to see through problems that have cropped up around the world, his ability to intervene at times when it has saved the countries that we have assisted; and now because he has disagreed, or at least ventured an opinion on private accounts relative to Social Security, he has now come under scrutiny, ridicule, and been called things like political hack. Senator REID made these comments on TV recently. Senator CLINTON made the comments recently. Senator CLINTON, I would remind her that her husband reappointed Alan Greenspan to this post.

I think it is important to note that how dare anybody disagree with the

other side of the aisle and if they do so, they will find themselves subjected to the kind of terminology like political hacks. It takes me back to the Medicare debate that we had in this Congress when AARP decided to embrace the Republican plan. Up until that day, the other side of the aisle described the AARP as the gold standard of organizations out protecting the welfare of seniors in America. The day they chose to embrace a plan offered by President Bush, they became the scoundrels, the leadership of their party went down and picketed at their front door and declared that the AARP was an enemy of senior citizens.

What a difference a year makes. Now that they are opposing any plans even to consider personal accounts, they are back in the good graces and AARP once again is fighting for people. What is desperate about this attack is that Alan Greenspan has presided over the economy in an extraordinary fashion. It is interesting that when Mr. Greenspan speaks, the world listens. The Wall Street market-makers listen. Political leaders around the world listen. His words are carried across every wire story in the world because of the impact his words have on the economies of our Nation and our allies. He is not viewed as a political hack by those allies. He is viewed as a sage, stable, steady hand on the controls and levers of the American economy.

As I said earlier, I do not agree with Mr. Greenspan on all issues. I think sometimes we raise rates too slowly or raise them too quickly and then ultimately do not lower them enough to get the kind of economic recovery that we had hoped through rate adjustment. That being said, though, I hardly would describe a man that is lauded by virtually every facet of the American economy as a political hack or somebody whose time has come for them to leave.

So I just make the point that I do not mind debating the intricacies of Social Security; I do not mind having a debate representing the fifth largest Medicare-eligible population in America, the various opinions on whether you raise caps, change age of retirement, consider for a moment personal accounts just as a conversation point; it does not have to necessarily end up in law, but let us at least talk about it to see if it fixes Social Security. But it does trouble me that somebody of Mr. Greenspan's credibility, somebody of his reputation, somebody who has certainly served this Nation in a wonderful way would be pilloried by a political party simply because he chose to talk about how we may solve the woes of Social Security in the future.

I commend him for his work. I salute him for his brilliance on handling America's markets. I ask the other side of the aisle to reflect back on the history of his service to this country as the Federal Reserve chairman. I ask them to look at the collapsing of some economies in Asia during his tenure

when he sought and was able to rescue those economies from fiscal collapse. It is often said if the United States gets a cold, the rest of the world gets the flu. The same could happen if you allowed the economies of these nations to collapse without our intervention.

I salute Mr. Greenspan, and I do ask that my colleagues refrain from making him the object of their political ire. Let us debate the merits and the wisdom of our direction, but let us not ruin somebody's personal and business career simply to get even for their statements or their opinions.

AMERICA'S INCREASING DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, if Mr. Greenspan had been doing such a good job, the value of the dollar would not be declining every single week. Let me just say that the budget that just passed here is a national disgrace. It only passed by a couple of votes. If two people had changed, we might have gotten a real budget resolution on this floor, just by the narrowest of margins.

Last week, the U.S. Commerce Department announced the largest one-month budget deficit in U.S. history. Somebody better pay attention. Mr. Greenspan ought to pay attention. In fact, now we have the second largest trade deficit in history. The ships are lined up outside L.A. harbor as far as you can see out into the Pacific and they go back empty. What is wrong with these accounts?

Gas prices, by the way, are up 19 percent. The value of the dollar has declined by more than 33 percent, more than a third against the Euro in the past 3 years, and our economy is sputtering. The demand for oil is just about to increase with summer and vacations on the way. No wonder the stock market fell more than 100 points last week, based on investors' fears about, you guessed it, rising oil prices.

The February budget deficit of \$114 billion was the first time the deficit for any one month exceeded \$100 billion. Every day America goes more in hock to foreign lenders. They are the ones that are propping us up. In fact, if you just look between a year ago, October 2003 and November 2004, you can see who we are in hock to. Japan holds most of the paper, over \$714 billion now. Next comes Europe, over \$380 billion. China, Hong Kong, but they are going up very fast, \$241 billion. We get down here to the oil exporting countries. OPEC, over \$141 billion. And every day we owe them more and more interest as America goes into hock to foreign lenders who now own about 40 percent of us.

Equally troubling is the record trade deficit in January which increased to \$58.3 billion as imports coming into our country continued to swamp exports

going out. Even the lower value of the dollar has not helped with exports because the fundamentals are bad. Higher deficits mean more U.S. jobs get shipped to China, to India, to Latin America, jobs everywhere, good jobs. But not here in the United States. U.S. light crude flirted with \$55 a barrel, near-record levels of last October and Ohio's gasoline prices at the pump rose 15 cents, up from the last week of February. Currently, Ohioans are paying over \$2.10 for their gasoline and the upward trend just keeps on going. What is truly dangerous and tragic about this trend is America's utter dependence on foreign sources of oil.

Here we have it. We are supposed to be energy independent in this country. You go back to 1982, every single year America has become more and more dependent on imported petroleum. It means we are strategically vulnerable to disruptions, as over half the petroleum we use is imported. It is time for a new age of American energy independence.

But is this Congress or the White House up the street paying any attention? The Wall Street Journal reported last week on corn-based ethanol and whether the visionary farmers who are leading this effort across the Corn Belt would lose their shirts as some of these multinational interests would come in and buy up the meager investments that they had been able to make out of their own back pockets. This is where the Federal Government needs to step in.

My Biofuels Energy Independence Act of 2005, H.R. 388, does exactly this by helping these visionary Americans hedge predatory oil companies who lock their product out at every gas pump in this country.

□ 1700

They need long-term financing, not a comatose President and Congress. Imagine an America that was energy independent again and where energy independence rose to a national priority and where we put the dollars we are paying for imported fuel into the pockets of producers here at home.

The administration is cutting support for advancing biofuels by over \$84 million this year alone. I ask people who is locking out a new energy age for America? Who is locking them out at pumps across this country? Who is putting their hand in people's pockets?

Freedom for America in the 21st century should mean freedom from dependence on petroleum. America could create thousands and thousands and thousands of new jobs and billions of new dollars back in our own pockets if we but understood what is affecting every single user of petroleum in this country and why we are falling further and further into hock.

It is time for an age of American energy independence again. Will Washington hear the message from the countryside?

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE WORLD BANK

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, when the World Bank was founded in 1944, its official title was the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the IBRD. The reconstruction of Europe and Asia was the primary mission of the World Bank, and reconstruction has always been central to the Bank's mission.

Since 1944, the Bank has helped Germany and Japan rebuild. It was then crucial to the reconstruction of South Korea and played a key role in the renaissance of Eastern Europe after the fall of communism. Today, Germany, Japan, South Korea, and many Eastern European nations have now become donors to the Bank, supporting its work, rather than recipients.

As of today, I am the only Member of Congress who has served in the World Bank, and it is a noble institution, with thousands of professional staff helping people in poorer nations rise up to realize their full potential. The challenge before the Bank today has been the reconstruction of Iraq. Republicans and Democrats by wide margins agree that the international community should do more through multilateral institutions in helping the people of Iraq build greater incomes and more security and do it in cooperation with other nations.

But there is a problem. There is a very disappointing record of the World Bank in Iraq. The World Bank promised Iraq \$387 million in cash to be contributed for the benefit of the Iraqi people, and as of just 6 months ago the Bank has committed only \$43.6 million for the reconstruction of Iraq, about 13 percent of what was actually promised. Now, 2 years later after the fall of Saddam Hussein, the problem is worse because the pace of World Bank funding for projects in Iraq is extraordinarily slow. As of just 6 months ago, there were only nine postings for projects in Iraq funded by the World Bank.

This is an institution which not only promised \$387 million from its own account but also led a pledging conference, putting together \$32 billion in pledges for the people of Iraq. To compare, the United States pledged \$18.4 billion for the reconstruction and has already obligated 7 billion of that. Of the 32 billion, only a tiny percentage has been completed.

Much of the fault of this very slow progress is at the hands of the current

President of the World Bank, President Wolfensohn. President Wolfensohn to date has not allowed any World Bank staff to be stationed in Iraq. Despite the presence of hundreds of international staff working for a wide variety of international development organizations, President Wolfensohn will not even allow staff of the World Bank to volunteer to do the important work of helping the Iraqi people build a new democracy and create higher incomes for Iraqi working families.

That is why it was such good news to hear that Paul Wolfowitz will be named as the United States' new nominee to take over the World Bank in July. No one more than Deputy Secretary of Defense Wolfowitz knows how important it is to set a new example of helping the international community to help a democracy rise in Iraq.

We have seen great changes in the Middle East of late, in Syria and in Egypt and in other places, just sponsored by what has already happened in Iraq. Think if we could actually have a president of the World Bank put to use the \$32 billion in international funds or at least the \$387 million promised by World Bank to actually help the people of Iraq. From my view, we could not have Secretary Wolfowitz take over the leadership of the Bank faster. Under President Wolfensohn we are mired in the mud, unable to move very much assistance, and unable to do what on a bipartisan level so many of us want to do, to get the international community involved in the reconstruction of Iraq and the building of a new democracy.

I am very happy with this new nomination. I think Secretary Wolfowitz as an Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, as our Ambassador to Indonesia, and as someone who has provide a leadership role in the Department of Defense, can make a real difference. With more aid to Iraq and more reconstruction, we can bring the troops home faster.

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

(Mr. CARDOZA 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 gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. COOPER 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 gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROSS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE FISCAL YEAR 2006 BUDGET

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

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the 2006 budget that we just passed that now moves to a conference committee makes the wrong choices for our Nation. It reflects secured priorities and runs counter to our deepest held beliefs. This budget embraces disastrous economic policies while at the same time fails to put forward a vision of what this great country of the United States should be.

What America needs instead are responsible policies that reflect our values and helps bring our Nation together and invests in the future by expanding opportunity. But this budget proposes to cut vital domestic investments and services for the middle class, for our veterans, for our seniors, for our children, for the needy among us, while continuing to accumulate a huge budget deficit.

And, Mr. Speaker, there is no State in the union that is hurt more from this budget, from the cuts of it these budgets, than our State of Georgia. And keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, this is a State that just recently voted overwhelmingly for the President. But yet here we are in Georgia suffering more from this budget than any other State, \$800 million cut from the Centers For Disease Control when we need all of the help we can get to fight the mounting diseases, life threatening diseases, that are moving across our Nation.

Sixty million dollars have been cut from last year's spending for military construction projects in Georgia, \$366.8 million dollars from 91,050 Georgia children by underfunding No Child Left Behind, \$26.7 million in homeland security funding in Georgia has been cut under this budget, \$7.9 million has been cut from the Georgia Regional Hospital; TRIO programs for almost 13 million Georgians, affecting 13,000 students and many of these students from impoverished backgrounds, many of these students first-time members of college from families. Thirty-seven million dollars have been cut in Perkins scholarships in Georgia. And one particular project, Mr. Speaker, \$75,000 has been cut from an educational and recreational center in Powder Springs in Cobb County, Georgia, in the midst of construction, which halts the construction of this badly needed project.

And let me turn to HOPE VI, one of the most successful housing programs this Nation has ever produced. It is being eliminated completely from the budget, which revitalizes public housing. And in Atlanta, Georgia, in the metropolitan area, HOPE VI is the greatest success story among HOPE VI projects in the entire Nation, but it is costing our community \$120 million in economic loss, not to count the millions that is lost from leveraging those badly needed dollars and improving the surrounding communities. Heartless and cruel are words that come to mind.

Section 8 families are cut by 8,700 in Georgia. Community Development Block Grants, which our cities and our counties and our local communities live by, cut by \$211.9 million. And health care for 2 million Georgia veterans cut. Funding for firefighters cut by 30 percent.

This is not a budget of vision. This is not a budget of hope. This is a great country. This budget does not reflect the vision of a great country. This budget cuts nearly \$2 billion out of Georgia's economy. And on top of that in spite of the cuts, each Georgia family's share of the national debt has been increased by \$38,281. This budget is irresponsible, and the cuts are going to hurt an awful lot of America's precious people.

As a member of the Blue Dogs, we have repeatedly said we must pay as we go. We have repeatedly said that the Federal budget should be an honest blueprint for spending of priorities of the Federal Government. However, this budget is not honest. It is passing our obligations and responsibilities and challenges to our children and our grandchildren while cutting vital programs. This budget increases the national debt. It increases the deficit while cutting important programs.

Now we must work, Mr. Speaker, and implore this House/Senate joint conference committee to do the responsible thing for America and let us move with the vision, the courage that the people of America expect us to do and restore these cuts and move forward with a responsible budget.

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

(Mr. BOYD 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 gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SALAZAR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE NATIONAL DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the Republicans' budget that was just passed in this House a little while ago, H. Con. Res. 95. Principally I think it fails to address the crucial and central issue which this Congress should address, and that is fixing our national budget.

Somebody in my area the other day asked me the question, what keeps me awake at night? And my answer was pretty simple. Being an investment banker by profession before I came to

this House, I said our deficit and our debt.

We have a serious problem, Mr. Speaker, our Treasury is over \$7 trillion in debt.

□ 1715

We continue to borrow every year under this administration at something over \$500 billion a year. And how does this Congress react? We signed up for another credit card. Interest rates are low. We can afford it. And when we max out our new credit card, we will just go and get another credit card. Free money. That is what this Congress is doing.

But even if the money is cheap, it is not free. And while it may be cheap now, at some point what went down must come up. Interest rates will rise. That is the history when you look at the markets. They always do.

I wonder if the American public fully appreciates that this Congress and this President continue to borrow on their credit cards the way we do. Do they know, for example, that our deficits are being financed by the Chinese? As of last year, \$1.9 trillion of our debt, or 40 percent of it, was owned by foreign investors. The Chinese own about \$217 billion of that, the Japanese cover about \$668 billion, the oil-rich OPEC countries own about \$48 billion, and the list goes on and on.

So we keep cutting our taxes so we are not sending that money to Washington, D.C., but we keep spending as if we had that revenue, as long as our friends the Chinese and the Japanese and other foreign investors continue to prop up our debt. How long will that last?

We need to protect our financial security. Carrying around this much debt is making us incredibly vulnerable. We are essentially being held hostage by our own financial obligations. As long as we continue down this road, we weaken our position as a world leader because our financial stability is in the hands of other nations.

This is not just a national security problem. Running a big deficit and debt is also a problem for the economic health of this country. As a Nation, personal savings has dropped from almost 11 percent in 1984 to about 1 percent in 2004. We are not saving.

We are also weak in investment, despite historically low interest rates. In fact, if you look at this budget, you will see that we are spending about \$1.5 billion a week in the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, \$1.5 billion a week. But we are cutting education, and we are cutting the health care system. We are cutting our national parks budget; we are cutting transportation. We are not investing and reinvesting in our water and sewage systems. All the investment that we need to be a productive country, we are not investing.

Do you think the Chinese are investing \$1.5 billion a week in Iraq in a war? No. They are building their water systems, they are educating their people,

they are building their transportation systems, their telecommunications systems. They are investing. We are just spending.

It is poor fiscal judgment; and this Congress, led by this side, is guilty of putting that on a credit card that all Americans will end up paying.

My background is in finance. I used to do that. I used to finance for companies, for people. I used to tell them how to do things. I have never seen this kind of disregard, this structural problem that we are creating.

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress begins to make the tough choices, and that is the reason I opposed H. Con. Res. 95 today.

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

(Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts 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 gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONGRATULATING MAUI ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, INC., ON ITS 40TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker and fellow citizens of our country, and especially of my Great State of Hawaii, and of the great County of Maui, celebrating its centennial this year and the place to where my own great-grandparents moved and made their life home in 1900, aloha.

"Maui no ka oi," Maui is the best, not just because of its scenery and lifestyle, but because it has always been an innovator, and because, like all of our Hawaii, it takes care of its own. And there is no better example of the true spirit of Maui than Maui Economic Opportunity, Inc., which I stand today to congratulate on the occasion of its 40th anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, Maui Economic Opportunity, Inc., MEO, is a private, non-profit Community Action Partnership Agency, which was chartered on March 22, 1965, by Federal mandate under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. MEO provides an enormous array of community services annually to over 20,000 people throughout Maui County, encompassing the four islands of Maui, Molokai, Lanai, and Kahoolawe.

MEO's model is "Helping People, Changing Lives." Its mission is simple and direct: to help the poor, the elderly, children and youth, persons with

disabilities, immigrants, other disadvantaged people, and the general public to help themselves, so that they may become self-sufficient.

MEO has more than fulfilled this mission. In 2003, for example, MEO was one of only four agencies out of 1,000 community action agencies nationwide to receive an Agency of Excellence Award from the National Community Action Partnership. This prestigious award, for MEO's superior administrative operations and program excellence, is a true testament to its advocacy and its outstanding services tailored to the specific and often unique needs of Maui County.

Among those many services, MEO provides the largest specialized transportation program in Maui County, with vehicles carrying the elderly, low-income, persons with disabilities, youth, Head Start children, and the public, 7 days a week and up to 18 hours a day. MEO's award-winning Head Start program provides services to 384 children through 14 centers county-wide. The MEO YouthBank, including an AmeriCorps program, provides opportunities for youths ages 14 to 26 to work, learn and prepare for their future.

The MEO community services staff works tirelessly in challenging situations, providing emergency assistance, job placement, training and other support services. The MEO Development Corporation provides loans and training to start small businesses, create jobs, and boost the community's economy. MEO's Anlace Hispano provides services to the Hispanic-speaking and immigrant population, and the Being Empowered and Safe Together reintegration program serves individuals making the difficult transition from prison back into the community.

Moreover, MEO has never hesitated to go above and beyond its core mission in times of dire community need. In the aftermath of 9/11, for example, MEO, in partnership with the County of Maui, distributed \$1.5 million to residents affected economically when Maui's tourism industry slumped. Just a few weeks ago, MEO volunteered its services to assist employees dislocated through the destruction by fire of Kahului Mall.

Of course, the secret of MEO's success has always been its wonderful, dedicated and caring staff, led by some truly extraordinary executive directors throughout the last 4 decades. My former State House of Representatives Speaker and colleague, Joe Souki, well laid the groundwork for the modern era and was followed for the last 2 decades by the irrepressible Gladys Baisa, who will soon retire. Maui County will truly miss your leadership, Gladys; but you and MEO chose well in your successor, Sandy Bas.

So you can see, Mr. Speaker, that Maui Economic Opportunity, Inc., has truly created a better community for everyone and richly deserves these happy birthday greetings before it

moves on into a bright and equally rewarding future. Mahalo, and aloha.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE VETERANS OF THE PERSIAN GULF

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to the veterans of the Persian Gulf who are from the Mahoning Valley in Ohio. Our valley has long been blessed to have local sons and daughters willing to volunteer to serve in our country's military, and our most recent veterans of the Persian Gulf are cut from the same cloth. When they were called on to serve overseas in the Middle East, leaving their families and friends for extended periods of time to fight in a foreign land, they answered the call. They answered the call, even though they faced great physical risk, even death; and I thank them for their service, for their patriotism, and for their sacrifice.

We as a country owe them a tremendous debt and are forever grateful. We need to ensure that they are provided the equipment and support they need in the field to complete their jobs effectively, that their families are taken care of when they are away, that they have jobs to come home to when they return, and that they receive the benefits that they have earned as veterans.

We have no higher legislative priority, I know myself and speaking for the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), than fully funding the veterans benefits that they have been promised.

Yesterday, I voted for the supplemental funding bill for the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. I believe that we need to finish the job we started in the Middle East and bring stability to that region and then to immediately bring our troops home.

God bless the men and women who have served during the war on terror, and God bless the men and women who are still serving on the other side of the world. These veterans have protected this country for years, since its inception; and the highest honor that we could bestow upon them is to make sure that we take care of them.

Mr. Speaker, we have the freedoms we enjoy today because of the sacrifices that our soldiers have made throughout history, and I am proud today to honor the men and women of the Mahoning Valley who have served this country in the Persian Gulf and have served so nobly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), for sharing these moments with me as we stand here in the Chamber of the people's House, the House of Representatives, to honor those from our region.

Ohio is a patriotic State, and the great Mahoning Valley is certainly a

patriotic region of Ohio. Over the years, literally thousands of young men and women have left the great Mahoning Valley and have served in this country's Armed Forces. They are serving today, so many of them, in harm's way, unselfishly giving up of their time and their talents, while their loving families wait at home, hoping and praying that they will be safe.

Both the gentleman and I have visited Walter Reed Hospital. We have talked with Americans who have lost their legs, many have been blinded, so many have sustained brain injuries. I have been to the Bethesda Naval Hospital and seen young people walking down the hallways with their families walking with them, young people who have been terribly disfigured.

We are paying a great price for the war that is currently under way; and the least we can do, the very least we can do as a Nation is to make sure that when these honored people come home that they are treated with justice and fairness, that they are able to receive the health care that they have been promised and that they deserve.

As we stand here in the safety of this great Chamber, we should never forget that many of our friends and the families and loved ones from the great Mahoning Valley are in harm's way. So we honor them, and we honor their families, because they have joined in the sacrifice as well.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

We also want to recognize all our friends in Youngstown at this time, where at the Italian-American War Veterans Post 3 the veterans and community leaders on April 14 will hold a tribute honoring the Mahoning Valley area sons and daughters at war.

We would like to thank Herman Adams, Ray Ornelas, and Dom Medina for all their help in putting this together and organizing it, helping us to honor those troops.

□ 1730

KEEP SECURITY IN SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, in the ongoing debate on Social Security, I think it is essential that we take the time to put a face on the people served by and protected by Social Security.

All of the numbers and charts help us make the outline of the arguments, but it is the letters that I receive from my constituents that show the real face of Social Security. I would like to take the time to show one of those letters, one of the 400-plus letters I have received.

A gentleman named Hector MacDonald from Laredo, Texas. It says,

“Dear Congressman CUELLAR, As a member of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, I am writing to urge you please oppose any legislation or plan that would divert dedicated Social Security payroll taxes into private individual accounts or in any way harm the benefits, structure or traditional role of Social Security.”

As you know, President Roosevelt and Congress created Social Security in 1935 to protect retired Americans from experiencing a poverty ridden old age. And America's more than 35 million seniors have invested their hard earned money into Social Security during their long working lives. Social Security represents a covenant between government and its citizens. I therefore stand against the administration's policy and plans to reform Social Security through partial privatization or any other plan that would undermine the promise of the program's full guaranteed lifetime benefits.

One of my top priorities as a citizen and a voter is the protection of Social Security benefits for all current and future retirees. I sincerely hope among your top priorities as an elected official that you will also help defeat the privatization and other proposals that threatened our retirement security.

I urge you to work closely with the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare and protect the benefits we have worked for, paid for and have earned. Very sincerely, Mr. Hector MacDonald” from Laredo, Texas.

Again, I have received many letters like this, and I think this letter, Mr. Speaker, speaks for itself. I received over 400 letters like this one opposing the privatization of Social Security.

I have taken the time to read these letters, and I have taken a great deal of time to carefully review the proposal and listen to all sides of the debate; and after a thorough analysis I have come to see clearly that this proposal to privatize Social Security does not pass my legislative test. That is, it will not make our families stronger.

The current proposal to privatize Social Security jeopardizes our safety net by pulling the security out of Social Security. It takes our guaranteed benefits and gambles them on a stock market. It threatens to pose benefit cuts, raising the retirement age. And finally it assures adding a tremendous sum to our existing \$7 trillion debt.

Social Security has always been the one source free from risk and designed to reserve as a bedrock guarantee for our seniors.

The system was created and has served for generations as social insurance, not social investment; and we owe it to ourselves and our children, especially our seniors, to preserve that bedrock guarantee.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 United States Code, 1928a, the order of House of January 4, 2005, and clause 10 of rule I, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Group of the North Atlantic Assembly:

Mr. TANNER of Tennessee,
Mr. ROSS of Arkansas,
Mr. CHANDLER of Kentucky,
Mrs. TAUSCHER of California.

FIGHTING TERRORISM

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. 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 this special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this is an exciting time in the history of the United States, in the history of the world, and in the advancement of freedom.

This afternoon a member of minority made a statement that this war was not a war of choice. Contrary to that opinion, which certainly one has a right to share in this body, I would remind all Members of this House and the people that this was in fact a war that was chosen by Osama bin Laden and even before that by people like Saddam Hussein, those who have subjugated and terrorized their people for decades and even generations.

Osama bin Laden turned his hatred on America after we responded to the request of the Saudi and Kuwaiti governments after Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait in 1990. His aggression was one of the key sparks in the current activities that we find ourselves engaged in right now.

This is a decisive time. In fact, we face the most serious threat to our freedoms and our liberties that we have faced since the end of the Second World War. We are fighting an enemy who has proven it will use whatever violent means necessary to further its cause. Indeed, we are not going to lose because of military strength, but we would lose only if the people of the United States have a loss of resolve.

My encouragement is to stay the course. As we see the development over the past several months around the world there are many, many things to be hopeful for. We recoil in horror at the report of suicide bombers and

strolling into crowded markets or onto packed buses and detonating themselves. Are they primarily focusing on our soldiers? No. The preponderance of casualties are attacks on their own people. In fact, this is not an insurgency in the classic sense. It is led by frankly a group of thugs, people filled with hatred, bitterness, criminals by any measure of merit, killing innocent men, women and children.

We watch in stunned belief when such a terror group announces it has taken hostage Americans or others who are innocent, working in Iraq peacefully to make it a safe place. A place where people can wake up in the morning, go to work, provide for their families, and then come home for a peaceful dinner, which so many of us, the vast and overwhelming majority of citizens in the United States, enjoy.

But our hearts swell glancing at pictures of the 8 million Iraqis who risked their lives to vote for a better way of life, one that does not include violence and brutal dictators. Every person who had the courage in his or her hearts to dip his or her finger in the purple ink on January 30 to vote in Iraq's first democratically held elections in decades, took a courageous stand for freedom and liberty and we applaud that.

I proudly joined my colleagues yesterday to pass the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Budget which we approved 388 to 43. The supplemental provides for \$76.8 billion in defense spending for pay, benefits, supplies and equipment for our troops because we will assure that our troops have the training, the tools and the equipment that they need to carry on to victory in this war.

We needed to move quickly to secure this money and we could not afford to wait for the budget process to wind its way to a finish. The military has told us they needed the funds by May 1 and Congress just cannot move that quickly on the entire defense appropriations bill.

The supplemental is money well spent to show our soldiers that we fully support them and that we are doing everything we can to provide for their safety. It shows our commitment to both our allies and also we show our enemies that we mean business, that we will continue to fight. We will pursue them in every corridor where they exist and, finally, win this war on terror.

This is not a fight we will lose, again, I reiterate because of military strength or lack of it. It is a fight that we can only lose if we choose to walk away, and we must not walk away.

This is a revolutionary time throughout the world. In the entire latitude 10-40 window, the doors of freedom are opening for the first time in decades, for the first time in history in some cases. We are seeing the fruit of the valor of our men and women in uniform in the developments in Lebanon, the developments in Egypt, the developments in Saudi Arabia. It is an exciting

time. It is exciting to see the values of the United States being carried forward, not being imposed but being embraced. Those are not a value of culture but a value of freedom and liberty, the dignity of the individual, the rights of every human being to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

I am proud of what the Iraqi people are doing after the bombings that have come on recruiting stations, on stores, on schools, on polling places. What we are seeing happening is an exciting thing, and that is the next morning the recruits are coming back. The next morning the security forces are coming to work. The next morning the police are on patrol. They are beginning to stand up and it is imperative that we stand with them.

We will continue to be strong and defend liberty so that other people may have the same freedoms that we enjoy.

I want to thank my distinguished colleagues who are here today with me to discuss the supplemental, the impact that it will have on our continued war on terror, one that we will see all the way through to victory.

Mr. Speaker, right now I would like to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I would like to make a few remarks to kind of put in perspective at least my view of the war on terror. Before I do that let me thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) for taking out this time to permit several of us to make these remarks.

Let me just say that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) has been a very energetic Member of the House of Representatives in spite of the fact that he has been here a relatively short time as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and we certainly enjoy having him here and serving with him.

We all know that we have many people deployed overseas in a number of places. The most often talked about today, of course, are Afghanistan and Iraq, and I think it is fitting at this time to thank and pay tribute to the members of our Armed Services who are, in fact, a part of that deployed force, and to note as others already have today that they often times pay a very high price for volunteering to help their country in this way.

In addition to those folks who are members of the military, there are civilians in Iraq and Afghanistan as well, members of private securities forces that are employed by the Iraqi government and by our State Department and other agencies to provide the security that is necessary. They put themselves in harm's way as well.

I am reminded of one of my constituent families who lost a civilian son who went to Iraq to carry out his private pursuits. And so there are many people who have volunteered,

and we thank them all for the sacrifice they and their families have made in carrying out the mission that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) has described as trying to solve a set of issues, a problem that is perhaps the most serious international problem that we have had since World War II.

The use of terror in carrying out political objectives is certainly not new. It goes back well over a century and we can find examples of it throughout the world and primarily perhaps in the Middle East as far back as 1900. And, of course, in 1928 it bubbled up in Egypt, where organizations were formed for the purpose of carrying out various types of ill-conceived missions, ill-conceived goals. And, of course, in modern history it has become very prevalent, for example, subsequent to the establishment of the country of Israel, those who wished the Israeli government and the Israeli people ill will and tried to create harm and perhaps do away with the state of Israel, began a war of terror in the Middle East and has continued, I think it is fair to say, continues today. It certainly did very recently.

I first became interested in these issues in the late eighties when on a trip to Israel I happened to pick up a Time Magazine and read a story, an article about Hamas. When I got there I began to ask Israeli officials about this group and they enlightened me over the period of time that I was in Israel on that trip, and I came home convinced that the subject of terrorism was something that our country was going to have to pay attention to and that, in fact, it could end up in the situation where we were going to have a very significant problem. And, of course, the rest of that story is history.

We know that during the nineties we suffered attacks in Saudi Arabia on American interests. We suffered attacks in two countries, in Africa on our embassies there, and we suffered the attack on the USS *Cole* in Yemen. Of course, in 2001 on September 11 our country was attacked here in the homeland.

We had been fairly passive, I must say, about this subject during the decade of 1990s and before. But subsequent to 9/11 and President Bush, who stood at this podium and talked about the global war on terror and declared the war on terror, our country has had some tremendous successes overseas. And through the help of people, some of whom have paid the ultimate sacrifice, but all of whom sacrificed in one way or another, we have had some great successes.

For example, in Afghanistan with the use of air power and some folks on the grounds, we were able to take down the regime that we know as the Taliban, and we were able to disburse the al Qaeda forces that were supported by the government known as the Taliban.

□ 1745

The al Qaeda forces were scattered. We believe that we have captured or

taken down in one way or another something in the neighborhood of 75 percent of their leadership and have, in effect, provided an opportunity for our country to claim a success with regard to the al Qaeda organization.

Of course, I had the opportunity along with some of my colleagues to travel to Afghanistan last February and to see the progress that has been made in that country because of our country's policies. Obviously, along with routing out the Taliban and taking down much of the al Qaeda leadership, the economy of Afghanistan is growing in leaps and bounds. It is not the kind of economy that we know, but still, it is an indigenous economy that is, in fact, growing at a good pace.

The Karzai government has been stood up. In talking with President Karzai, much progress has been made in the goals of education and society generally in that country. Of course, with the coming legislative elections, we will have another democratic victory in Afghanistan when the parliament is actually elected.

We had another opportunity in Iraq. We had problems in Iraq and took advantage of the opportunity in Iraq to take down one of the most despotic, tyrannical governments in the history of the world, the government run by Saddam Hussein and his Baathist party. So we move forward in the war on terror and we fight against insurgents and terrorists in Iraq and rebuild Iraq, bring its economy back up and provide opportunities for the Iraqi people, not only to have their economy grow but also to have that election that was symbolized by the purple finger of over 8 million Iraqi people who stood in line, sometimes being shot at, in order to be able to vote for their new government.

These things have all gone forward and they have set an example for the rest of the world, and as President Bush said not long ago, any country in the world that wants to establish a democracy, we will be there to help.

Today, as we look around the world, in Egypt, there are tendencies that are developing for democratic opportunities. The first real election perhaps in the history of Egypt will be held this year, and of course, in Lebanon, we all see on the news every day that the democracy there is progressing as well as in the West Bank and with regard to the Palestinians who are also in the process of forming a new government and providing for the elections that were recently held.

This is a problem. Terrorism is a problem, always has been. It has become a major issue today, however, primarily I believe because of the possibility of terrorists acquiring the possession of weapons of mass destruction which, of course, would be a very serious and unthinkable kind of a situation.

Once again, let me commend the gentleman from Kentucky for taking out this time to give me and others who will follow me an opportunity to express our views of the current situation

and the successes that are our military men and women and our government and the newly elected democratic governments in the Middle East are having.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his aggressive and energetic leadership in the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services. In the 20 years that he has served in the House, he has seen the end of the Cold War, of one dramatically large threat replaced by an even more pernicious threat with the rise of global terror and asymmetric threats.

This is a decisive time in our history, and it is important that we stand together as a people. I regret the occasional rhetoric that we hear even in this body that tears down the efforts of our leaders, of our soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines to effectively carry out their mission.

But there is also a mission at home that we have. As the dynamics of the threats to the United States have changed, it intruded upon our lives on September 11, the protection of our homeland, of our communities, of our children and our families. It is a critical, critical priority.

It is now a special opportunity to introduce a distinguished member of law enforcement who is also now a distinguished Member in this body from the State of Washington. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), who has established a great record of persistence, the ultimate captor with a great team of law enforcement people of the Green River Killer, who also brings profound insights into law enforcement and port security, homeland security, domestic law enforcement and is now adding great value to the entire people of the United States here in the House. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) for allowing me a few minutes to speak tonight.

I have had experience on the streets of this country and in protecting our communities and our families, and it has been an honor to serve for 33 years in the King County sheriff's office in Seattle, Washington.

Since September 11, our job has changed a little bit. We have had to focus on possible terrorists in our community. This country is at war. It is a different war, a war like we have never fought before. We call it the War on Terror.

Some may disagree with how we got into this war, why we are here and may want to even end this War on Terror. Some have even called it a war of choice. This was not a war of choice. Our country, our Nation was attacked. On September 11, we suffered human loss in a tragic attack on this Nation.

Then what happened? Our armed services jumped into action, and the

men and women of our military came to our aid, came to protect this country and went to war.

Some might ask, well, why would people volunteer for the armed services, why would anyone, law enforcement officers or people who serve in the military, why would they volunteer to sacrifice their life? Why would they volunteer to sacrifice time away from their families or put them in need for their care and attention and put their lives in danger? Why would men and women do that?

As I thought about that, it reminded me of a story that happened a few years ago. I have a 28-year-old son who now is or he was 10 when this happened, but it was a hot summer day in Seattle. It was one of the few hot summer days we had, and I was mowing the lawn and he was following behind me. As we were mowing the lawn and he was tugging on my shirt, he said, Dad, let me mow the lawn, I know I can do this. I was a little bit unsure about having my 10-year-old son run the lawn mower. My wife came out and said, Dave, the phone was ringing; it is for you.

I went in to answer the phone. My son was still tugging at my shirttail, Dad, I can do this, let me mow the lawn. So I said, Dan, if you can start that lawn mower, you can mow the lawn.

So I watched from the window as I was on the telephone, and Dan pulled and tugged and pulled and tugged and pulled and tugged on this rope to start this lawn mower, and the sweat was just pouring down his face, and I thought soon he would give up, but he kept on going.

Finally, then he came to the point where he was so exhausted he had to stop and pause, and he put his head down and he wondered, where do I turn now, what do I do. This was a proud moment for me as a father because he stopped, he looked up, he put his hands together, and you could read his lips. He said, please, Lord, start this lawn mower. Then he bent over and pulled on the rope, and the lawn mower started. So I thought to myself, you know what, if God wants Dan to mow the lawn, I am not going to stop him.

Here is the moral of the story. Here is a young boy who has faith and hope and trust that small children have. If you stop and think about the faith and the hope and the trust that our kids have, that our children and grandchildren have today in each and every one of us, parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles, Members of Congress, I do not care who you are, those children are looking to us for leadership.

What has happened here is our military is fighting, sacrificing their lives because they know they cannot give in to terrorists because those little eyes that you look into, that hold that faith, that hope and that trust must never lose that hope, faith and trust.

This country needs to be free. We must support our men and women in

uniform to preserve the faith, hope and trust that every one of our children in this Nation have, and when we passed the supplemental yesterday and supporting our troops for the training, equipment and tools that they need to conduct this war and do their job, we sent them a clear message: We support you and we love you. We care for you and we thank you for keeping our country free and for making sure that our children never lose that faith, hope and trust that they have in all of us and in this great Nation.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington State and also salute all members of law enforcement, our fire, EMS and first responders who are working literally around the clock to make this Nation safe.

Indeed, I want to salute our soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines. My former comrades, classmates, former comrades when I was an enlisted soldier and those who I went to the military academy with and served on active duty with, who are still serving this country today. I applaud your efforts. We love you and we thank you for the sacrifices that you are making to give us a safer tomorrow, a safer Nation, a safer future and hope for the world.

In our have it now, you deserve a break, have it your way society we can easily forget that all true freedom came at a great price. It came with persistence. It came with faith. It came with hope and real hope is not what we see now. Hope is something that we do not yet have, that we are waiting for, that we are pursuing aggressively with great hunger, and that freedom ultimately, as all true freedom came, with the shedding of blood, the willingness to lay down our lives for our friends.

In the prior generations, that has been done willingly, acceptingly, and now we have a great generation that has raised up to defend this Nation to prepare and protect this country for our children and grandchildren as they come forward.

There is a liberal intellectual elite in this country that say the people of the Arabic world are not capable of embracing freedom. I wholeheartedly disagree with that. As one who has learned to love the Arabic culture over the last 27 years, I have seen in ordinary men and women that spark of desire for freedom, a desire to be free, a desire to give their children hope and opportunity and freedom and to grow up in a safe community, to be able to pass on the tenets of their faith, to live with a future that is secure, a future that has promise.

Let me share with you another perspective, another view. I want to share some excerpts from an e-mail that I received from my neighbor down the street. His name is Colonel Charlie Waylon, and he is a reservist.

Working as an emergency room physician, he answered the call after September 11 to join a special forces unit first in the liberation of Afghanistan.

Then he came back again in Operation Iraqi Freedom and is now on his third tour in theater, willingly serving, making a difference in the lives of our soldiers and Marines but also making a difference in the lives of the Iraqi people.

He is a colonel, and his son reports soon to Fort Benning, Georgia, for infantry basic training. They, along with the rest of our soldiers, are constantly in my prayers and my wife Pat's prayers. It is e-mails like this that I receive on a regular basis that convince me that we are doing the right thing, and not only that, that we are winning.

Before my friend went to Iraq, he was asked three questions by one of his neighbors: Are we winning? Is it worth the price? Are we accomplishing anything?

Having spent some time now in theater for the third time, he says the answers to all three are an unequivocal yes. Let me say that again. It is an unequivocal yes.

What gives him that authority to speak is his experience on the ground, having seen that situation develop over time.

First, let us focus on the big picture. We are not engaged in a war in Iraq itself, the main war on the ground. We are engaged in a war of world views, one that does not value freedom, one that values hatred and closed societies over openness and freedom and true discourse; one that does not value the true dignity of the individual, the preciousness of all life but discards that for the sake of a theology of hatred. It does not represent the center of mass of people in that part of the world.

The fact that the Iraqis would rise up and go to the polls in numbers greater than turnout in elections in the United States of America says the man and woman on the street cares deeply, deeply about embracing this opportunity for freedom. Who are we to walk away from them in their time of need right now?

□ 1800

We are now fighting a counterinsurgency, and it has two goals. One, it wants to overthrow the democratically elected government of Iraq which has just held its first session, and try to run the United States out of the country.

What needs to be clear is that we are not alone in facing this enemy. 70 percent of the eligible voters in Iraq turned out for the election. Outside the Sunni Triangle that number approached 85 percent. In my district in the 2002 election only 38 percent of the registered voters turned out to vote. Who are we to criticize those efforts of those valiant people?

We all mourned when we heard that a bomb exploded outside an Iraqi police training center and killed 120 recruits. But if we can find one positive aspect in that needless tragedy, that atrocity, it is that 120 Iraqis felt safe enough to even sign up to become police officers;

that they had courage to invest their lives, to lay their lives down, to put them on the line to protect their families, their communities and ultimately their nation. And the exciting thing is that the men come back the next day. They come back to serve because they understand what is at stake.

Moderate Shiite clerics are not asking us to leave Iraq. The Kurds are not asking us to leave, and the overwhelming majority of Iraqis are not asking us to leave. They want us to stay, to stand by them while they train up, while they become strong and stabilize their own country and bring forth their flavor in terms of their culture of the freedoms that they are taking hold of.

Let us look at what has been achieved so far by those detractors of the policy of this country who have said that this war was a war of choice. It was imposed upon us, I might remind them.

And I would also state, Mr. Speaker, that since in the last year Libya has denounced weapons of mass destruction and opens its doors to the United Nations weapons inspectors, it has opened its doors to Western trade, a desire to become part of the community of nations, and it has renounced terrorism. A former perpetrator of terrorism has repented of that and now are beginning to walk in a new direction, seeing the inevitability of the rise of freedom in the Middle East.

In the fall of 2004 Afghanistan held free and open elections. Women who under the rule of the Taliban could barely leave their homes walked freely to polling places and voted.

In January Palestine elected a national leader in a United Nations supervised election in which women also voted. We are hopeful that the situation with the Palestinian people will lead to a free government, a peaceful government that can coexist alongside the democracy in Israel.

Also in January the Iraqis held their unprecedented election, and again, women voted in overwhelming numbers.

One of my West Point classmates shared with me in a confidential e-mail his perspective on seeing women coming to the polls to vote. He saw elderly women, young mothers with their children clinging to them standing, ignoring the ordnance flying about them, who had the courage to take hold of this once in a lifetime, once in a generation, once in a century opportunity to make a difference, to transform what had been an oppressive atrocity ridden, closed society in which the individual did not matter, but only to feed an appetite of megalomaniacal power of a dictator. That has been cast down. These people are seizing that opportunity.

The unfolding events in Lebanon and Syria's declaration that it will begin withdrawing from Lebanon is an outstanding indicator that as we stay the course and we link arms with freedom

loving peoples in that part of the world, that we will see peaceful resolution to the challenges that we face, and these terrorists will be repudiated for the inhumane individuals that they are.

My friend ends his e-mail by stating that it is not just men and women who are helping lead their countries toward a brighter future. Women who spent years living under dictatorial regimes that demanded their silence are stepping up and playing a major role in the spread of democracy.

He says, and I quote, I want women fully enfranchised throughout this part of the world. I want them voting. I want them involved in government because in my opinion, he states, if they are, this will be a safer, saner and less militant world.

As we transition to other topics relating to this, I would like to introduce a distinguished colleague of mine, a member of my entering class in the Congress. He is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL). He brings a very pertinent record of professional achievement into this body, and can speak with an authority on a wide variety of issues related to the global war on terror.

Prior to being elected to the United States Congress, Mr. MCCAUL served as an Assistant United States Attorney whose charge was counterterrorism investigation and prosecution in the great State of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his leadership in managing this very important debate here today. As the gentleman mentioned, I have a background in counterterrorism in the Justice Department. I know this war on terror firsthand. I serve on the Homeland Security Committee and the International Relations Committee.

You know, many believe that the war on terror began on September the 11th, 2001, but the fact of the matter is we have been at war for several decades. You do not have to go back very far for evidence of that. As recently as 1993 an individual by the name of Ramzi Yousef entered the United States claiming political asylum. He was detained and given a notice to appear. He failed to appear at that hearing. Instead he would join the first al Qaeda cell in downtown Manhattan.

We recently passed the REAL ID Act to make it more difficult for those like Ramzi Yousef to obtain political asylum in this country.

After joining his fellow classmates from the bin Laden academy, he engaged in a conspiracy to blow up the World Trade Center. Fortunately, the Towers remained standing that day. But that day would come later. And that was Osama bin Laden's dream.

Then the embassies in Africa were bombed, and the USS *Cole*. In 1997, bin Laden openly and publicly declared war against the United States. The only

thing that troubled him was that the United States would not respond back to his declaration of war. It seemed like the United States was a sleeping giant, and it would not be until the bloodiest alarm of 9/11 that the giant would finally awake.

And now, to the present. There is positive news in this war on terror. We have rooted out al Qaeda in its caves in Afghanistan. We have killed or captured nearly 75 percent of the leadership. We have liberated Afghanistan and held free elections for the first time in the country's history, and we have liberated Iraq. We know that Zarqawi in Iraq has significant ties to bin Laden. We know that al Qaeda today says it has the right to kill 4 million Americans, 2 million of them children. It is a threat that we take very serious today, and it is a threat that we are responding to.

We have seen significant and positive developments in terms of the Syrians pulling out of Lebanon.

Rarely in the history of the world has freedom moved so swiftly through a region. In places where oppression, tyranny and inhumane treatment once flourished, we now find nations waking up to the reality of self-ruled governments and the benefits that come with their new democracies. In Iraq for the first time in more than a generation, people are speaking up for or questioning governments, a new right for many of them. And this discourse is occurring not in closed rooms or the hidden chambers of a dictator's prison, but in the legislative halls of a free Iraq and Afghanistan.

As recently as this week, we as a Congress passed an emergency wartime supplemental bill. We have an opportunity to continue our commitment to the brave fighting men and women who are helping ensure this birth of democracy by providing the necessary tools to protect themselves, by providing the body armor that they need, by providing the armed Humvees that they need, and by increasing death benefits from \$12,000 to \$100,000.

The United States Government and Coalition Forces have trained and equipped nearly 82,000 Iraqi police and highway patrol officers, and along with soldiers, the United States and its allies are well on the way to helping Iraqis defend and protect themselves in their own country.

In all, more than 142,000 Iraqi police officers and soldiers, many of whom have already taken over the responsibilities of protecting their freedom, have received training. About 130,000 of those troops helped ensure the success of the Iraqi elections, some even died to protect those vital votes. Add to that of Iraq's 18 provinces, 12 are now being patrolled and policed by Iraqis. And on February 21, the 40th Iraqi National Guard Brigade officially assumed control of its area of operation in and around Baghdad. This is the first Iraqi brigade to stand alone and have direct control over an area of op-

eration. While the Coalition Partners continue to advise the brigade, the areas will be under complete Iraqi control.

With the \$5.7 billion proposed to train Iraqi troops in the supplemental budget, we are making a confident investment in a nation that will uphold the democracy those in those lands have fought so hard for.

But our need to help spread freedom also includes Afghanistan. We voted on a \$1.3 billion investment to be made there to stabilize this emerging democracy and eventually reduce U.S. forces in the area. We have seen American forces quietly making tremendous progress in a land which for so long had none. Already, Americans have trained 36,000 national and local Afghani police officers, 1,000 border security agents and 400 highway patrol officers. Coalition Forces have set up six training locations to make it efficient to train these troops, and we must remember by training these troops we are spreading and securing democracy, and therefore making us safer here at home. With each and every Iraqi and Afghani troop trained, America is one step closer to bringing its sons, its daughters, its husbands and wives home for good.

I would like to close with a very powerful story. It is a story of Janet and Bill Norwood. It is the story of Sergeant Byron Norwood. As many Members recall, at the State of the Union, Mr. and Mrs. Norwood sat right over there. The President talked about how their son, Byron, lost his life. He lost his life in an incredibly brave story. He rescued seven Marines held hostage by insurgents. He saved seven Marines' lives from the insurgence in Iraq, and paid the ultimate sacrifice in the process. It was a defining moment in the State of the Union, the warm embrace between Janet Norwood and Safia from Iraq.

I would like to close by reading a card that I received from Mrs. Norwood. With each parent I have talked to who lost a loved one in Iraq, they all said the same thing, "Finish the job."

This is a picture of Sergeant Byron Norwood. And in the card written to me, Mrs. Norwood said, "Dear Representative McCaul.

"We want you to know how much we have appreciated your visits to our home. It was a pleasure to meet you and Linda and to be able to share more about Byron with you. Knowing that you and so many other Americans honor and respect his sacrifice helps greatly to ease our sorrow.

"Thank you also for the flags. The one that was flown over the Capitol on the day that Byron died will always have a special place in a beautifully displayed box with other treasures from Byron's Marine Corps service. He would be so amazed and so proud.

"The whole idea of the Post Office naming is such a stunning honor. One of the things we worried about was that people would soon forget about

Byron. If your bill passes, that will never happen, and that is such a great comfort.

"If you ever become aware of any way I can be of service in my new role as a Gold Star Mother, either to the government or to the Gold Star Moms, please let me know. Sincerely, Janet."

Mr. Speaker, this is what it is all about. This brings this war on terror home to the homes of every family in this Nation, and it is a war that we will prevail in.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his profound words. No more powerful words can be spoken than those of a mother who has lost a son, whose blood was shed literally to protect our freedoms, the lives of his fellow men.

In the words of our Lord, We share no greater love as a person than he who lays down his life for his friends.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COBLE (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today after 4:00 p.m. on account of illness.

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 Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CARDOZA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COOPER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOYD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SALAZAR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUELLAR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CASE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, March 21, 2005, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 103, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

Thereupon, (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, March 21, 2005, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 103, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1286. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Peanuts, Tree Nuts, Milk, Soybeans, Eggs, Fish, Crustacea, and Wheat; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance; Technical Correction [OPP-2005-0001; FRL-7698-9] received February 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1287. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Standards of Performance for Steel Plants: Electric Arc Furnaces Constructed After October 21, 1974, and On or Before August 17, 1983; and Standards of Performance for Steel Plants: Electric Arc Furnaces and Argon-Oxygen Decarburization Vessels Constructed After August 17, 1983 [OAR-2002-0049; FRL-7874-9] (RIN: 2060-AJ68) received February 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1288. 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; North Carolina Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [NC-200429; FRL-7868-7] received February 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1289. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, El Dorado County Air Quality Management District (Mountain Counties Portion), Imperial County Air Pollution Control District, and South Coast Air Quality Management District [CA 307-0460a; FRL-7874-6] received February 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1290. 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; Pennsylvania; Revised Format of 40 CFR Part 52 for Materials Being Incorporated by Reference [PA200-4200; FRL-7843-2] received February 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1291. 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; Minnesota; Revised Format of 40 CFR Part 52 for Materials Being Incorporated by Reference [MN-86-1; FRL-7867-5] received February 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1292. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Mississippi: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-7875-7] received February 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1293. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District [CA 207-0435a; FRL-7871-1] received February 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1294. 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; Forsyth County, Mecklenburg County and Buncombe County, North Carolina, and Chattahoochee-Hamilton County, Knox County, and Memphis-Shelby County, Tennessee [R04-OAR-2004-NC-0003-200426; FRL-7877-3] received February 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1295. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [CA 309-0474; FRL-7872-4] received February 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1296. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Connecticut; Plan for Controlling MWC Emissions From Existing Municipal Waste Combustors [R01-OAR-2004-CT-0004; A-1-FRL-7877-6] received February 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1297. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Dyes and/or Pigments Production Wastes; Land Disposal Restrictions for Newly Identified Wastes; CERCLA Hazardous Substance Designation and Reportable Quantities; Designation of Five Chemicals as Appendix VIII Constituents; Addition of Four Chemicals to the Treatment Standards of F039 and the Universal Treatment Standards [RCRA-2003-0001; FRL-7875-8] (RIN:

2050-AD80) received February 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1298. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Rates for Pilotage on the Great Lakes [USCG-2002-11288] (RIN: 1625-AA38) received March 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1299. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; Rowing Regattas, Indian Creek, Miami Beach, Florida [CGD07-05-010] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received March 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1300. 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; Severn River, College Creek, Weems Creek and Carr Creek, Annapolis, MD [CGD05-04-196] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received March 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1301. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Regulated Navigation Area; Humboldt Bay Bar Channel and Humboldt Bay Entrance Channel, Humboldt Bay, California [CGD11-04-010] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received March 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1302. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Fireworks Display for the Columbian Government, Bayside Park, Miami, Florida [COTP Miami 04-105] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1303. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Fireworks for Disney at Bay Front Park, Miami, Florida [COTP Miami 04-140] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1304. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Miami New Year's Fireworks Display at Bay Front Park, Miami, FL [COTP Miami 04-149] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1305. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Dunkin Donuts Fireworks—Boston, Massachusetts. [CGD01-04-119] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1306. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Mononhansett Island, Massachusetts [CGD01-04-131] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1307. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Dunkin Donuts Fireworks Display, Providence, Rhode Island [CGD01-04-134] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1308. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Red Sox Fireworks—Boston, Massachusetts. [CGD01-04-135] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1309. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Metro North Railroad Bridge over the Norwalk River, Norwalk, Connecticut [CGD01-04-136] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1310. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Regulated Navigation Area; East Rockaway Inlet to Atlantic Beach Bridge, Nassau County, Long Island, New York [CGD01-04-150] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); 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. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 53. Resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the issuance of the 500,000th design patent by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (Rept. 109-22). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 683. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 with respect to dilution by blurring or tarnishment; with an amendment (Rept. 109-23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1038. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to allow a judge to whom a case is transferred to retain jurisdiction over certain multidistrict litigation cases for trial, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-24). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOEHNER: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 366. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 to strengthen and improve programs under that Act; with an amendment (Rept. 109-25). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 185. A bill to require the review of Government programs at least once every 5 years for purposes of evaluating their performance (Rept. 109-26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LEACH, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GILCHRIST, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. CARSON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALSH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SABO, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. CASE, Ms. LEE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. CAPPAS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FARR, Mr. KIND, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WU, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Ms. SOLIS):

H.R. 1356. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify the jurisdiction of the United States over waters of the United States; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WELDON of Florida (for himself, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. WOLF, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HOSTETTLE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. AKIN, Ms. FOX, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BERRY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. TERRY, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BAKER, Mr. RENZI, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BURGESS,

Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. NEY, Ms. HART, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MOLLINGAN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. POMBO, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WELLER, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. HALL):

H.R. 1357. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit human cloning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYES:

H.R. 1358. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to payment of mental health counselors under TRICARE; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Florida:

H.R. 1359. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the pilot program for alternative water source projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. BASS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 1360. A bill to create a fair and efficient system to resolve claims of victims for bodily injury caused by asbestos exposure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, and 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. DREIER:

H.R. 1361. A bill to improve the ability of the Federal Government to coordinate and conduct stabilization and reconstruction operations in countries or regions that are in, are in transition from, or are likely to enter into, conflict or civil strife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina):

H.R. 1362. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the public disclosure of prices for hospital and ambulatory surgical center procedures and drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Mr. HYDE):

H.R. 1363. A bill to establish a statute of repose for durable goods used in a trade or business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1364. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to enable the Supreme Court to

review decisions in which the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces denied relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. REYES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. LEE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. WATSON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CASE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FARR, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KIND, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. WEINER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. CARSON, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FALGOUT, Mr. HINCHAY, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WYNN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 1365. A bill to award a congressional gold medal on behalf of Cesar E. Chavez in recognition of his service to the Nation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1366. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to expand eligibility for Combat-Related Special Compensation paid by the uniformed services in order to permit certain additional retired members who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for that disability and Combat-Related Special Compensation by reason of that disability; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 1367. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to protecting the labor rights of current and former employees of coal industry employers that are debtors under such title; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. POE, and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 1368. A bill to provide the Secretary of the Army with additional and enhanced authority with respect to water resources projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CANNON (for himself, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 1369. A bill to prevent certain discriminatory taxation of natural gas pipeline property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE):

H.R. 1370. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to develop a multipurpose cadastre of Federal real property to assist with Federal land management, resource conservation, and development of Federal real property, including identification of any such property that is no longer required to be owned by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 1371. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to ensure equal treatment for members of reserve components who perform inactive-duty training in determining their entitlement for hazardous duty pay, aviation incentive pay, diving duty special pay, and foreign language proficiency pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself and Mr. SIMMONS):

H.R. 1372. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to impose minimum nurse staffing ratios in Medicare participating hospitals, 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. CARDOZA (for himself and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 1373. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide leave for members of the Armed Forces in connection with adoptions of children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. GORDON):

H.R. 1374. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit aliens who are independent living assistants to be accorded status as J nonimmigrants to provide in-home living and home support services to adults with disabilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL, Mr. HOYER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. POE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 1375. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Michael Ellis DeBakey, M.D.; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RUPERSBERGER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LEACH, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HINCHAY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. LEE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WYNN, and Mrs. MALONEY):

H.R. 1376. A bill to protect the public health by providing the Food and Drug Administration with certain authority to regulate tobacco products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BALDWIN,

Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KIND, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 1377. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deter the smuggling of tobacco products into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mrs. EMERSON (for herself and Mr. BERRY):

H.R. 1378. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the regulation of ephedrine alkaloids, including ephedrine and pseudoephedrine, and for other purposes; 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. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 1379. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat electric transmission property as 15-year property for depreciation purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. FORD, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 1380. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand incentives for education; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. TANNER, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico):

H.R. 1381. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide incentives linking quality to payment for skilled nursing facilities and to establish a Long-Term Care Financing Commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. TANGREDO, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 1382. A bill to provide for a one-year delay in the implementation of the voluntary prescription drug benefit program, and to provide for a one-year extension of the Medicare prescription drug discount card and transitional assistance program and of the coverage of prescription drugs under the Medicaid Program; 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. FORD:

H.R. 1383. A bill to direct the President to transmit to the Congress each year a comprehensive report on the national homeland security strategy of the United States; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GINGREY (for himself, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 1384. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to update certain procedures applicable to commerce in firearms and remove certain Federal restrictions on interstate firearms transactions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODE:

H.R. 1385. A bill to include Nelson County, Virginia, in the Appalachian region for purposes of the programs of the Appalachian Regional Commission; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. OSBORNE, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. CASE, Mr. OTTER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. TERRY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mrs. CUBIN):

H.R. 1386. A bill to establish a National Drought Council within the Department of Agriculture, to improve national drought preparedness, mitigation, and response efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Resources, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. HERGER (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BERRY, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 1387. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the excise tax exemptions for aerial applicators of fertilizers or other substances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 1388. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the increase in expensing of certain depreciable business assets enacted by the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act 2003 and extended by the American Jobs Creation Act of 2004; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINCHEY:

H.R. 1389. A bill to prohibit the importation, manufacture, distribution, or storage of ammonium nitrate compound without a license, to prohibit the receipt of ammonium nitrate compound without a license or permit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. LEE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 1390. A bill to provide access and assistance to increase college attendance and completion by part-time students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 1391. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on allyl ureido monomer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 1392. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on methacrylamido etheleneurae monomer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HOOLEY (for herself, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1393. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to make volunteer members of the Civil Air Patrol eligible for Public Safety Officer death benefits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HOOLEY:

H.R. 1394. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to clarify that the Administrator of the Small Business Administration is authorized to make economic injury disaster loans in response to disasters caused by drought; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. HOOLEY:

H.R. 1395. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide a minimum mandatory prison sentence for manufacturing methamphetamine on properties where children reside, and for other purposes; 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. ISRAEL:

H.R. 1396. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish recall authority regarding drugs, to increase criminal penalties for the sale or trade of prescription drugs knowingly caused to be

adulterated or misbranded, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 1397. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for certain energy-efficient property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1398. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require that, after the year 2010, all gasoline sold in the United States for motor vehicles contain not less than 10 percent ethanol and that all diesel fuel sold in the United States for motor vehicles contain not less than 5 percent biodiesel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 1399. A bill to expand the number of individuals and families with health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, and Rules, 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. KELLER:

H.R. 1400. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for aiming laser pointers at airplanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island:

H.R. 1401. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program of grants for the detection and control of colorectal cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (for himself and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 1402. A bill to provide for equal coverage of mental health benefits with respect to health insurance coverage unless comparable limitations are imposed on medical and surgical benefits; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (for herself, Ms. LEE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PALLONE, and Mrs. MALONEY):

H.R. 1403. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish in the Department of Defense an Office of the Victim Advocate, to prescribe the functions of that office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (for herself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. WAMP, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. GORDON):

H.R. 1404. A bill to posthumously award a congressional gold medal to Wilma G. Rudolph; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1405. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from income and employment taxes and wage withholding property tax rebates and other benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 1406. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the authorized weight allowances for the shipment of baggage and household effects of senior non-commissioned officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 1407. A bill to provide that certain wire rods shall not be subject to any antidumping duty or countervailing duty order; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H.R. 1408. A bill to provide assistance to combat HIV/AIDS in India, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEACH, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota):

H.R. 1409. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance for orphans and other vulnerable children in developing countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 1410. A bill to provide for coverage of hormone replacement therapy for treatment of menopausal symptoms, and for coverage of an alternative therapy for hormone replacement therapy for such symptoms, under the Medicare and Medicaid Programs, group health plans and individual health insurance coverage, and other Federal health insurance programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, Government Reform, and Veterans' Affairs, 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. LINDER:

H.R. 1411. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that a convention or association of churches includes individuals (with or without voting rights) as well as churches; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CASTLE, and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1412. A bill to amend the Ports and Waterways Safety Act to require notification of the Coast Guard regarding obstructions to navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H.R. 1413. A bill to make the protection of vulnerable populations, especially women and children, who are affected by a humanitarian emergency a priority of the United States Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. LEE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 1414. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue regulations concerning the shipping of extremely hazardous materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Mrs. MCCARTHY (for herself and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 1415. A bill to improve the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 1416. A bill to repeal the reduction in Medicare payment for therapeutic shoes and inserts for individuals with diabetes effected by section 627 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003; 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. MCCRERY (for himself, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELLER, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. CANTOR, Ms. HART, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 1417. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the subpart F exemption for active financing income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself and Mr. WEINER):

H.R. 1418. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, and chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that any health benefits plan which provides obstetrical benefits shall be required also to provide coverage for the diagnosis and treatment of infertility; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

H.R. 1419. A bill to require that Homeland Security grants related to terrorism preparedness and prevention be awarded based strictly on an assessment of risk, threat, and vulnerabilities; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. ROSS):

H.R. 1420. A bill to prohibit as indecent the broadcasting of any advertisement for a medication for the treatment of erectile dysfunction; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NUSSLE (for himself, Mr. TANNER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. JOHNSON of Con-

necticut, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. WAMP):

H.R. 1421. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for an energy efficient appliance credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSBORNE (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. LEACH):

H.R. 1422. A bill to prohibit high school and college sports gambling in all States including States where such gambling was permitted prior to 1991; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. WEINER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1423. A bill to ban the manufacture, sale, delivery, and transfer of handguns that cannot be personalized, and to provide for a report to the Congress on the commercial feasibility of personalizing firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. LEE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PITTS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 1424. A bill to impose sanctions against perpetrators of crimes against humanity and genocide in Darfur, Sudan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WU, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

H.R. 1425. A bill to ensure that the Federal student loans are delivered as efficiently as possible, so that there is more grant aid for students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PICKERING (for himself, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. TANNER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 1426. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide public access to quality medical imaging procedures and radiation therapy procedures; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 1427. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to eliminate the 10-year limitation on the collection of nontax debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POMBO (for himself, Mr. GILCHRIST, and Mr. DICKS):

H.R. 1428. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. PRYCE of Ohio (for herself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs.

MYRICK, Mrs. BONO, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. DRAKE, Ms. HART, Mr. DENT, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CARSON, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1429. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property by the Administrator of General Services; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RADANOVICH (for himself and Mr. CARDOZA):

H.R. 1430. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to complete a study of the feasibility of establishing the National Parks Institute in Central California; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. FARR, Mr. KIND, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 1431. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to modify requirements for the appointment and training of members of Regional Fishery Management Councils, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1432. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to redesign the \$1 coin to commemorate Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1433. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Associate Justice Thurgood Marshall; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1434. A bill to designate the Federal building to be constructed at 799 First Avenue in New York, New York, as the "Ronald H. Brown United States Mission to the United Nations Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1435. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the foreign tax credit and the benefits of deferral to companies doing business directly or through subsidiaries in Sudan until the Government of Sudan takes demonstrable steps to end genocide in Sudan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RENZI:

H.R. 1436. A bill to remove certain use restrictions on property located in Navajo County, Arizona; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 1437. A bill to eradicate the poppy plant in Afghanistan; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey):

H.R. 1438. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to exclude from creditable wages and self-employment income wages earned for services by aliens illegally performed in the United States and self-employment income derived from a trade or business illegally conducted in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms.

WOOLSEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 1439. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to enter into a partnership with a qualified local educational agency to conduct a model school-to-work program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. WATSON):

H.R. 1440. A bill to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from imposing penalties for indecent broadcasts on providers of video over cable television systems, satellite carriers, the Internet, or non-broadcast providers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CARSON, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 1441. A bill to require all newly constructed, federally assisted, single-family houses and town houses to meet minimum standards of visitability for persons with disabilities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1442. A bill to complete the codification of title 46, United States Code, "Shipping", as positive law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FORD, Mr. KIND, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. LEE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. COOPER, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 1443. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide families of disabled children with the opportunity to purchase coverage under the Medicaid Program for such children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHAYS:

H.R. 1444. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain meatless frozen food products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOUDER (for himself, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 1445. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to establish provisions with respect to religious accommodation in employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SOUDER (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CASE, and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota):

H.R. 1446. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to eliminate the safe-harbor exception for certain packaged pseudoephedrine products used in the manufacture of methamphetamine, and for other purposes; 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. STRICKLAND (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 1447. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services under part B of the Medicare Program, 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. STUPAK:

H.R. 1448. A bill to direct the Commandant of the Coast Guard to convey the Coast Guard Cutter MACKINAW, upon its scheduled decommissioning, to the City and County of Cheboygan, Michigan, to use for purposes of a museum; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. KING of Iowa):

H.R. 1449. A bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TANCREDO:

H.R. 1450. A bill to require additional tariffs be imposed on products of any non-market economy country until the President certifies to the Congress that that country is a market economy country, and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to deposit the amounts generated from those tariffs into the Social Security trust funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr.

BOEHLERT, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 1451. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to reduce emissions from electric powerplants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. BISHOP of New York):

H.J. Res. 38. A joint resolution recognizing Commodore John Barry as the first flag officer of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.J. Res. 39. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELAY:

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the two Houses; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BASS:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution congratulating Bode Miller for winning the 2004-2005 World Cup overall title in Alpine skiing; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. BERKLEY (for herself, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. PORTER):

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the founding of Las Vegas, Nevada; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a site in Arlington National Cemetery should be provided for a memorial marker to honor the memory of the 40 members of the Armed Forces who lost their lives in the air crash at Bakers Creek, Australia, on June 14, 1943; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution supporting the goal of increased homeownership in the United States and recognizing the importance of homeownership programs, fair lending laws, and fair housing laws in achieving that goal; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the community development block grant program should remain under the administration of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution honoring Army Specialist Shoshana Nyree Johnson, former prisoner of war in Iraq; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Katherine Dunham should be recognized for her groundbreaking achievements in dance, theater, music, and education, as well as for her work as an activist striving for racial equality throughout the world; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Lionel Hampton should be honored for his contributions to American music; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Lena Horne should be recognized as one of the most popular performers of the 1940s and 1950s and for her outspoken opposition to racial and social injustice; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a postage stamp commemorating Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, Jr; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued by the United States Postal Service honoring Roy Campanella, and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Romare

Howard Bearden should be recognized as one of the preeminent artists of the 20th century for his artistic genius and visual creativity in the depiction of the complexity and richness of African American life in the United States; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued by the United States Postal Service honoring Arthur Ashe, and that the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Zora Neale Hurston should be recognized for her achievements as a novelist and anthropologist, and for her contributions to the Harlem Renaissance movement; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Madame C. J. Walker should be recognized for her achievements in business, her inventions, and her commitment to the African-American community; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Arthur Schomburg should be recognized for his leadership and contributions in documenting, recording, and researching the historical contributions to society of peoples of African descent and for his efforts to combat racial and ethnic discrimination in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. CARSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with regard to the world's freshwater resources; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and 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. JONES of North Carolina:

H. Res. 167. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to Second Lieutenant Ilario Pantano, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PITTS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Ms. HART):

H. Res. 168. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Social Security is a vital program facing bankruptcy, which must be reformed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Ms. ESHOO):

H. Res. 169. A resolution recognizing the importance of sun safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. WATSON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. STARK, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. LEE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. FARR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. FILNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H. Res. 170. A resolution of inquiry requesting the President to transmit certain information to the House of Representatives respecting a claim made by the President on February 16, 2005, at a meeting Portsmouth, New Hampshire, that there is not a Social Security trust; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DREIER:

H. Res. 171. A resolution supporting the creation of the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization at the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CHABOT, and Ms. WATSON):

H. Res. 172. A resolution expressing the condemnation of the House of Representatives on the one year anniversary of ethnic violence in Kosovo that occurred on March 17 and 18, 2004, and expressing condolences to the families of individuals who were killed or injured; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. HARMAN (for herself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. REYES, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. TIERNEY):

H. Res. 173. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Director of National Intelligence should establish and oversee the implementation of a uniform, multi-level security clearance system across the intelligence community to fully leverage the cultural and linguistic skills of subject matter experts and others proficient in foreign languages critical to national security; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. MEEKS of New York (for himself, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. SOLIS):

H. Res. 174. A resolution congratulating the people of Malaysia and honoring Datuk Siti Norma Binti Yaacob regarding her recent appointment as the first female Chief Judge of Malaya, Malaysia; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr.

MCHUGH, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. KELLY, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H. Res. 175. A resolution recognizing the importance of establishing a national memorial at the World Trade Center site to commemorate and mourn the events of February 26, 1993, and September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 176. A resolution honoring Dick Brown: New York's greatest ambassador to Washington; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 177. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Sugar Ray Robinson should be recognized for his athletic achievements and commitment to young people; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 178. A resolution honoring the life of Betty Shabazz; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 179. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that A. Philip Randolph should be recognized for his lifelong leadership and work to end discrimination and secure equal employment and labor opportunities for all Americans; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Mr. WYNN (for himself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H. Res. 180. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a United Nations Emergency Peace Service capable of intervening in the early stages of a humanitarian crisis could save millions of lives, billions of dollars, and is in the interests of the United States; 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. GORDON.
 H.R. 20: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 H.R. 21: Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. WATERS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 H.R. 22: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 23: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WEINER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
 H.R. 29: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 34: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Ms. FOXX, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 47: Mr. BOREN.
 H.R. 63: Mr. RUSH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. CROWLEY.
 H.R. 68: Mr. CARDOZA.

H.R. 98: Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 131: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 151: Mr. WEINER and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 197: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 198: Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 215: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 216: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 225: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 239: Mrs. DRAKE and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
 H.R. 282: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 297: Mr. WU, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. BERKLEY, and Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 302: Mrs. DRAKE.
 H.R. 303: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 305: Mrs. MUSGRAVE and Mr. HOBSON.
 H.R. 311: Mr. BOREN.
 H.R. 312: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 341: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
 H.R. 356: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.
 H.R. 359: Mr. OTTER.
 H.R. 366: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. WELLER.
 H.R. 373: Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. CASE, and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 376: Mr. RAHALL and Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 400: Mr. KOLBE and Mr. FLAKE.
 H.R. 407: Mrs. DRAKE.
 H.R. 457: Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 458: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky and Mr. POMEROY.
 H.R. 475: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 489: Mr. MATHESON and Mr. SALAZAR.
 H.R. 500: Ms. HARRIS.
 H.R. 513: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 517: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 525: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. BEAUPREZ.
 H.R. 537: Mr. BASS.
 H.R. 550: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. BERRY.
 H.R. 583: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 595: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 596: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 606: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 627: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. SIMMONS.
 H.R. 653: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
 H.R. 658: Mr. KUHL of New York.
 H.R. 669: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 670: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. HYDE.
 H.R. 682: Mr. SODRELL.
 H.R. 685: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. SHAW, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. ISTOOK, and Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 691: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 697: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MEEHAN, and Ms. HERSETH.
 H.R. 698: Mr. SHADEGG and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 699: Mr. GOODE and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
 H.R. 710: Mr. KIND and Mrs. MALONEY.
 H.R. 712: Mr. FEENEY and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 713: Mr. WICKER.
 H.R. 719: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. PICKERING.
 H.R. 721: Mr. CONAWAY.
 H.R. 747: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 752: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 765: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 771: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 791: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 793: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. LOBONDO.
 H.R. 798: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. BERRY.
 H.R. 799: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 800: Mr. COX, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. LINDER.
 H.R. 809: Mr. OTTER.
 H.R. 817: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
 H.R. 827: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 838: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 845: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
 H.R. 867: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
 H.R. 869: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 871: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 881: Mr. OWENS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Mr. WAMP.
 H.R. 884: Mr. WALSH, Mr. FARR, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 896: Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 914: Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 916: Mr. HINCKEY, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 923: Mr. MEEHAN and Mrs. DRAKE.
 H.R. 927: Mr. REGULA.
 H.R. 928: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. WATSON.
 H.R. 934: Mrs. MCCARTHY and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 935: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 969: Mr. BECERRA and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 972: Mr. SANDERS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 973: Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 974: Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 985: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. BARROW.
 H.R. 997: Mr. RADANOVICH and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 998: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 1001: Mr. REYES and Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H.R. 1049: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 1106: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 1107: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 1120: Mr. SABO.
 H.R. 1124: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 1125: Mrs. MCCARTHY.
 H.R. 1130: Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 1131: Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 1145: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1147: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. LANTOS.
 H.R. 1158: Mr. EHLERS.
 H.R. 1183: Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 1185: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 1186: Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 1194: Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 1202: Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 1214: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 1216: Mr. MURPHY.
 H.R. 1217: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 1219: Mr. FORBES, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1237: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 1245: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1246: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. CASE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 1247: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
 H.R. 1248: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
 H.R. 1249: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GORDON, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 1259: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 1286: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. MCHUGH.
 H.R. 1290: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 1293: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1295: Mr. FORD and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 1299: Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. BEAUPREZ.
 H.R. 1300: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 1306: Mr. SHAW, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 1309: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 1313: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1322: Mr. OLVER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 1335: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 1345: Mr. CHOCOLA.
 H.J. Res. 10: Mr. CARDOZA.
 H.J. Res. 23: Mr. REHBERG.
 H.J. Res. 27: Mr. DeFAZIO.
 H.J. Res. 37: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.
 H. Con. Res. 43: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H. Con. Res. 47: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. McCAUL of Texas.
 H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
 H. Con. Res. 69: Ms. MUSGRAVE.
 H. Con. Res. 74: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD.
 H. Con. Res. 76: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
 H. Con. Res. 83: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. HOSTETTLER.
 H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. WEXLER.
 H. Con. Res. 91: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BOREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. Crowley, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OTTER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H. Con Res. 96: Mr. EHLERS.
 H. Con Res. 97: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H. Res. 27: Ms. LEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SHAW, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. OWENS, Ms. CARSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr.

McNULTY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. ENGEL.
 H. Res. 30: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Mr. McDERMOTT.
 H. Res. 67: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. HERSETH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mrs. MCCARTHY.
 H. Res. 84: Mr. HOBSON.
 H. Res. 85: Mr. GILCHREST.
 H. Res. 127: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H. Res. 131: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Ms. MATSUI.
 H. Res. 137: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H. Res. 146: Mr. SOUDER.
 H. Res. 148: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 158: Mr. KIND, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. BOSWELL.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were detailed from public bills and resolutions as follows:
 H.R. 65: Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 415: Mr. FOLEY.
 H.J. Res. 23: Mr. CLEAVER.