

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER
AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT
ON H. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT
RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. PUTNAM, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-63) on the resolution (H. Res. 248) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany 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, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 248 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 248

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany 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. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The conference report shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

Sec. 2. (a) During the One Hundred Ninth Congress, except as provided in subsection (c), a motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report a bill to the House shall not be in order if the bill, as amended, exceeds an applicable allocation of new budget authority under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as estimated by the Committee on the Budget.

(b) If a point of order under subsection (a) is sustained, the Chair shall put the question: "Shall the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted notwithstanding that the bill exceeds its allocation of new budget authority under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974?" Such question shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by a proponent of the question and an opponent but shall be divided without intervening motion.

(c) Subsection (a) shall not apply—

(1) to a motion offered under clause 2(d) of rule XXI; or

(2) after disposition of a question under subsection (b) on a given bill.

(d) If a question under subsection (b) is decided in the negative, no further amendment shall be in order except—

(1) one proper amendment, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole; and

(2) pro forma amendments, if offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of

the Committee on Appropriations or their designees, for the purpose of debate.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a great day in this House and a great day for our Nation and an honor to kick off the debate about the fiscal blueprint, that our conference of the House and the Senate has come together to set forth the priorities for our Nation.

House Resolution 248 is a closed rule that provides for consideration of the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 95, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010.

As a member of both the Committee on Rules and the Committee on the Budget, I am pleased to bring this resolution to the floor for its consideration. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. It provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Importantly, section 2 of the resolution is a valuable addition to the rules and process of the House. I appreciate the work that a number of Members in the House have put into this effort. Specifically, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) particularly have fought for budget process reform and, with the leadership of the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) and the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE), have included it. Congress in this resolution makes a strong commitment to enforcing fiscal responsibility with the addition of a separate order for the 109th Congress. The resolution creates a point of order in the Committee of the Whole against a motion to rise and report a general appropriations bill if that legislation, as amended, is in breach of its 302(b) budget allocation. Any Member of either side of the aisle, on the Committee on the Budget or not, on the Committee on Rules or not, may raise this point of order.

A breach in allocation will be determined by the Chair, based on estimates provided by the Committee on the Budget as is currently prescribed in the Budget Act.

If the Chair sustains the point of order, the Chair would put the question

to the Committee, and there would then follow 10 minutes of debate on the question, equally divided.

At the conclusion of the debate, the Chair would put the question to the whole Committee. If the motion to rise and report were defeated, then no further amendment shall be in order except one proper amendment equally divided and debated and multiple pro forma amendments, if offered by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, for the purpose of debate.

This point of order is only applicable once for a given bill and does not apply to a motion offered under clause 2(d) of rule XXI.

The congressional budget is the ultimate enforcement tool, allowing Congress to clearly identify its priorities, to lay out that fiscal blueprint and vision for the coming fiscal year. It lays out the plan for how America's tax dollars will be spent. It allows us at a time of war to ensure that our Nation's soldiers, Guardsmen, Reservists, sailors, Marines, Coast Guardsmen are equipped and trained and supported, prioritizing guarantees that our economy continues to expand, providing jobs and opportunities for more Americans to achieve their piece of the American Dream each and every day. It is a tool that allows us to make certain that our government acts in a fiscally responsible manner to ensure opportunities and safety for future generations of Americans.

This added point of order gives one more enforcement mechanism to ensure that Congress spends responsibly and follows the priorities set forth in the congressional budget. Just as small businesses and large businesses, families and individuals sit down on a regular basis and review their budget and, despite the pressure, have to stick to it, so should Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a member of the Committee on the Budget that this year reported out a historic blueprint that sets in motion a path to cutting the deficit both in dollars and as a percentage of our gross domestic product, a percentage of our economy. This budget wisely targets both discretionary and mandatory spending in an effort to do that and in establishing priorities.

□ 1700

The Committee on the Budget calls for a reduction in total nondefense, non-homeland security discretionary spending. That has not been done since President Reagan was in the White House. And for the first time since 1997, the budget includes reconciliation instructions to authorizing committees calling for a reduction in the rate of growth in mandatory programs.

Mandatory spending is the guaranteed spending, the entitlement spending, if you will, that grows each and every year, largely without congressional reform or review. Today it consumes 55 percent of the budget, and if

it continues unchecked, it will reach nearly two-thirds of the entire Federal budget by 2015.

It is unacceptable that more than half of the government's spending today is largely on automatic pilot. This is neither sound policy nor sustainable fiscal policy, and Congress is on its way to losing control over spending priorities as entitlements squeeze the budget more and more.

These reconciliation instructions embodied in this conference report are the vital step to begin the process of getting mandatory spending back to growth at a sustainable rate and continuing to lead us on that path toward cutting the deficit in half in 5 years.

I am hopeful that while the authorizing committees are reviewing their programs, they would also conclude that a number of these mandatory programs would be better suited as discretionary, and therefore subject to continued oversight by the Congress.

I am proud of the work the Committee on the Budget has done this year. I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for his tremendous, steadfast, fair, balanced and honorable leadership of that committee and for driving us forward with a fiscal discipline that brings us to this point of consideration of the conference report on the budget.

I urge Members to support the rule and the underlying conference report.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, every Republican Congress has its winners and its losers, and no where is that more apparent than in the budget. Looking at this budget, we could clearly see that those losing far outnumber those winning. The winners are millionaires and billionaires who will benefit from repeal of the estate tax, the credit card companies who make billions off of bankruptcy legislation, and oil and gas companies given subsidies by the energy bill while oil is at \$55 a barrel.

The losers in the budget are anyone who relies on Medicare, Medicaid or Social Security, and our Nation's veterans desperately needing health care funding, families with seniors who depend on Social Security, and any family that might have a child in need of a student loan.

Those are the winners and losers chosen by this budget, and each and every one of America's hardworking men and women are in one of these two categories.

I would ask my fellow Americans, which category do you fall into? If you are a millionaire, a billionaire or a senior executive at a major credit card company, insurance company or pharmaceutical company, chances are very

high you are a winner. Likewise, if you are a foreign financial institution, you are likely a winner, because you will be granted even more opportunities to buy your own piece of America's skyrocketing debt.

On the other hand, if you are part of the hardworking American middle-class, you are likely one of the many who will lose out. The debt your children will have to pay likely exceeds the amount of money you have saved for their college education. Gas prices will continue to rise as your tax dollars go to fund incentives for oil companies. And the benefits and programs that your parents and relatives depend on to make ends meet, as well as the resources that your children will depend on to get funding for a college education, are being slashed in order to give more of your money to the winners, a group which should be easy to recognize at this point.

Now, if you are a member of the working class or the working poor, or if you are a single mother, there should be no doubt in your mind; of course, you are a loser in this budget. And, likewise, if you are a senior citizen, you depend on Social Security, middle aged, a young person counting on Social Security to be there when you retire, you lose out more than anyone in this budget.

In fact, just as Republicans scheme to privatize Social Security and decry that financial crisis with the right hand, they have been raiding the Social Security surplus since Bush took office with the left. I believe that as of this budget, all of the Social Security surplus will be gone.

Remember all that talk about the lockbox? Well, I guess the lock has been broken. We do not need a security camera to see who has been getting away with all the loot. On this President's watch, fiscal year 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, every penny of the Social Security trust fund has been spent to finance deficits for a 4-year total of \$635 billion. That is billion with a B. That is a staggering betrayal of the trust given by the American people.

And what about the new budget resolution that we consider today? It spends 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. This budget, when projected over the next 10 years, spends a total of \$2.6 trillion from the Social Security surplus. That is the retirement security of America's middle class. And they have the gall to wonder why so many fiscally responsible Democrats have objected to these irresponsible tax cuts that benefit the rich.

I think it is time that we slowed things down and explain to our friends across the aisle what fiscal responsibility is and what it is not. Fiscal responsibility does not include giving away the store, regardless of whether the consequences will be in 5 years or 10 years or 20 years. It means to look and plan for the future so there is an opportunity available for generations yet to come.

Being fiscally responsible does not mean mortgaging the future of this country on the backs of our children and grandchildren. It means providing adequate funding for schools and health care and retirement security.

It does not include asking the American people to pay for the tax cuts given to the millionaires and billionaires. It means giving a break to folks who work hard day in and day out to put food on the table for themselves and their children.

And, most of all, being fiscally responsible does not include robbing the Social Security trust fund blind.

So, as I am sure everyone can see with this budget, the people who need our help the most lose out.

It does not have to be this way. There was a choice. The Democratic alternative offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) would have made us proud and protected the core principles that we say we fight for in this institution, such as great schools, good jobs, secure retirements and quality health care.

It would have brought the budget back into balance by 2012 and reinstated the budget enforcement rules to protect Social Security and increased our commitment to education, protected our Nation's veterans and eliminated the cuts to Medicare and Medicaid. That is the kind of budget I wish we were considering. That is the kind of budget that the hardworking men and women of America want from their Congress. They want a fair approach that gets us back to fiscal sanity.

Much like the President's Social Security proposal, this budget is the wrong bill at the wrong time and will hurt a vast majority of our Americans, and I urge all my colleagues to defeat this conference report.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to a distinguished physician, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the fiscal 2006 budget conference report. I would also like to take this opportunity to express my support for permanent budget reform that will enable us to further restrain the growth of the Federal Government and Federal spending.

Like many of my colleagues, I believe that streamlining the budget and eliminating the deficit are absolutely necessary and essential to the continued growth of our economy. While I might not agree with every detail of this conference report, and I even believe that a few more dollars could be saved, we must accept this compromise between the House and the Senate as a solid step in the right direction.

Failure to pass a budget should not and cannot be an option. Only with the passage of this budget can we move forward with a blueprint to advance further fundamental reforms and save

more of the people's money. Therefore, this budgetary blueprint will enable us to strengthen fiscal discipline, without endangering the current opportunity for budget reconciliation.

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed by some of my colleagues who continue their steady drumbeat of support for increased taxes and increased spending. This is a dangerous philosophy, and will only destroy jobs and opportunities for working Americans. We cannot tax and spend the deficit away, Mr. Speaker. We cannot strengthen the economy with a tax-and-spend mentality.

Mr. Speaker, we in the majority will never, let me repeat, never accept tax-and-spend policies as fiscally sound and fundamentally fair for the American taxpayer.

The other side tries to hide their intentions for increased taxes by using phrases like "rolling back the tax cuts." But, Mr. Speaker, they cannot fool the American people, because when they say "rolling back," they mean increasing taxes for working Americans and small businesses.

"Rolling back" means killing the almost 2.5 million jobs created over the past year. "Rolling back" means reversing the economic growth that has helped improve the lives of all Americans. "Rolling back" the tax cuts means rolling over the American taxpayer, and, Mr. Speaker, that would be simply unacceptable.

Like the President, I reject any attempt to raise taxes. This budget does not raise taxes. It does, however, provide for continued tax relief. From tax cuts on capital gains and dividends, to relief to the alternative minimum tax, this budget puts money back into the pockets of American workers while funding our Nation's priorities and cutting the budget deficit.

This budget also ensures the continued strength of our Armed Forces and homeland security through providing an increase in defense and homeland spending.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time since 1997, this budget will include instructions for the Congress to find savings and mandatory spending this year, and additional savings over the next 5 years.

This budget makes dramatic strides to reduce spending, and it forces Congress to tighten its belt and to eliminate waste, fraud and abuse.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support and encourage my colleagues to support this budget conference report.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee, or should I say the Break-the-Rules Committee, is at it again. Here we are taking up a bill that adds to the deficit and cuts billions of dollars from the safety net that protects the most vulnerable people in our country. We are considering this bill

under a martial-law rule and without the 3 days required by the House rules so that Members can actually read and analyze this bill for themselves.

What is the big hurry, Mr. Speaker? The House is in session all next week. We do not need to ram this important bill through like this.

I have an idea. Let us take the weekend and actually read the budget. Let us figure out what it really means. Let us listen to our constituents before we vote on this conference report.

Perhaps the Republican leadership is concerned that the more the American people learn about what is in this budget, the less they will like it. We know that this budget resolution includes upwards of \$40 billion, maybe more, worth of budget cuts, and we know that the people affected by these cuts are those who can least afford it.

With passage of this budget, the Republican leadership will deny school breakfasts and school lunches to hungry children. They will deny health care to people who cannot afford health insurance. They will deny poor, pregnant women and infant children food and nutrition advice through the WIC program. Of course, they will deny the wealthiest few in this country their huge tax cuts.

To make matters worse, this is not a balanced budget. It is not even close. It continues to burden our children and grandchildren with record debt.

Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Jim Wallis recently issued a statement in reaction to this budget entitled "Budgets Are Moral Documents . . . and There is Still Time to Speak."

He writes, "Poverty reduction should be a moral imperative in politics. A budget that scapegoats the poor, fattens the rich and asks for sacrifice mostly from those who can least afford it, is a moral outrage. These budget priorities would cause the prophets to rise up in righteous indignation, as should we. Our Nation deserves better vision."

Mr. Speaker, this budget creates a government without a conscience, and we must do better. I urge my colleagues to reject the rule and reject this budget conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I include Reverend Wallis' article for the RECORD.

[From Convener of Call to Renewal, Apr. 27, 2005]

BUDGETS ARE MORAL DOCUMENTS . . . AND
THERE IS STILL TIME TO SPEAK
(By Jim Wallis)

The biblical prophets frequently spoke to rulers and kings, and usually spoke for the dispossessed, widows and orphans, the hungry, the homeless, the helpless, the least, last, and lost. People of faith are called to speak in the same ways.

Budgets are moral documents that reflect the values and priorities of a family, church, organization, city, state, or nation. Examining budget priorities is a moral and religious concern. According to press accounts, the final budget resolution could include cuts to Medicaid of \$10 billion; cuts of \$6 billion to programs that empower the poor, disabled, abused and neglected—the least, last

and lost; and billions in cuts to food stamps. These are misguided priorities. Cutting pro-work and pro-family supports for the less fortunate jeopardizes the common good. This approach is not value-based and does not square with our moral and religious convictions.

To add what some reports say could be \$70 billion more in tax cuts for the wealthy at the same time shows that this budget has not received enough moral scrutiny. Our political leadership's tax cut mentality ignores "the least of these"—leaving them with crumbs from the feast of the comfortable. And it does nothing to help our deficit problems. Religious communities spoke clearly in the past years about the perils of a domestic policy based primarily on tax cuts for the rich, program cuts for low-income people, and an expectation of faith-based charity. We speak clearly now against budget proposals asking that the cost of the deficit be borne by the poor, who are not to blame and can least afford it.

Poverty reduction should be a moral imperative in politics. A budget that scapegoats the poor, fattens the rich, and asks for sacrifice mostly from those who can least afford it is a moral outrage. These budget priorities would cause the prophets to rise up in righteous indignation, as should we. Our nation deserves better vision.

People of faith will continue to speak for the least, the last and the lost. We urge congressional leaders to join us by opposing budget resolutions that place basic human needs at risk. Will leaders who can positively impact the budget debate do so? It's not too late to "Speak out for those who cannot speak, for the rights of all the destitute. Speak out, judge righteously, defend the rights of the poor and needy." (Proverbs 31:8-9).

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for the budget for fiscal year 2006 and stand firmly behind our effort to exercise fiscal responsibility when it comes to spending taxpayers' hard-earned dollars.

I came to Congress in part because I believed Federal spending had gotten out of hand. The Federal Government was growing by leaps and bounds, and as government grew larger, it was crowding out the private sector, the engine that drives our Nation's growth and prosperity. I was concerned about that, and I still am.

We have done a lot of good things since the American people put a new majority in charge in 1994. We have repeatedly reduced the tax burden on families and entrepreneurs, we have reformed the welfare system, we have reformed elementary and secondary education. The government has continued to grow, and this budget is a chance for us to renew America's confidence and prove that we still have the courage to lead.

□ 1715

I want to recognize my colleague, the chairman of the House Committee on

the Budget, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), for taking a firm stand against out-of-control Federal spending by crafting the resolution we have before us. He and the leadership on both sides have worked hard to bring us to this point.

There is no question that this budget is going to require us to make some difficult choices. We are going to look closely at how we are spending taxpayers' money and how we can do better. I applaud the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for putting us on this path. It is time for us to get serious about fiscal discipline.

Under this budget resolution, my committee is being asked to play a large role in reining in spending; and my response is that we want to be a part of the solution, and we will be part of the solution. The time has come to make the tough choices, because there is a bigger picture that we cannot afford to ignore. We are going to look at each program in our jurisdiction with a skeptical eye. Instead of asking why should we not spend more on this program, I think we are going to ask, why should we not spend less.

Our committee has undertaken a bold agenda for reform in the last 4 years, and we will continue down that path into the future. We will be working to improve education from early childhood programs under Head Start, to helping students pursue a college education under the Higher Education Act, and we will continue to fight for secure access to health care and retirement security in a changing economy.

However, we cannot allow ourselves to believe that our commitment to reform is measured by how much money we throw at the problems facing our Nation. Instead, we will judge our success by what we demand in return for our investment, which has always been about achieving results for American taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support a responsible budget that shows our resolve to rein in Federal spending. The budget is about setting priorities, and it is about showing leadership. I support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), for yielding me this time; and before the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce leaves, when he says that his committee is being asked to play a large role, the amount of that large role over the next 6 years is \$12.7 billion. Now, that has to come out of the education budget somewhere. I cannot identify where it may come from, but the fact of the matter is it is going to be a cut.

Expressing their concern that the other body is not in session next week, our colleagues on the other side are forcing Members to consider a budget

that was just filed at 2:45 this afternoon. I am curious how my colleagues expect the Members to educate themselves on this budget, and do not tell me, well, it has been in conference, because all of us know the mishmash that takes place there. Are they supposed to educate themselves by reading the titles and the tables of contents? If that is how I lived my life, then I would still think that J.D. Salinger's "Catcher in the Rye" is about a baseball player who loves to eat deli.

The truth of the matter is, our colleagues may not want us to know all that is in this particular budget.

Typically, the Committee on Rules reports a closed rule for conference reports, but the House and Senate Republicans have settled on a \$2.6 trillion budget that increases the deficit, includes spending cuts that fall the hardest on those with the least in our society, and provides for more tax cuts that this country cannot afford. I do not know what part of not having guns and butter all of us do not understand in this body.

Regarding the deficit, the fiscal year 2006 Republican budget makes no attempt to rein in the nearly \$400 billion projected deficit for this year. I maintain that the deficit is exactly the largest problem that this Nation has and is the most difficult for Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, to explain to the American people. But without PAYGO in this budget, without some consideration being given in a serious way to the deficit, we can all expect that there are going to be real problems.

I believe this budget neglects America's children, neglects our seniors and veterans. I believe it underfunds our domestic priorities by billions, including veterans benefits; our education system; and perhaps most importantly during this dangerous time in history, homeland security.

Finally, the process by which we are bringing this to the floor is skewed in favor of Members not having sufficient time. America's budget problems are not going to go away, no matter how quickly we ram budgets through here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my colleague on the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY).

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to support the budget because it is good for our country. I also rise to commend the hard work, the determination, the integrity of our chairman, the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE); and I also want to salute the fine work and the honesty and the integrity of the Senate budget Chair, the Senator from my State, Senator GREGG.

Why is this budget so important to our Nation? We need to reduce our budget deficit; and our budget, this

budget, puts us on a path to do that. We need to establish fiscal restraint, and this budget actually cuts non-defense discretionary spending for the first time in years. It also slows the rate of growth of entitlement spending. Let me repeat this, because it is being portrayed as a cut. It is not a cut. It is slowing the rate of growth of entitlement spending, and allowing us, through the Commission on Medicaid, to do a better job of delivering services, better health care to those people who need it the most.

Very importantly, this budget allows our economy to grow. Since we instituted the tax cuts in this very Chamber, 3 million new jobs have been created in our country. We need to continue down this path of growing jobs.

Perhaps most importantly, this budget provides for our national security. It increases defense spending; it honors our troops and the commitments of our Nation's veterans by spending nearly \$1 billion more on veterans benefits, without a copayment and without an enrollment fee.

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent job. I commend it to my colleagues, and I urge their support for this budget.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and the underlying budget conference agreement.

More than a month ago, the House passed a concurrent budget resolution that left average Americans out in the cold. The budget slashed domestic programs for education, health care, and veterans health benefits in order to make room for more tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. I voted against it because I thought it left out the needs of the middle class and working families and would hurt my constituents in my hometown of Sacramento.

Today we are considering the conference agreement to that budget which has been negotiated in secret over the past several weeks and rushed to the floor without time for Members to even read through it. But it appears that these several weeks have not yielded many improvements. The cuts to the most vulnerable are still there. The cuts to education are still there. And it still favors big oil companies at the expense of our natural treasures by allowing drilling in ANWR.

More fundamentally, Mr. Speaker, this is a budget agreement without courage. During President Clinton's administration, Congress took up the hard work involved in weighing our Nation's competing priorities, and it meant that we were able to create a Social Security surplus for future generations in a very responsible manner. But it has been just the opposite under this Republican majority. They are spending every dollar of the Social Security surplus in order to finance their

deficits and their tax breaks for the wealthiest of Americans.

Just as irresponsibly, this budget is trying to hide the President's plan to privatize Social Security. The President wants to divert Social Security payroll taxes out of the Social Security system and into private accounts. Replacing a guaranteed benefit with the risks of Wall Street is bad public policy. It would mean an average benefit reduction of \$152,000. It is not surprising that the American people have rejected it. We should be strengthening Social Security's fundamental commitment made from one generation to another instead of weakening it.

Conveniently, the budget agreement before us ducks responsibility for this reckless plan. We know that privatizing Social Security would require borrowing \$2 trillion over the next 10 years, debt borrowed against our children and our grandchildren. Not surprisingly, this inconvenient reality is left out of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the budget is our Federal Government's statement of priorities. Crafting it involves tough choices among many competing and worthwhile programs. Nonetheless, Democratic priorities are clear: making health care more affordable, strengthening Social Security, investing in our local communities. I do not believe this budget has these priorities in mind, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this misguided agreement.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to another aged and crusty Member of the House, a leader on fiscal policy, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the elderly gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak in favor of this rule and in favor of this budget. It all comes down to priorities, Mr. Speaker: how are we going to balance the budget. There are different ways of doing it. We believe the way to balance the budget is grow the economy and create more jobs and control spending. What the other side has said they want to do is raise taxes. You can raise taxes, but you will hurt jobs.

What we have done in the last year is remarkable, Mr. Speaker. The budget deficit has gone down from a projected \$521 billion, down by 20 percent over the last year, to \$412 billion, largely because of increased jobs and economic activity.

Now, what we want to do to ensure that we cut the deficit in half over 5 years and, hopefully, exceed that goal is control spending. For the first time since the Reagan administration, we are actually going to reduce nonsecurity discretionary spending, an actual reduction in expenditures on nonsecurity discretionary spending. That is a great step in the right direction.

For the first time since 1997, we are actually going to address entitlement reform. Fifty-four percent of the Fed-

eral budget, Mr. Speaker, is on auto pilot, our entitlements. We are finally going to be trying to control the growth of entitlements. Is it Draconian? Hardly. We are growing entitlements at 5.6 percent instead of 5.7 percent over the next 10 years. In fact, those who say that this bill cuts Medicaid are simply missing the mark. Medicaid is going to grow at 7.3 percent instead of 7.6 percent. So for the next 5 years, Medicaid will spend \$1,112,808,000,000. That is \$1,112,800,000. Instead, Medicaid will now spend \$1,102,800,000,000. We are talking about growing Medicaid at 7.3 percent instead of 7.6 percent. We are talking about getting a handle on out-of-control spending so we can control spending to reduce the deficit.

It is all about priorities, Mr. Speaker. We believe that the money that is made in America, the money that comes to the Federal Government through revenues is not our money, it is our constituents' money, it is the taxpayers' money. We believe we have an obligation to be good stewards of taxpayers' dollars. We believe that there is waste, fraud, and abuse in the Federal Government; and we believe that everything the Federal Government is doing is not being done exactly right, that we can reform, get better use of our tax dollars, and get better savings so that we can get rid of this budget deficit. We have already reduced the deficit by 20 percent.

We need to keep good jobs, keep the economy growing, and control spending. That is exactly what this budget does. It has unprecedented advances. The first time we are actually getting some spending control on mandatory spending since 1997; the first time we are actually reducing nonsecurity spending and discretionary since the Reagan administration.

It is a good budget, and I urge its support.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it has been more than a month since the House and Senate both passed budget resolutions on a fast track, but it was only Tuesday of this week that the House finally got around to appointing conferees. We had the first and only meeting of the conference yesterday amid reports that a conference report was almost a done deal.

□ 1730

The meeting was a formality, to give some semblance of collaboration to the budget process. But there has been no collaboration. There has been no transparency. This conference report was prepared by Republicans and their staff behind closed doors, at times and places unknown to me, even though I am a conferee. So not surprisingly, this conference report does not reflect the

resolution that we would have passed had we been full partners in this process.

Let me tell you what this conference report is not. This is not a budget that follows the will of the House as expressed 2 days ago in the motion to instruct conferees. Two days ago, 348 Members of the House voted emphatically against Medicaid cuts. The conferees disdained the instruction and whacked Medicaid anyway for \$10 billion.

So this is a budget with spending cuts, and the Republicans will tell you that these are necessary to reduce the deficit. But in this budget, the spending cuts do not go to the bottom line and reduce the deficit dollar for dollar. They will be used to offset tax cuts so that they will at least partially offset their impact on the bottom line of the budget, because, you see, this budget does not make the bottom line better. It does not make the deficit better. It makes it worse.

The government faces a deficit this year of \$427 billion. Now, you would think that with deficits of this size, that the budget would be used to make the bottom line smaller not larger, but not this budget. It does just the opposite. This will make the budget \$167 billion worse on the bottom line over the next 5 years than the CBO baseline budget.

I have right here what we could put together as quickly as possible, given the short amount of time we have had, a back-of-the-envelope analysis. Let me go through it bullet by bullet. The House-passed budget produced deficits of \$127 billion above the deficit in CBO's current services baseline forecast.

This report, this conference report produces deficits that are \$40 billion greater than the House-passed budget; \$167 billion above the CBO baseline. This does not improve the deficit problem. It makes it worse.

The conference report calls for \$35 billion in reconciled spending cuts, compared with \$69 billion in reconciled spending cuts in the House budget resolution. That \$35 billion difference accounts for most of the \$40 billion difference in total deficits.

In the conference report, there are cuts in nondiscretionary spending, big cuts, \$150 billion over 5 years. But they are virtually offset with defense discretionary spending increases, so these two accounts in discretionary spending are basically a wash. And as for the tax cuts, they remain at \$106 billion.

So what we have here is a budget that does not help the situation. This is a budget that hurts the situation. And let me mention one particular aspect where harm is done that is wholly unnecessary.

Everybody knows that we have a problem with Social Security, looming insolvency. Call it a crisis, call it a problem. You would think that a budget of this kind would at least, if it did not have a grand solution, would at

least do no further harm. But instead, this budget, in order to pay for the reduction in income taxes, reaches into the Social Security trust fund, takes out \$160 billion and spends that entire trust fund surplus for the operation of the government, not for Social Security benefits.

This is not a step forward for Social Security. This is a step backward. And it is just another reason that we should all, all of us, oppose this bill. It is bad in substance. It's bad process.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) who has been a leader in budget process reform and in fiscal discipline.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of this conference report. And I also want to congratulate the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Budget Committee, who I know is on the floor now.

Mr. Speaker, I believe he probably has the most difficult job that one has in the United States House of Representatives; and that is, each one of us, 435 of us, have opinions about how much money we should take from American families and spend in government, and once we get that money what should we spend it on.

And certainly I have my opinions. I believe we need to do more to protect the family budget from the Federal budget. And at the same time there are some categories of government I wish we could spend more money on. I believe that there is still more we could do in policing our border, more we can do in veterans health care.

But I strongly support this budget for several reasons. Number one, a budget is a whole lot more than just numbers. It is more than just an accounting green eye-shade function. It is about priorities. It is about vision.

This is a budget that provides for the common defense. This is a budget that helps us fight and win this war on terror. It is a budget that promotes economic growth.

Under this Republican administration's economic policies, we have come out of the recession. We have created 3 million jobs. We are giving Americans jobs and growth and hope and opportunity. And this budget protects that.

And perhaps also, very important and very historic, this budget provides for something we call reconciliation. Now, in Washington terms, that is kind of an insider baseball term. But what it means is we start the process to reform our entitlement spending.

Now, why is that important?

Our friends on the other side of the aisle are always talking about how, for some reason, their budget is fiscally responsible and ours is not. But right now we have Medicare; over the next decade it is growing to grow at 9 percent a year. Medicaid is going to grow at almost 8 percent a year. Social Security is growing at 5½ percent a year. The General Accounting Office tells us

that if we do not reform these programs, that we are on a glide path to where our children and our grandchildren will have to see their taxes increased 2½ times. This is fiscally responsible?

Sure. We can balance the budget in 2040. All we do is we leave spending on automatic pilot, and we raise taxes on our children and grandchildren 2½ times.

Mr. Speaker, I see nothing fiscally responsible in that approach. And this is why I am a strong supporter of this. And I believe we must start the process of reform. Our children and grandchildren are facing this legacy, this sea, this tsunami of red ink. There is a question of generational fairness here.

And Mr. Speaker, many of us in this Chamber know that we can get better retirement security at a lesser cost. We can get better health care at a lesser cost if we just have different policies. I mean, right now we know, we know that if we will embrace real Social Security personal accounts with real assets that owners can work and have a nest egg, that they can get more, greater retirement security than what present Social Security is promising and cannot deliver.

Now, our friends on the other side of the aisle will find fault in this budget in a couple of ways. And I have been listening to the debate. They say tax relief is why we have these massive budget deficits.

Well, unfortunately, they have not looked at the latest Treasury reports. We have actually cut marginal rates. And guess what? We have more tax revenue because people have incentives to go opt and create new small businesses and to expand and to hire new people. Again, look at the facts. The facts are indisputable. We have cut marginal tax rates, and we increase more tax revenue.

But say that we believe in their theory, that tax relief is actually part of the problem. Say tax relief was just a line item that said the office of widget control.

Well, if you look very closely at what this budget does, it provides \$16.6 billion in tax relief versus \$2.5 trillion in spending. That is less than 1 percent. So somehow less than 1 percent of the Federal budget supposed to cause all these problems? I do not think so. In this case, tax relief has proven to be part of the deficit solution, not the deficit problem.

And when it comes to the deficit, the deficit is really a symptom. It is spending that is the disease. And without real reform, without real reconciliation, we do not get it, Mr. Speaker, and this is why I am so strongly in favor of this budget resolution.

And once again I congratulate our great chairman, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for the work he has done.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for a response.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, let me respond to the gentleman's contention about taxes. When the Bush administration presented its tax package, they told us that the revenues produced by the individual income tax in 2004 would be \$1,118,000,000,000. In fact, in 2004 revenues produced by the individual income tax were just over \$810 billion. There was a \$300 billion shortfall in revenues beneath the projection of the Bush administration, which accounts for three-fourths of the deficit, \$412 billion deficit in 2004.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, once again, the Republican majority has written a budget that uses every penny, every penny of the Social Security surplus. I went back and read what the President said March 22, 2001. "The budget I set up says the payroll taxes are only going to be spent on one thing, and that is Social Security." Once again, the President is not keeping that commitment.

The budget, this budget of yours, raids Social Security in 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010. That is reform? That is regression. And for every year covered by this budget, every penny comes out of the Social Security surplus, every penny.

Now, it was not many weeks ago the President went to West Virginia. And we all read about it. He went to the bureau that holds the trust fund documents of the Social Security, and he said, "There is no trust fund, just IOUs."

I could not disagree with the President more. Those bonds held by the trust fund are backed by the full faith and credit of the United States. So the problem is not with Social Security or the trust fund, it is with the fiscal irresponsibility of this administration.

I remember 1993, when many of us joined to put this country on the path of fiscal responsibility. And we faced not deficits, but surpluses, not using Social Security.

But then the Republican majority comes here, and the Bush administration, and they push through a number of measures, including the irresponsible tax cuts, with the results that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has just indicated. And we warned you, more red ink. And you did not listen.

So last year, we have a deficit of \$412 billion. But if you do not include Social Security, it is \$567 billion. That is reform?

This same lack of fiscal discipline will result in an even larger deficit this year. This has to stop. It has to stop. And we can do that tonight.

I urge the House to reject this irresponsible budget, defeat the previous question and demand a budget that does not raid the Social Security trust fund.

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

I would remind the gentleman that the Social Security bonds are still backed by the full faith and credit of the United States. And unlike the other side of the aisle, this side of the aisle is concerned not just about Social Security for today's seniors, who are perfectly cared for if you are 50 and older, but for tomorrow's seniors as well, those students who are graduating from college today who will retire 15 years after the system has gone bust if action is not taken.

One side has plans, competing plans even, a variety of plans. The other side is in denial.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the full faith and credit of the United States Government. Of course the question is, who is the government? Well, the government would be the taxpayers of the United States. They are the ones who have to back up all the spending that goes on here in Washington, D.C.

For 40 years the Democrats controlled Congress. They did not mind spending Social Security, every dime of it, in any way they wanted to. In fact, the Democrats, for 40 years, set us on a path of an unlimited credit card without the assets to back it up.

Just recently, before the Ways and Means Committee, we had the Comptroller General of the General Accountability Office, David Walker. And David Walker testified that right now the United States needs \$43 trillion to meet the unfunded liabilities and debt. That is four times the size of the American economy. That is scary.

□ 1745

Now, David Walker was appointed by Bill Clinton. David Walker is a non-partisan independent, and he says that we have got to get control of mandated spending, entitlements. This budget is starting to get real. Because if we do not face this challenge, then our children and our grandchildren are going to face, as was described a little earlier, an economic tsunami. I can see the ocean going out now if we are talking about \$43 trillion of unfunded liabilities and debts. The question is when will the wave come back in.

We have got to get serious. We have got to be nonpartisan and work together to solve some of these issues, or we are going to have a terrible, terrible tragedy in this country. So it is time to get real. We have to get control of spending in this country. And by the year 2020, Mr. Walker says that all the funds coming into the general Treasury will be consumed by entitlements and interest on the debt. There will be nothing left over for discretionary spending and for Congress to make decisions.

By the year 2040 all the money coming into the Federal Treasury will be consumed by the interest. We will lose Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, period, if we do not get real and reform the process.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me time.

It is curious to me, each speaker that has come to the Republican side in the last half hour since we have debated the rule is introduced as an expert on fiscal policy, an expert on fiscal policy.

Look at the deficit that they have run up. Look at where we find ourselves today, two wars and five tax cuts; and they present themselves to the people as an expert on fiscal policy.

Mr. Speaker, in the election of the year 2000, there was a lot of mocking about the term the "lockbox." It made great play even on "Saturday Night Live."

Let me tell you what they have done. Over the next 10 years Social Security will raise \$2.6 trillion for the trust fund. This Republican budget spends every cent of that surplus. That means that we need this money to provide benefits to retirees, and guess how we are going to do it? We are going to borrow the money. And we are going to do just what we have been doing since they have been in charge, and then we are going to increase our indebtedness to the Chinese and to the Japanese.

Everybody knows this for what it is. It is unsound policy. The first Bush budget promised that "none of the Social Security surpluses will be used to fund other spending initiatives or tax relief."

That is what they said. Let us give you the record. It is the polar opposite. After acknowledging the importance of keeping the trust fund secure, they have raided every single cent of the trust fund in the fiscal year 2002 budget to pay for their tax cuts that, by the way, went to the top 1 percent of wage earners in America.

Well, let us have another refresher here in recent history. In fiscal year 2003 the same thing happened. The Republicans spent every cent of the Social Security trust fund surplus. In 2004 they spent every cent of the Social Security trust fund surplus. And in 2005 they intend to spend every cent of the Social Security trust fund surplus. So over these last 4 years the Republicans' budgets have spent \$635 billion of the Social Security trust fund on huge tax cuts for the wealthiest among us.

Only in Washington could you lop \$2 trillion off the Federal budget with tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and then in the next breath say Social Security is in danger.

We have got to do something to fix Social Security after they have raided the trust fund. Now, after draining the Social Security trust fund, the Presi-

dent then says, Social Security is going bankrupt. His strategy is failing on every front. It is failing his fiscal policy with record deficits. By the way, this is from a Republican Party that at one time spoke to fiscal rectitude.

It is failing politically because the American people who are paying attention, and they all are, are rejecting the Social Security trust fund because they know the trust fund account has been raided by the majority party.

We know we will have to do some adjustments to Social Security to strengthen it, but look what their answer is: raid the trust fund. We have offered a budget alternative that would begin to shore up Social Security. Our plan offers tough budget rules that would force Congress to pay for new spending or tax cuts that would pull money out of the Social Security trust funds.

I want to say something, Mr. Speaker. In the 17 years that I have been in this House, this is absolutely the worst budget that has been presented. There is not even competition for how bad this budget proposal is, and they do it on the backs of the Social Security trust fund.

So let me close on the basis on which I began, and I would like to have them answer this question: two wars, and five tax cuts.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the House of what this budget is since we have heard what it is not. It accommodates the tax relief that was passed by this House on a bipartisan basis. It fully supports national defense with an increase of nearly 5 percent. Homeland security expenses are dealt with with an increase of 2.3 percent, and an overall nonsecurity, nondefense discretionary spending reduction of less than 1 point, something that, if you only heard the other side, you would believe would lead to massive chaos in the streets, the sky falling and ruin of biblical proportions.

I only wonder what will be said next year. What type of analogy or metaphor will top that of this year? This is a budget that is responsible, that lays out priorities for a Nation and is one that gives a vision, a direction for the country towards cutting the deficit in half in 5 years, by dealing not just with discretionary spending but with mandatory as well, and in doing so by reducing the rate of growth.

Something that is lost in this debate is that it is not even a net cut. It is only a Washington, D.C. cut when you are going up 7.3 percent instead of 7.5 percent and accused of making cuts. This is a budget that meets the needs of our national defense. It creates a climate of opportunity and growth for small businesses and individuals who are working every day to be a part of the American Dream and to achieve their goals that they have set out to achieve and take risks and seek capital and take on new employees and buy

equipment. It allows them to continue to do that.

It has an eye towards future generations. It is not a budget about today or about the selfishness of one generation over another, but looking ahead multiple generations and saying, how do we deal with problems that we know nonpartisan experts in these areas, the comptroller general, think tanks of all shapes and sizes and stripes say in 2040, you have a major problem in Social Security. What are you going to do for that first year, teacher? What are you going to do for that student who is graduating from high school this year who will retire years after the system has become insolvent if we fail to act?

On this side you see a variety of opinions, in fact, even clashing ideas about ways to address the problem. And on the other side there is silence. The party that gave us a pillar of domestic policy is in denial about a problem that will affect future generations, and I believe that is a tragedy.

This budget is a budget for today, tomorrow, and decades to come.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

What our friends on the majority side are doing would be downright funny if it were not so downright tragic. The motion that we are here taking a \$2.6 trillion budget with less than 3 hours to look at it is not laughable. It is disgusting.

We tried at the beginning of this year to enforce the 3-day rule except for cases where a supermajority could be obtained. You denied that. I challenge you to go home to your rotary clubs, your town halls, your citizens groups and say, friends, the United States Congress led by the Republican majority passed a \$2.6 trillion budget and the Members had 3 hours to look at it. Be honest with your constituents. Say, I read that entire budget in those 3 hours we had. Be honest with your constituents and tell them how much of that Social Security trust fund you are borrowing to disguise your spending and to disguise the cost of your deficit.

You folks ran on a platform back in 1993 where you said if legislation cannot pass 3 days of scrutiny, it should not be enacted into law. That is the case today with this budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me time.

The Republicans have a view that is unstated, if you repeat something that is untrue over and over again, people will believe it to be true.

And take the signature line of my friends on the majority, this budget will cut the deficit in half in 5 years. It is not true. There is no year-to-year deficit that ever gets to that point, and this budget does not do it. What they did is they puffed up the deficit number, the projection, a year and a half ago. They puffed up that number and now they are talking about a reduction from that puffed up number. It simply is not true.

But what I really want to talk about is Medicaid, what you are doing to Medicaid with this budget. We now know that the Medicaid cuts in this House reconciliation bill could be as high as the entire Energy and Commerce instruction to reduce \$14.7 billion over 5 years.

Two days ago this body passed a motion to protect Medicaid by an overwhelming vote of 348 to 72, 152 Republicans joined all Democrats to oppose cuts to Medicaid. And so what do we get? We get a budget that is going to reduce Medicaid by a substantial amount of money, \$10 billion, \$14 billion, we do not know. Any cut to Medicaid is a significant hit on our States.

But the bottom line is Republicans today with no notice, with a few hours notice of this budget, will troop down here and they will vote for a budget resolution that cuts Medicaid, and two days ago they all stood up and said, oh, no, no, no, we are opposed to Medicaid cuts. That is what we have got here.

If this budget could stand the light of day, an extended light of day, frankly, we would see more time than 3 hours to review it. But the bottom line is cuts to Medicaid will have a devastating effect on our society. They will make the system less viable for health care providers. They will have an impact on seniors and impoverished children.

This budget is an outrage and should be rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me close this debate by urging Members to vote "no" on the previous question so I can modify the rule to allow the House to reject this flawed budget conference report and require the House Committee on the Budget to produce a new Federal budget that does not raid the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, since President Bush took office, Republican budgets have spent every penny of Social Security trust surplus in order to finance the deficits and pay for their tax cuts.

While the President travels the country trying and failing to convince Americans that privatizing Social Security is a good idea, his tax cuts continue to pile up the IOUs in the Social Security trust fund.

We need a budget that will bring back budget enforcement, to protect the Social Security surplus and return the budget to balance by 2012.

The Spratt budget would put us back on the path to fiscal solvency and that is the kind of budget America needs and deserves, not the budget before us today.

Please vote "no" on the previous question so we can protect Social Security and begin restoring some fiscal sanity to the Nation.

□ 1800

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), my distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me time, and congratulate him on the fine job that he has done on this and as a member of the Committee on the Budget, as well as the Committee on Rules.

This a great day, Mr. Speaker. We are at the point where, once again, we are continuing to do the work of the American people. We have spent weeks and months focused on this very important budget issue. We have now seen both houses of Congress address these questions, and we have come together with a conference agreement.

It is a conference agreement which is going to allow us to focus on a number of priorities of the Federal Government, that is, our national defense and our homeland security, but at the same time we are focused on very important societal needs that are out there, as well as the fiscal responsibility.

We know that economic growth is a very important part of that, and as I listen to my colleagues decry this issue of spending and deficits and all, we know that the single most important thing we can do to deal with this deficit issue is to continue to see the economy grow, and that is exactly what the tax cuts in this measure will do, as they have done. In fact, in last year's budget, we saw the deficit \$109 billion lower than anticipated. Why? Because of the economic growth that followed our tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very fair rule allowing a conference agreement. Members have had a great deal of time over the past several weeks and months to focus on this issue. Let us continue to do what we have done throughout this great 109th Congress: Get the work of the American people done.

I thank my friend for yielding me time.

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

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. CON. RES. 95—
CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE FY2006 CON-
CURRENT BUDGET RESOLUTION

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That the House finds the following:

(1) From 2002 through 2005, the Republicans in Congress have spent every dollar of the \$637 billion of Social Security trust fund surpluses on tax cuts and other purposes unrelated to Social Security.

(2) The 2006 Republican Congressional budget resolution conference agreement spends every dollar of the projected \$1.1 trillion Social Security surpluses over the next five years on tax cuts and other purposes unrelated to Social Security.

Sec. 2. That upon adoption of this resolution the conference report to accompany 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 is hereby rejected.

Sec. 3. The Committee on the Budget is directed to report a new concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 that does not raid Social Security surpluses by diverting these funds for purposes other than Social Security, and stipulates that Social Security payroll contributions will be used solely for the purpose of providing retirement, disability and survivor benefits.

I want to close this debate by urging members to vote no on the previous question so I can will modify this rule to allow the House to reject this flawed budget conference report and at the same time require the House Budget Committee to produce a new federal budget that does not raid the Social Security trust funds.

Mr. Speaker, since President Bush took office, Republican budgets have spent every penny of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus in order to finance their deficits and pay for their tax cuts. While the President travels the country trying, and failing, to convince Americans that privatizing Social Security is a good idea, his tax cuts continue to pile up the IOU's in the Social Security trust funds.

We need a budget that will bring back budget enforcement to protect the Social Security surplus and return the federal budget to balance by 2012. Mr. Spratt's budget would put us back on the path to fiscal solvency, and that is the kind of budget America needs, not the budget that is before us today.

Vote "no" the previous question so that we can protect Social Security and begin restoring some fiscal sanity to this nation.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the previous question immediately prior to the vote.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, all time on our side having expired, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a

quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 248 will be followed by 5-minute votes, as ordered, on adopting the resolution and approving the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 196, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

YEAS—228

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

Wicker	Wilson (SC)	Young (AK)
Wilson (NM)	Wolf	Young (FL)

NAYS—196

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

NOT VOTING—10

Clyburn	Flake	Paul
Cunningham	Ford	Rothman
Doggett	Meeks (NY)	
Filner	Moran (VA)	

□ 1827

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 147, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would voted "nay."

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 147, I was detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 345, noes 75, answered "present" 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

AYES—345

Abercrombie	Castle	Foxx
Ackerman	Chabot	Frank (MA)
Aderholt	Chandler	Franks (AZ)
Akin	Chocola	Frelinghuysen
Alexander	Clay	Galleghy
Allen	Cleaver	Garrett (NJ)
Andrews	Coble	Gerlach
Baca	Cole (OK)	Gilchrest
Bachus	Conaway	Gillmor
Baker	Conyers	Gingrey
Barrett (SC)	Cooper	Gohmert
Barrow	Costa	Gonzalez
Bartlett (MD)	Cox	Goode
Barton (TX)	Cramer	Goodlatte
Bass	Crenshaw	Gordon
Bean	Cubin	Granger
Beauprez	Cuellar	Green (WI)
Berman	Culberson	Green, Al
Biggart	Cummings	Gutierrez
Bilirakis	Davis (AL)	Hall
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Harman
Bishop (NY)	Davis (FL)	Harris
Bishop (UT)	Davis (IL)	Hastert
Blackburn	Davis (KY)	Hastings (WA)
Blumenauer	Davis (TN)	Hayes
Blunt	Davis, Jo Ann	Hayworth
Boehrlert	Davis, Tom	Hensarling
Bonner	Deal (GA)	Herger
Bono	DeGette	Herseth
Boozman	Delahunt	Higgins
Boren	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Boswell	DeLay	Hobson
Boucher	Dent	Hoekstra
Boustany	Diaz-Balart, L.	Holden
Boyd	Diaz-Balart, M.	Holt
Bradley (NH)	Dicks	Honda
Brady (TX)	Dingell	Hooley
Brown (OH)	Doolittle	Hostettler
Brown (SC)	Doyle	Hoyer
Brown, Corrine	Drake	Hunter
Brown-Waite,	Dreier	Hyde
Ginny	Duncan	Inglis (SC)
Burgess	Edwards	Inslee
Burton (IN)	Ehlers	Israel
Butterfield	Emanuel	Istook
Buyer	Emerson	Jackson (IL)
Calvert	Engel	Jenkins
Camp	Eshoo	Jindal
Cannon	Etheridge	Johnson (CT)
Cantor	Evans	Johnson (IL)
Capito	Everett	Johnson, E. B.
Capps	Farr	Johnson, Sam
Cardin	Fattah	Jones (OH)
Cardoza	Feeney	Kanjorski
Carnahan	Ferguson	Kaptur
Carson	Foley	Keller
Carter	Forbes	Kildee
Case	Fortenberry	Kilpatrick (MI)

King (IA)	Myrick	Schwartz (PA)
Kingston	Napolitano	Schwarz (MI)
Kirk	Neugebauer	Scott (GA)
Kline	Ney	Sensenbrenner
Knollenberg	Northup	Serrano
Kolbe	Nunes	Sessions
Kuhl (NY)	Nussle	Shadegg
LaHood	Obey	Shaw
Langevin	Ortiz	Shays
Lantos	Osborne	Sherman
LaTourette	Owens	Sherwood
Leach	Oxley	Shimkus
Lee	Pallone	Shuster
Lewis (CA)	Pascarell	Simmons
Lewis (GA)	Pastor	Simpson
Lewis (KY)	Payne	Skelton
Linder	Pearce	Smith (NJ)
Lipinski	Pelosi	Smith (TX)
Lofgren, Zoe	Pence	Smith (WA)
Lowe	Peterson (PA)	Snyder
Lucas	Petri	Sodrel
Lungren, Daniel	Pickering	Solis
E.	Pitts	Souder
Lynch	Poe	Spratt
Mack	Pombo	Stearns
Maloney	Pomeroy	Sweeney
Manzullo	Porter	Taylor (NC)
Marchant	Portman	Terry
Matheson	Price (GA)	Thomas
Matsui	Price (NC)	Thornberry
McCaul (TX)	Putnam	Tiahrt
McCollum (MN)	Radanovich	Tierney
McCrery	Rahall	Towns
McHenry	Rangel	Turner
McHugh	Regula	Turner
McIntyre	Rehberg	Upton
McKeon	Reichert	Van Hollen
McKinney	Renzi	Velázquez
McMorris	Reyes	Walden (OR)
Meehan	Reynolds	Walsh
Meek (FL)	Rogers (AL)	Wamp
Meeks (NY)	Rogers (KY)	Wasserman
Melancon	Rogers (MI)	Schultz
Menendez	Rohrabacher	Watson
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Watt
Michaud	Ross	Waxman
Millender-	Roybal-Allard	Weldon (FL)
McDonald	Royce	Weldon (PA)
Miller (FL)	Ruppersberger	Westmoreland
Miller (MI)	Rush	Wexler
Miller (NC)	Ryan (OH)	Whitfield
Miller, Gary	Ryan (WI)	Wicker
Miller, George	Ryun (KS)	Wilson (NM)
Mollohan	Salazar	Wilson (SC)
Moran (KS)	Sánchez, Linda	Wolf
Moran (VA)	T.	Woolsey
Murphy	Sanders	Wynn
Murtha	Saxton	Young (AK)
Musgrave	Schiff	Young (FL)

NOES—75

Baird	Kelly	Platts
Baldwin	Kennedy (MN)	Pryce (OH)
Becerra	Kennedy (RI)	Ramstad
Berry	Kind	Sabo
Brady (PA)	Kucinich	Sanchez, Loretta
Capuano	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Costello	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Latham	Slaughter
DeFazio	Levin	Stark
English (PA)	LoBiondo	Strickland
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Markey	Stupak
Fossella	Marshall	Tanner
Gibbons	McCarthy	Tauscher
Graves	McCotter	Taylor (MS)
Green, Gene	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Grijalva	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Gutknecht	McNulty	Tiberi
Hart	Moore (KS)	Udall (CO)
Hastings (FL)	Moore (WI)	Udall (NM)
Hefley	Nadler	Visclosky
Hinchey	Neal (MA)	Waters
Hulshof	Norwood	Weiner
Issa	Oberstar	Weller
Jackson-Lee	Olver	Wu
(TX)	Otter	
Jones (NC)	Peterson (MN)	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—14

Berkley	Doggett	King (NY)
Boehner	Filner	Paul
Bonilla	Flake	Rothman
Clyburn	Ford	Sullivan
Cunningham	Jefferson	

□ 1837

Mr. MARCHANT changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 148, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 144 on H.R. 748, my vote was incorrectly recorded as a "no" vote when it should have been recorded as a "yes" vote.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES.—

Whereas the Committee on the Judiciary conducted a markup of the bill H.R. 748, the "Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act," on Wednesday, April 13, 2005 and ordered the bill reported on that same day;

Whereas the Committee on the Judiciary subsequently reported H.R. 748 to the House on Thursday, April 21, 2005, with an accompanying report designated House Report 109-51;

Whereas, during the markup of H.R. 748, Representatives Nadler, Scott, and Jackson-Lee offered in good faith a total of five amendments to the bill, all of which failed on party-line votes;

Whereas, because Representatives Nadler, Scott, and Jackson-Lee called for recorded votes on their amendments, under section 3(b) of Rule XIII, the votes were published in House Report 109-51;

Whereas, although it is the long and established practice in House reports to describe recorded votes with objective, nonargumentative captions, the Committee on the Judiciary majority departed from this practice in House Report 109-51 by captioning these five amendments with inflammatory, inaccurate captions implying that these three Members of Congress condoned the criminal behavior of "sexual predators";

Whereas, as one example, while an objective, nonargumentative description of one of