



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2005

No. 33—Book II

## Senate

### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2006—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. GREGG. There is 7½ minutes remaining in opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. GREGG. There is story after story for everything in this country. The problem is, if we start funding all the stories, we will run out of money and tax our kids so they cannot afford it and tax ourselves so we cannot afford it.

The issue is setting priorities. The President has suggested a priority in the area of CDBGs. I suspect this Congress is not going to accept that priority, but it should function within the caps that have been set in order to decide whether it chooses that priority.

This is a reasonable approach, to set a cap and then say to the Appropriations Committee, you decide whether CDBGs make more sense than some other program that would compete for the same amount of money.

I will not vote for either of these amendments, but if I had to vote for one or the other, I would be more inclined to vote for the one from the Senator from Minnesota because he does not impact caps and takes it out of something called 800 which is the general operation of the Government which means basically a cut to IRS and other operating accounts within the Government.

I don't think that should be the way we should approach this. We should, rather, allow the Appropriations Committee to make decisions on this and we should not be arbitrarily in the Senate reallocating money from IRS over to the CDBG Program on the basis of anything, including stories.

I understood the Senator from Maryland wanted a couple of minutes.

I yield the Senator 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I commend the Senator from Minnesota for a very eloquent statement about the effectiveness of the CDBG program. Of course, he has absolutely firsthand experience with it having been a mayor of one of our great cities. I appreciate his analysis of the worth of the CDBG program.

I simply make this point, and this is a broader priorities question: The amendment I have offered derives the funding, in order to restore the money, by closing tax loopholes—the very provisions that passed the Senate overwhelmingly last year 92 to 4 on the FSC/ETI bill. A lot of these provisions were dropped in conference. The ones dropped would produce \$27 billion over a 5-year period. So there is not much argument about the necessity of closing these loopholes. The overwhelming judgment here was that ought to be done. That would then avoid cutting other programs.

There is a dilemma here. I understand that. If we are trying to keep things neutral as far as contributing to the deficit is concerned, then the question becomes, do you cut other programs in what is, I think, an already extremely tight budget. So you fund CDBG, but you would diminish the funding for housing, education, and other programs—across the board. The alternative is to find a revenue source in which there is general agreement in terms of an abuse of the Tax Code.

Now, the chairman refers to that as taxing and spending. I do not know how you spend if you do not tax unless you are going to run up a deficit. I regard that as responsible budget making.

You always have to use reasoned judgement and analysis in terms of what is fair and right. The proposal here is to close some of those tax loopholes. There has been an overwhelming judgment that those loopholes should be closed. The amount of revenue pro-

duced by closing the loopholes dropped in conference is three times what it would cost to restore the CDBG Program. Thus closing only some of them would produce sufficient revenue to restore these programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 2 minutes

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Maryland.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The Senator from Mississippi.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 208

(Purpose: to modify the designation authority for an emergency requirement)

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 208, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] proposes an amendment numbered 208.

On page 42, line 14, strike "that" and all that follows through "designates" on line 15 and insert: "that the Congress designates as an emergency requirement".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 10 minutes evenly divided on this amendment.

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, section 402 of the pending budget resolution establishes a procedure for designating emergency appropriations that I believe creates a new and unnecessary hurdle for Congress in responding to emergency situations. It distorts the balance of power between Congress and the President.

Section 402 permits an emergency designation of an appropriation to be challenged on a point of order and provides that the point of order can be waived only by a vote of three-fifths of

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S2899