



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	Meeke (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	LaTourette	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.

(5) 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)
Gallegly	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
 Boehlert 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)
 Brown-Waite, Granger McCotter
 Ginny Graves McCreery
 Burgess Green (WI) McGovern
 Burton (IN) Green, Al McHenry
 Butterfield Green, Gene McHugh
 Buyer Grijalva McIntyre
 Calvert Gutierrez McKeon
 Camp Hall McMorris
 Cannon Harman McNulty
 Cantor Harris Meehan
 Capito Harris Meek (FL)
 Capps Hart Meeks (NY)
 Capuano Hastings (FL) Melancon
 Cardin Hastings (WA) Menendez
 Cardoza Hayes Mica
 Carnahan Hayworth Michaud
 Carson Hefley Millender-
 Carter Hensarling McDonald
 Case Herger Miller (FL)
 Castle Herseth Miller (MI)
 Chabot Higgins Miller (NC)
 Chandler Hinojosa Miller, Gary
 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 Lathourrette 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 gentlewoman 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 any place 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
Function 650—Social Security	no change
Function 750—Administration of Justice	+\$1 billion
Juvenile Justice	\$600 million
Department of Justice Prisoner Reentry Program	\$300 million
Weed and Seed and Drug Elimination Programs	\$100 million
Function 800—General Government	no change
Total General	\$32.4 billion
Amount to be applied to deficit reduction	\$3.9 billion

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

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
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
Function 700—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
Function 920—Allowances (all for purposes of Homeland Security)	+\$2.05 billion
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	Pascrell
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	Millerender-	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)	Heger
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
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boyd
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson
Clay
Cleaver
Conyers
Costello
Crowley
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Emanuel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)

Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchev
Holt
Hooley
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kind
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McGovern
McKinney
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Millender-
McDonald
Miller, George
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Nadler

Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Owens
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Rangel
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanders
Schakowsky
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Solis
Strickland
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson

NOES—313

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw

Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris

Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Honda
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch

Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)

Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays

Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Obey

NOT VOTING—19

Boehner
Cardoza
Coble
Cummings
Delahunt
Doolittle
Hinojosa

Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Larsen (WA)
McCotter
McDermott
Ney
Oliver

Stark
Sullivan
Watt
Waxman
Woolsey
Young (FL)

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 Rep-
resentatives, 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
Biggart	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
Herse	Melancon	Skelton
Higgins	Menendez	Slaughter
Hinche	Michaud	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)
Biggart	Flake	Lewis (KY)
Bilirakis	Foley	Linder
Billirakis	Forbes	Lipinski
Bishop (GA)	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Bishop (NY)	Fossella	Lowey
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Lucas
Blackburn	Fox	Lungren, Daniel
Blumenauer	Frank (MA)	E.
Blunt	Franks (AZ)	Lynch
Boehlert	Gerlach	Mack
Boehner	Gibbons	Maloney
Bonilla	Gilchrest	Manzullo
Bonner	Gillmor	Marchant
Boozman	Gingrey	Marshall
Boren	Gohmert	Matheson
Boswell	Gohmert	Mateson
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	Herse	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	Gallegly	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 1992 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. CAPPS, 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. FALGOMAVAEGA, Mr. HINCHEY, 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. RUPPERSBERGER, 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. HINCHEY, 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. HINCHEY, 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. TANCREDO, 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. KUHL 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. SÁNCHEZ 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.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2005

No. 33

Senate

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. We look to You today, O God, maker of heaven and earth. Unless You lay the foundation of our plans, we labor in vain. Unless You guard our Nation, our efforts to find security are futile.

As Your servants in the Senate seek to do Your will today, make it clear to them the path they should follow. In the flowing of pressure, help them to hear the whisper of Your wisdom. Empower them to anticipate the forces that threaten the freedom of this good land. Plant in each of our hearts a reverential awe of You that will lead to life.

We pray in Your wonderful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order the leadership time is reserved.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2006

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 18, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 and 2010.

Pending:

Bingaman (for Smith) Amendment No. 204, to create a reserve fund for the establishment of a Bipartisan Medicaid Commission to consider and recommend appropriate reforms to the Medicaid program, and to strike Medicaid cuts to protect states and vulnerable populations.

Carper Amendment No. 207, to provide for full consideration of tax cuts in the Senate under regular order.

Snowe Amendment No. 214, to ensure that any savings associated with legislation that provides the Secretary of Health and Human Services with the authority to participate in the negotiation of contracts with manufacturers of covered part D drugs to achieve the best possible prices for such drugs under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, that requires the Secretary to negotiate contracts with manufacturers of such drugs for each fallback prescription drug plan, and that requires the Secretary to participate in the negotiation for a contract for any such drug upon request of a prescription drug plan or an MA-PD plan, is reserved for reducing expenditures under such part.

Harkin Amendment No. 172, to restore the Perkins Vocational Education program and provide for deficit reduction paid for through the elimination of the phase out of the personal exemption limitation and itemized deduction limitation for high-income taxpayers now scheduled to start in 2006.

Hutchison Amendment No. 218, to fully fund the level of Border Patrol Agents authorized by the National Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 and as recommended by the 9/11 Commission.

Landrieu Amendment No. 219, to establish a reserve fund in the event that legislation is passed to provide a 50 percent tax credit to employers that continue to pay the salaries of Guard and Reserve employees who have been called to active duty.

Salazar/Conrad Amendment No. 215, to provide additional funding for rural education, rural health access, and rural health outreach programs.

Conrad (for Dorgan) Amendment No. 210, to repeal the tax subsidy for certain domestic companies which move manufacturing operations and American jobs offshore.

Collins (for Lieberman/Collins) Amendment No. 220, to protect the American people from terrorist attacks by restoring \$565 million in cuts to vital first-responder programs in the Department of Homeland Security, including the State Homeland Security Grant program, by providing \$150 million for port security grants and by providing \$140 million for 1,000 new border patrol agents.

Vitter Amendment No. 223, to express the sense of the Senate that Congress should provide dedicated funding for port security enhancements.

Vitter Amendment No. 224, to restore funding for Corps of Engineers environmental programs to fiscal year 2005 levels.

Allen Modified Amendment No. 197, to increase by \$1,582,700,000 over fiscal years 2006 through 2010 funding for Transportation (budget function 400) with the amount of the increase intended to be allocated to the Vehicle Systems account of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for supersonic and hypersonic aeronautics research.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this morning we will immediately resume consideration of the budget resolution. We have an order in place from last night which sets aside specific debate times in relation to several amendments this morning. There is no debate time remaining on the resolution beyond this time agreement. Senators, therefore, can expect a lengthy series of votes to begin sometime around 1:30 today. This vote-arama will necessitate continued cooperation from all Members. I cannot stress enough the importance of every Senator staying on the floor or very close by throughout the afternoon and into the evening. This is always a trying and challenging period because of the unusual nature of what happens over the course of the day. But beginning around 1:30, we will start a series of votes that will go on for a while.

I encourage my colleagues to work with the managers to use restraint in not offering amendments if they are purely message amendments and are not substantive. It is going to be a

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2875

challenge to bring everything to closure over the course of today and early into this evening already, so please use restraint in terms of whether to offer amendments.

TERRI SCHIAVO

I know we want to get started, but I did want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an issue that we do have to act on before we leave. I do so on behalf of a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have come up and said: There is an important issue facing the country that we have not addressed in the past and that other systems of government and other branches of government have inadequately addressed, and, therefore, it is time for the U.S. Senate to speak.

It centers on the fact that if we don't act or if somebody does not act, a living person who has a level of consciousness, who is self-breathing, will be starved to death in the next 2 weeks—thus the action that is required to be done either later tonight or tomorrow in order to prevent that starvation to death by Terri Schiavo.

I first heard about the situation facing Terri Schiavo actually several years ago, but the immediacy of it has played out in the last several days because of this decision that has been made, not by her parents who want to keep her alive, not by her family who wants to keep her alive, but by her husband.

From a medical standpoint, I wanted to know a little bit more about the case itself, so I had the opportunity to review the initial tapes that were made, the physical examination on which the case was ultimately based, the fact that she was in a persistent vegetative state, and scores of neurologists had come forward and said that it doesn't look like she is in a persistent vegetative state. It is a strange word, "vegetative state," that connotes all sorts of things to lay people. It is a medical term that means that she is not in a coma. Persistent vegetative state is a specific diagnosis that typically has to be made over a period of multiple examinations, usually multiple days, and some neurologists say should be made over several weeks. The facts of this case are that it was made by a single, or maybe two, but a single examination over a very short period of time. The professionals themselves who have viewed those tapes question that initial diagnosis.

The other questions arise: Does she have any hope of being rehabilitated? I talked personally to one of the neurologists who examined her, and he said, absolutely, she can greatly improve, substantially improve if she is given the appropriate rehabilitation. I asked myself, had she expressed her wishes about the end of her life? She had no written directive in terms of what would happen if such an event struck her. Did she have an advanced medical directive? The answer is no.

So we have come to the point where on this floor we are going to have to

face the question of whether we believe that a conscious woman who is breathing on her own—and yes, she has a severe disability, similar to what cerebral palsy might be. She can't physically feed herself. She can't verbally express her desires at this juncture, but she has no legal direction.

The question is, Should we allow her to be starved to death? I mention that because it is an important case. It has to do with the culture of life. I believe this body is going to have to speak on this particular matter before we leave for recess.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 204

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 60 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form in relation to the Medicaid amendment No. 204 offered by the Senator from Oregon, Mr. SMITH. Who yields time?

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on the Bingaman amendment, I would like to yield 4 minutes to Senator BAUCUS, 4 minutes to Senator CORZINE. I believe after that Senator STABENOW will take 4 minutes and Senator CLINTON for 4 minutes as well, and perhaps Senator ROCKEFELLER following if time remains.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I strongly support the Smith-Bingaman-Coleman amendment to strike the reconciliation instruction to the Finance Committee to cut Medicaid by \$15 billion. Some say this amendment is not important because the budget is just a blueprint and the Finance Committee would never make these cuts. That is just not true. A vote for this budget is a vote for cuts, plain and simple. If the reconciliation instruction is to cut, the Finance Committee is under instruction to cut.

Once we pass this budget, the reconciliation instructions are binding. The Finance Committee would be bound to find the \$15 billion in savings. Although it would be difficult for the committee to reach agreement on these cuts, the committee would make the cuts. The Finance Committee has never failed to comply with reconciliation instructions. I do not believe that it would start this year. Those who say it is just a blueprint, that is a smokescreen. It is not accurate.

The administration says we need to address waste and abuse in Medicaid. They say these cuts will end the abuse of intergovernmental transfers. I urge my colleagues to not be swayed by these allegations. The administration has been negotiating reform of intergovernmental transfers on a State-by-State basis for the past 2 years. They have already squeezed significant savings through this new policy, and there will not be much further savings if Congress goes down this road. How do I know this? Because Montana is one of the States that was required to revise

its intergovernmental program to comply with new State rules last year.

Keep in mind that the change in policy has never been published. There has been no notice, no invited comments, no rulemaking—never; no State Medicaid director's letter, none.

So how much in savings remains in reform of intergovernmental transfers? The Congressional Budget Office says zero, no savings. So let's not fool ourselves into thinking we are really cutting fraud and abuse in Medicaid with these cuts. Rather, these cuts will hurt people. In fact, in Montana, the proposed cuts would mean a loss of health coverage for 2,800 seniors or more than 12,000 children.

These cuts are definitely shortsighted. If Congress simply starts cutting Medicaid without considering the overall effects, it would force people to seek care in emergency rooms, and even higher spending would result, or even more people could lose coverage altogether.

Some say these are small and represent only a 1-percent cut in the program's growth over 5 years. But the President's \$45 billion net Medicaid cut over 10 years is more than the \$39 billion Congress has allocated to CHIP coverage for millions of uninsured children during the 10-year lifetime of that program.

I applaud the leadership of Senators Bingaman, Smith, and Coleman. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important amendment.

This is important. I strongly urge our colleagues to do what is right, to not make these cuts. It is going to directly affect people. Support the Smith amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I, too, rise to speak strongly and forcefully in support of the bipartisan amendment Senators SMITH and BINGAMAN have offered. The idea of cutting \$15 billion in the Medicaid Program mandated under this resolution is a bad fundamental choice for our Nation. It is also a bad policy-setting device because it lets the budget process drive Medicaid reform. This amendment directs the creation of a Medicaid commission to investigate and consider possible improvements.

A thoughtful, reasoned approach to limiting the growth in the cost of the Medicaid Program, which is driven by enrollments and the high cost of health care. And while there may be fraud and abuse, the big issue is that we have a health care problem and how do we finance it. It is being ignored by using what I think is a shotgun approach as opposed to the thoughtful, reasoned approach of how Medicaid reform should be done. That is what this amendment does.

Last week, Senators WYDEN, MURRAY, JOHNSON, and I offered a successful amendment during the markup of the budget resolution. The sense of the

Senate was agreed to unanimously by the Budget Committee. As a part of this resolution, it states that the Finance Committee shall not achieve any savings under reconciliation that would cap Federal Medicaid spending, shift Medicaid costs to the States or providers, or undermine the Federal guarantee of Medicaid health insurance.

If this amendment is not accepted—and it is not possible, in my view, to cut \$15 billion from Medicaid without violating that agreement—what we are going to be doing is shifting \$15 billion to the States; if not to the States, to the local governments; if not to the local governments, to the health care providers. It is going to be charity care. It is going to be paid for. We are making a clear choice of transferring the responsibility for all of this care to someone else, moving it off the Federal books on to State and local or even private providers. Maybe we are shifting it on to the streets of our cities and the homeless.

We are making another choice, too, which is unacceptable. The fact is, we are trying to force others to make a choice of whether we say hospice care is more important than mental illness treatment or more important than people having the ability to have hearing and other kinds of specialty treatments. We are taking away the options of how we treat health care and, by the way, preventative care. We are also making a choice which I find completely hard to understand. Why have we decided that this \$15 billion we have mandated the Finance Committee to find, why are we saying this \$15 billion is so much more important than the cumulative \$204 billion or the tax cuts for those making over \$1 million? Isn't this a society that believes in sharing the responsibility for all of us to have access to a better life? We live in a society which provides enormous opportunity for so many, and many of us have benefitted from it, and we are making a clear choice that it is more important that this \$15 billion be cut than \$204 billion that is accumulating for tax cuts to the very wealthy. I do not think these are the choices the American people would make if they had those choices laid before them.

I don't understand. We are saying the most vulnerable should be dealt with without rational and reasoned expectations of where those cuts are going to come, and we are making all kinds of choices that are embedded in these kinds of issues. I believe the idea of a commission to stand back and find that reasoned and informed judgment is important.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GREGG. Will the Senator yield for a question, and I will give him a minute to answer it?

Mr. CORZINE. Certainly.

Mr. GREGG. Does this amendment raise taxes to pay for the \$15 billion that would be called for to put in this

budget, or does it increase the deficit with more spending?

Mr. CORZINE. The Senator from New Hampshire knows very well that what we are discussing is whether you extend tax cuts for those who earn over a million dollars. It is a debate we can have about language, about extension or raising, but at least this Senator would argue that it is more important to make sure that we have a health insurance program for everyone in this society rather than tax cuts for millionaires. These cuts will force states to raise taxes in order to raise the funds that will be necessary to maintain health care under Medicaid.

Mr. GREGG. To reclaim the time, the Senator did not answer the question. Maybe he is not familiar with the answer, but the answer is that this amendment increases the deficit by \$15 billion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Four minutes is yielded to Senator STABENOW.

Ms. STABENOW. I thank the Chair.

First I say to our esteemed colleague who chairs the Budget Committee, I think, as I have said before, he has done an excellent job on the committee and the floor in allowing important discussions and input. We all know this is about choices and priorities. We last year passed the tax loophole closings, as they have been called, some \$23 billion in a business tax bill, a tax bill that I supported that did not end up becoming law. We have already joined saying there are dollars we believe would better be spent in other ways, in fairness from a tax standpoint that tax loopholes should be closed, and those equal more than what we are talking about here in terms of health care for our most vulnerable citizens.

We also, as my colleague from New Jersey has said, have choices in this country about where everyone will contribute to the quality of life, what it means to be an American, to the strength of America, to what we are proud of and our best values, or whether only some people will do that. This is a debate about values and choices. That is what a budget resolution is. It is a picture of who we are. It is a picture of our values. I can't think of anything that is worse in this budget resolution than the picture that says for the most vulnerable children, the poorest children, or poorest seniors in the country, we are going to take away health care for them. That doesn't fit with what I know about my faith and beliefs about helping the least of these. It does not reflect what the people of Michigan believe about what is important in supporting each other in community and caring about each other.

In a way it balances priorities. Obviously, we want dollars that are spent efficiently and effectively, and we want to give the States flexibility. In my home State, I am very proud of what they have been able to do in bulk purchasing for prescription drugs under

Medicaid and working with other States and saving dollars, and we certainly know we want flexibility for them under Medicaid. But we also know that Medicaid is the single greatest provider of health insurance, covering over 21 million children, our future; 800,000 children in Michigan, our future. How many times do we say children are our future?

Well, this budget does not reflect that. It does not reflect that as it relates to funding their future skills and technology and education, and it certainly doesn't reflect their future if you are a poor child whose parents do not have health care.

Let me speak about a couple of people in Michigan. Betty Counts, who lives in Detroit with her daughter Yvette, who has mental and physical handicaps, is quoted in the Detroit News as saying, "It's getting more frustrating trying to get the services I need and the help my daughter needs." And the budget cuts will certainly make things worse for her.

Ask Jimia Williams how much Medicaid means to her. She lives in Flint and has a 19-month-old son who has seizures and asthma. She works 35 to 40 hours a week—and most of the people we are talking about are people who are working; 80 percent of the uninsured are working 1 job, 2 jobs, 3 jobs that do not provide health insurance—but her only source of health insurance right now is Medicaid. Medicaid pays for her young son to see a neurologist and get treatments for his seizures and his asthma, and it also pays for his medication, inhalers for both of them. She said, "Without Medicaid I would not be able to pay for my son's medical needs."

I could go on to so many different situations, but the bottom line of this vote is about our values and our choices.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. STABENOW. This amendment reflects what is best about America. I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

The Senator from New York is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I, too, come to the floor in support of the Smith-Bingaman amendment, and I thank our colleagues for bringing this amendment forward. What it does is very simply and very profoundly say, wait a minute, let's not cut Medicaid right now. Let's take the \$15 billion in cuts that are in this budget resolution and restore them. But that is not the end of it. Let's also put together a bipartisan commission so that we can take a hard look at Medicaid and try to figure out how to improve service delivery and quality and do more to make it cost effective.

I am very proud to cosponsor this amendment because I believe this is the right way to go. I believe wholeheartedly that we should be on a much

faster track to return to fiscal discipline and to reduce the unprecedented deficits we are running. But I do not believe slashing Medicaid funding is the answer to getting our fiscal house in order, and it is regrettable that we would have in this same budget room for millions and millions of dollars more in tax cuts while we attempt to balance our budget on the backs of our most vulnerable citizens.

I can look at the growth in Medicaid and certainly see the same strategy that everyone else has. In part it is part of the sluggish economy, the loss of health insurance benefits for so many people who do still have jobs. I know in my own State the Medicaid Program grew between 2000 and 2004. In fact, in the last 4 years in America, we have seen 35 million more Americans receive their health insurance through Medicaid. We now have 45 million uninsured Americans. I think that number would be above 50 million if we did not have Medicaid as a health care safety net.

This budget resolution hits New York especially hard, cutting our Medicaid funding by almost \$2 billion. Let me just tell you what that means. We provide insurance to 4.1 million New Yorkers through Medicaid. That includes 1.7 million children, 1.4 million adults, and 1 million elderly and disabled beneficiaries. These are people who are the frail elderly in nursing homes. These are the children of those who are working but do not have health insurance. These are people living with chronic diseases. For these people, Medicaid truly is their last resort. They have nowhere else to turn.

As some of you know, I just spent 5 days in the hospital in New York City with my husband, and we are very fortunate we can go to one of the finest hospitals in the world to get the care that is necessary, but I know very well that that hospital has two-thirds of its income coming in Medicare and Medicaid. It is in an area in New York City where there are a lot of poor people, people who get up every day and go to work. They get on the subways, the trains, they get to work, they work hard, but they do not have health insurance. Medicaid enables them to go to that hospital just like my husband can go to that hospital.

We need Medicaid reform. That is what Senators SMITH and BINGAMAN are proposing. Let us do the right diagnosis about what is wrong with Medicaid. Let us do what we need to do to get it on a better footing, but let me add that the costs in Medicaid have gone up more than the cost of private insurance. This is not just a problem in Medicaid, this is a problem in the health care system, and we are going to make our problem worse if we do this cutting of Medicaid without this type of bipartisan amendment.

If we tried to cut in New York, for example, we would have to make some horrible choices. Should we cut out children? Should we eliminate 100,000

beneficiaries, most of whom are in nursing homes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. CLINTON. I urge adoption of this very important and necessary amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I yield myself 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, let me once again do what I did last evening, and that is commend Senator SMITH for his leadership on this important issue. This is a very important test of what our priorities are and also whether we are essentially going to try to take advantage of those we think are less organized to resist.

There are a lot of ways we can save money in health care costs that the Federal Government underwrites. In fact, I have an amendment I am going to be offering later on today where I will propose some significant cuts, substantially more than we are talking about here, that can be saved in Medicare because I believe we should look at health care as an area where we need to constrain the growth in costs. But the problem is this budget does not do anything about Medicare. This budget particularly does not do anything about the enormous growth in the cost of Medicare as a result of last year's prescription drug bill. There are a lot of provisions in that bill which clearly overfund health maintenance organizations, HMOs, provide a slush fund to be used by the Secretary of Health and Human Resources. There is an enormous amount of money sloshing around in that legislation, but there is no effort in the budget to get at any of that. Instead, we have said, let's go after \$15 billion of cuts in the areas that affect these less organized lobbies, these less organized groups, these groups that are not going to speak up so strongly and resist the cuts.

That is why Senator SMITH's initiative is so important. That is why it is so important that we have a national commission to give us recommendations as to how we can intelligently save money in health care costs in future years.

There are ways that we can better coordinate health care delivery under Medicare and health care delivery under Medicaid. Forty-two percent of the cost of Medicaid is spent on people who are covered by Medicare. Now, we need to do a better job of coordinating those programs, and there are opportunities for saving money. Of course, none of that has been studied, and none of that has been given to us in the way of recommendations. All we are presented with in this budget is a recommendation that we cut \$15 billion and somehow or another essentially shift that cost to the States.

I know there is some discussion up and down the halls that maybe Secretary Leavitt has made some arrangement with the Governors and they are agreeable to this \$15 billion cut. I have spoken with our Governor, Governor Richardson of New Mexico, who is head of the western Democratic Governors—maybe all the Governors; I am not exactly sure of the title he holds these days. He is a leader on this issue, and he has assured me there is no deal and that these cuts that are proposed in this budget will adversely affect us in New Mexico.

We are struggling to continue the services we have traditionally provided under Medicaid. We are struggling to deal with the fact that more and more people are insisting on services in Medicaid because they are losing their private health insurance. That is why the cost of Medicaid overall has been going up, because more and more people are dependent on Medicaid.

This is an important amendment. Senator SMITH deserves the support of all of our colleagues on this amendment. I urge all our colleagues to support it. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, a vote for this amendment to defer these cuts to this commission and a reform effort that is bipartisan is not about being against reducing the deficit. It is, in fact, a way to achieve reductions, if that is what it comes to, in a way that takes care of the most vulnerable people in our society.

We are talking about 52 million Americans. Of these, we are talking about the elderly who are in nursing homes. Of these, we are talking about the chronically ill people without income who suffer from cancer or HIV. We are talking about the children of the working uninsured. We are talking about people who have no other recourse except, if they lose their health care, to go to the emergency rooms of our community hospitals. When they go there without the ability to pay, they are served, but we are all then later served the passing on of these costs in the form of higher prices to private plans and businesses—small businesses especially—that struggle mightily to continue providing health care.

Right now every year 3 percent—and it grows by that number—lose their insurance from their businesses because of the escalating costs largely driven by the inefficient distribution of health care.

It is very important for my colleagues to understand that this is not a vote against a budget of fiscal responsibility. This is a way to proceed toward fiscal responsibility in a way that is thoughtful. It is really important,

when we talk about a population that is vulnerable—those covered by Medicaid—that we do this carefully, that we do it thoughtfully, that we do it right instead of just doing it fast.

The truth is, when you put this kind of cut, \$15 billion, under reconciliation, that means it will be cut. Reconciliation is a Damocles sword that hangs over this place and has the ability to disrupt the regular process, taking it from a committee and right to the floor without the participation that, frankly, we have the privilege to provide but the duty not to shirk.

It is my belief that this proposal of a commission, made up of 23 members—Governors, Senators, Congressmen, providers, advocates, local officials—a bipartisan commission that can deal with the necessary reforms that must come to Medicaid can do them in a way that works for the population that has to be served and to disqualify those who game the system or abuse the system.

I readily acknowledge there is much in Medicaid that is broken. The truth is, we have not had a Medicaid commission since Medicaid's creation in 1965, and now we propose to let the budget drive the policy when we ought to be letting the policy drive the budget.

Given that we are going to do this and need to do it to modernize Medicaid, given the vulnerability of the population served, given the chance to do this right instead of just doing it fast, to let the policy drive the budget instead of the budget driving the policy with this vulnerable population, I plead with my colleagues to stand up to their duty and make sure that Congress is not circumvented, to defend the 52 million people in America who are counting on us to do it right, and not just to do it fast.

If we pass this, the reductions will come, but the reforms and the flexibility necessary at the State level to accommodate that will not be done in a more thoughtful and bipartisan way.

I see no others of my colleagues seeking recognition, so I simply close by asking Republicans and Democrats to be careful with this issue. Of all the choices we make around here on issues affecting the American people, this one calls for the most care, the most caution, the most thought, and the greatest degree of sensitivity because it involves the blind, the lame, the poor, the needy, those who have no recourse if we pull away this central strand in the safety net of America's social promise.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, will my friend from Oregon yield for a moment?

Mr. SMITH. I will be happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise to thank the Senator from Oregon for his leadership. He and the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. BINGAMAN, have led an effort I am proud to cosponsor. His eloquence is meaningful. This is an

opportunity for us to work in a bipartisan way, to lay out a process to achieve what we all want in terms of efficiencies, but to do it in a way that is thoughtful, caring, and appropriate, and to allow us to make the best decisions without hurting the most vulnerable people in this country.

I thank the Senator for his leadership.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for her kind words. I also say to my friend, the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator GREGG is a terrific fellow, one of the best people I know in this place. He has a tough job. I know I have made it more difficult. I, at a personal level, apologize to him for that, but I want him to know—I want all my colleagues to know—how personally and passionately I feel about this as someone who helped to create the Oregon health plan, to find ways to serve more with preventive medicine, in ways that stretch the dollar and serve more people who have no other recourse. I take that responsibility very seriously.

I am trying to reflect that with the best of motives, with an equal commitment to finding a budget that will represent our values and our views that includes all the Members; that does, perhaps for a few days, delay some of the cuts that would fall, but if these cuts fall badly, we will hurt the most vulnerable people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I had the great good fortune when I went to college to be taught by one of the historically strongest history professors in our Nation, a man named David Truman. He went on to be president of Mount Holyoke. He wrote probably the definitive treatise on American Government. One chapter in that treatise was dedicated to committees and commissions. He said that the commission is the place where you send issues when you do not want to have to deal with them, when you want to ignore them, when you want to obfuscate the issue, and when you want to basically kick the can down the road.

He was a brilliant professor and usually right, and in this case obviously totally correct.

This amendment, if it is adopted, will guarantee that the issue of Medicaid is not addressed. That is a guarantee in this decade. It does not kick the can down the road, it kicks the can down the road a decade because we will not do reconciliation again for a long time, I suspect. Next year is an election year, and Congresses are not inclined to make tough choices in election years. It has been 10 years since we did the

last reconciliation bill, so it is unlikely reconciliation will occur again. And we are not going to pass in this Congress a bill which reforms a significant program on the entitlement side without using reconciliation because the courage simply is not here.

So let's talk about why it is absolutely critical that this year we address the Medicaid issue and why it is not going to impact any children and why all this "wearing your heart on the sleeve" language we heard around here is a large amount of puffery.

We had some very disturbing testimony—and I believe that is the term used by the Senator from North Dakota, and it is accurate—from the Comptroller of the Currency as we talked about the liabilities already on the books that our children are going to have to pay because our generation put them on the books. They add up now to \$44 trillion. That is "trillion" dollars. Mr. President, \$44 trillion of liabilities is already on the books.

This chart shows that, \$44 trillion. To try to put that in perspective because a trillion dollars is something nobody can understand. If you take all the taxes paid in America since the Revolution, it adds up to \$38 trillion. So we have on the books more liabilities today than taxes paid in this country in the history of this country.

In fact, if you take the entire net worth of the United States today, and every American adds up all their net worth—all their houses, all their cars, all their jewelry, whatever they have, stocks, bonds, assets, real estate, it comes to \$47 trillion. So we have on the books almost as much obligation as we have net worth.

The practical effect of that is that we are overwhelming the next generation with obligations which they will have to pay. Our children and our grandchildren are going to have to pay the taxes to support that \$44 trillion worth of obligations we put on the books. So it is important that we look at from where those obligations come.

They come primarily from what is known as entitlement accounts, specifically three major accounts: Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. In fact, the vast majority of them do not come from Social Security, they come from Medicare and Medicaid. Health care represents \$27 trillion of that \$44 trillion of costs that are on the books that our children are going to have to pay because we have already committed them to do that to support the baby boom generation when it retires.

It is entitlements that are the issue. My colleagues have come forward and said: But we do not have to deal with Social Security, even though the President has been willing to discuss it. We do not have to deal with it, no; stiff arm Social Security. OK, that is off the table.

The President says he just amended the Medicare law, so he does not want to move on Medicare this year. OK, that is off the table.

That leaves one issue, one major program that should be looked at this year at least, and that, of course, is Medicaid.

The other side of the aisle and three speakers this morning have already said you can just address this problem by raising taxes. I note—it does not appear to be anybody has focused on this at all—but the amendment before us does not raise taxes, it raises the deficit. We heard all of yesterday, the day before, and the day before that how the other side of the aisle did not want to raise the deficit; they wanted to be the party that was opposed to deficit spending. Today they come forward and the vast majority of the people sponsoring and supporting the program, the bill before us, which dramatically raises the deficit by \$14 billion in the 5-year period, something like \$60 billion in the 10-year period.

But even if you accept the fact that they want to raise taxes to pay for it, the issue is, Could you solve this problem, this outyear liability that is caused by all these entitlement accounts, Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, by raising taxes?

You cannot do it. This chart shows it so clearly. The cost of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security is the red line here. The blue line is the historical amount that the Federal Government spends, 20 percent of GDP. That is what we have historically spent, since World War II, essentially. You can see that the red line crosses the blue line in about the year 2029, 2028, in that period. These three programs—Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid—will actually cost the Federal Government more than 20 percent of the gross national product.

What does that mean in practical terms? It means you wouldn't be able to spend any money on education, any money on roads, any money on national defense, because the entire Federal Government would be absorbed by paying for these three programs. Or, alternatively, you could take the approach the other side wants to take, which is raise taxes.

If you did that, you would have to double the tax rate on Americans in order to pay for this program. Working Americans, young Americans, these pages who are here today and are going to get a job, would find their ability to have a decent lifestyle would be dramatically reduced because they would have to pay twice as much in taxes as our generation has paid in order to support these Federal programs which are already on the books.

You cannot tax your way out of this. I don't care if you confiscate all the income of the two top brackets, you cannot get this system under control through taxes. You have to address the other side of the ledger, which is spending responsibly on these programs. That is what this bill tries to do. That is what the budget tries to do.

In a most minor way, a minuscule way, almost, we suggest in this budget

we want to save \$15 billion in the rate of growth—not cuts—in the rate of growth of Medicaid over the next 5 years; \$15 billion. You say \$15 billion is a lot of money. It is a lot of money, but you have to put it in context. Over the next 5 years, the Medicaid system is going to spend \$1.12 trillion—that is trillion with a "t"—and \$15 billion on that amount is 1 percent, essentially. What we are actually trying to save in this bill is \$14 billion.

This chart shows it. Medicaid spending will go up dramatically. It will go up by 39 percent. It will not go up by 41 percent. That is what it would do. It would go up by 41 percent if this bill doesn't go into place, but if this bill goes into place, it will go up by 39 percent. A 39-percent rate of growth in this program is what we are planning.

We have heard people come down here, especially the Senator from Oregon, and say if this language passes, lives will be lost. I think he said that. Children will be lost. That is absurd, misleading, inaccurate, and a total gross exaggeration. I wish the Senator had been a Governor because he would know that the Medicaid system today does not benefit children as much as he thinks it does. There is a large chunk of the Medicaid system today which is being gamed out of the system by States and being used in the general operations by the States to build roads, to put police officers on the road—a large chunk of it. That could be saved.

There is a large chunk of the Medicaid system today which is going to pharmaceuticals to pay dramatically more than what we pay under any other program for pharmaceutical products. That could be saved.

There is a large chunk of the Medicaid system today which is going to people who are gaming the system by what is known as spending down. That is when you, in a rather fraudulent way, get rid of your assets—give them to your kids or give them to somebody else in your family so that you can then come to the Government and say, Support me in a nursing home. So all the other Americans in this country who are playing by the rules end up supporting people who are breaking the rules and who are gaming the system through spending down. Huge amounts of dollars are pouring out of the system under those accounts.

A lot of money is being lost in this system simply because it is inefficiently run, because the Governors do not have the flexibility they need in order to get more service because they know how to deliver it, but instead they are hamstrung by all sorts of rules and regulations which make no sense to them and which undermine their capacity to deliver the service efficiently.

The President and innumerable Governors, responsible Governors in this country, have come forward and said you give more flexibility to the Governors and they can take a little less rate of increase in spending and deliver

much more service to many more kids. So this concept that you cannot get to this 1-percent savings, that you cannot live on a 39-percent rate of growth in Medicaid without having children lose their lives and be not able to go to the emergency room for care, is scare tactics. Not only that, it is not right. Because if you cannot step up—especially as a Republican who supposedly is committed to fiscal responsibility, because that is what our party is supposed to be committed to—and say that you can deliver better service with more flexibility, then you are probably not a very good Governor. I doubt there are any Republican Governors, at least, and I suspect there are not a lot of Democratic Governors who don't believe they can do more with a lot more flexibility.

The President has listed seven or eight—actually, Governor Leavitt has—seven or eight different proposals, none of which impact services one iota and, in fact, some of which would significantly expand services to children, which could be accomplished if we reform the program and would slow the rate of growth in this program along the lines projected here.

So it is unconscionable that people would claim a \$14 billion reduction in the rate of growth when you are having a \$1.1 trillion expenditure, a reduction which represents 1 percent over 5 years, could not be accomplished in the context of a program where there are obviously so many problems which need to be addressed and which could deliver more efficient and more effective service.

It gets back to this point, of course. If we do not do this now, we are not going to do it. This is not an amendment to set up a commission, the purpose of which is to resolve the problem. This is an amendment to set up a commission to make sure the problem is never resolved. It is irresponsible because of that.

I do think it is important to note how this budget has been structured. A lot of people say this Federal budget is pretty meaningless and it is sort of a process we go through here. Of course, 2 out of the last 4 years we didn't even have one. To some degree they are correct, I regret to say.

We have in this budget three basic elements: discretionary spending, entitlement spending, and the other is taxes. On the discretionary side we set a discretionary cap. We have already seen 24 amendments or so offered on the floor that will affect that cap—in other words, Members not willing to accept the spending levels of this budget. They have to put money into this program or that program. We have another hundred or so amendments also pending which do exactly the same. So the willingness to discipline the discretionary side of the ledger is, to say the least, tepid. One would suspect there are going to be a lot of games played with that cap even if it gets into place before we get to the appropriations

process. But it does, hopefully, limit the rate of growth and it does have some impact. But regrettably I have to admit it is at the margin.

Then there is a tax side. Most of the taxes, in this budget at least, are taxes which most people are going to vote for. That point was made yesterday—whether there are reconciliation instructions, most of these tax cuts are going to be extended. They are very popular: R&D, spousal stuff, tuition tax stuff.

No, the essence of this budget is whether we are going to address the fastest growing function of the Federal Government, the function of the Federal Government which is going to bankrupt our children and give them much less of a quality of life than we have had; whether our generation, the baby boom generation, which is now the generation that governs, is going to be willing to stand up and admit that we put too much on the books for our children to bear. That is the essence of this amendment. This amendment knocks out the only significant effort—well, there is one other dealing with the PBGC—the only significant effort to bring under control the rate of growth in the Federal Government in the outyears; the major piece of fiscal discipline.

In the short term you can argue the discretionary caps may help. But in the long term, which is where our big problem is and where we all acknowledge it to be, the only thing that is going to address that is if we reconcile the Medicaid number. If we do not do it this year, it is not going to be done. That is why I find this amendment to be so pernicious, because it is put forward as if the people who support it are for fiscal discipline when in fact its practical implication is to gut the only thing in this budget which actually will generate fiscal discipline. And it is being done by Republicans. You have to ask yourself how they get up in the morning and look in the mirror.

In any event, that is where we stand. I am not going to deny that this isn't a crucial vote. This is a crucial vote. If the Medicaid language is passed, if it is knocked out of the bill, I think I put in context the effect it has on this budget. More important, I hope I have put in context the effect it is going to have on our kids and our grandkids, because we will have said that in none of the three areas where the explosive growth is occurring—in none of these three areas where we are headed to this disaster, where our children are not going to be able to afford the costs that we have stuck them with—that in none of these three areas is this Congress willing to act. That would be more than an unfortunate event.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Do I have any time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 10 minutes 45 seconds.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I reserve that time and yield the floor. I yield the remainder of the time on my side to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank Senator GREGG for the leadership he provided at the Budget Committee. This is never an easy job. I worked with Senator PETE DOMENICI when he was chairman, and we had this vote-arama and critical votes year after year. We got it done every year except for 2 out of the last 3 years. We need this blueprint in place so we can go forward, so we can have some modicum of controlling ourselves, controlling spending.

I don't like everything in this resolution, particularly. I think right now the aggregate of money for a State is too much; the aggregate amount of money for Treasury and IRS is too much. I would like to have more in agriculture, education, transportation. But if each one of us picks our issue where, "Oh, no, we can't have any restraint here," we will never have any.

I enjoy listening to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle get up and give these great speeches about how we have a problem with the deficit, we have to have restraint, and then when it comes time to have restraint, to do things to help the economy grow, or control spending in any area, we all say: No, not my area.

We have to do it across the board. We know that the problem in the Federal Government is not on the discretionary side. It is not how much we are going to be spending on highways or education. The growth there has been relatively restrained. That is true in most of these categories. The problem is in the mandatory area. Frankly, I have never liked mandatory areas. What does mandatory mean, you get it no matter what? Then a Governor or legislature can keep adding people, keep adding people, perhaps for good reason, perhaps political reasons.

All of a sudden, you have a program that grows like topsy-turvy, totally out of control. It is going to bust State budgets. It already has. It will have a huge impact on the Federal budget.

These mandatory programs are going to cause situations where we cannot continue to afford to spend what we are spending in the future, what we committed to on Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

Do I think this is a great program? Yes. I personally know what they mean. I have benefited from them. I have seen what they don't do. When my father was killed in an automobile accident after 30 years of paying into Social Security, because of the marital situation and my age, our family got nothing out of it.

I would like to have some sort of system where people pay and they have an opportunity for their families to benefit, if they so choose.

Medicare—I know what it means to people who are aged and have health problems. I think what we did on the prescription drug issue was a huge mistake. We didn't have real reforms. In

fact, we put more burdens on Medicare, and we are not going to be able to afford what we have gotten into on Medicare. But Medicaid is the subject for discussion. My State has wrestled with this. Over the past few years, we kept adding people and programs to it until it was not a problem for a while, but for the last 2 years it is absolutely totally out of control, and my poor State of Mississippi, there is a \$270 million hole. The Governor and legislature fought about it, cussed about it, struggled with it. Finally, last Sunday night at midnight they came up with an agreement.

What was the agreement? They couldn't figure out any way to pay for it or to cut it, and they borrowed the money from the tobacco trust fund, and said: Don't worry, we will pay it back later. Excuse me? I don't think that is a very good or permanent solution. The States need help. We need to be thoughtful in how we reform Medicaid to make sure those we are committed to giving help really do get it, and that it is done in a controllable, reasonable way.

The Federal Government is part of the problem. We have to match the funds.

The President made a very small recommendation of some savings in the Medicaid area. Then the Senator from New Hampshire took that, and actually he took some of the savings and added some of it back in areas where it was badly needed, for a net savings of only \$14 billion in this resolution over 5 years. If we cannot support that, we might as well fold our tent.

Let me say to my colleagues here, too, that we are going to have to do this. We are going to have to do it now and later.

When we come back out of conference, we are going to have serious reforms, or a way to get to reforms and some savings in the Medicaid area because we cannot continue down this road.

I am sorry. I am embarrassed to say that Democrats seem to not want to have any kind of restraint, and, unfortunately, some of my Republicans colleagues, too.

This is an important vote. It is not the only important vote. It is not one that will destroy the whole process, but it is going to tell a whole lot about who we are.

I don't see how anybody who votes for this amendment to knock out this little, tiny savings can ever raise their voice again and say they are worried about deficits and Federal Government spending to go on too long. I realize I am talking in very broad terms and not going into any specificity.

This is an important vote. I plead with my colleagues, show some restraint. We have shown so little restraint for several years. We have all been a part of that. But now we are paying the price. We have these deficits which we have to cut. It is estimated this resolution would cut the

deficit about half over the next 5 years. I believe that is right. It is probably not enough. We probably should do more.

The red line and the red ink on the chart in these entitlement programs is going to swamp us. Some people say we can do that later. Can we do it better later? No. Every year we wait, it gets worse. It makes the reforms and the necessary savings more difficult and larger.

I just wanted to urge my colleagues to support the Budget Committee's action and support this resolution. Don't vote to take out the tiny savings in Medicaid that is included here. The States have to be doing some of that. They show a lot more restraint and leadership than we do on them. They have one thing that is different: they have to have balanced their budgets every year. It is in their constitutions. My poor State does. Maybe someday we will still have to come back to that at the Federal level.

I thank Senator GREGG for his leadership, and I thank him for yielding.

Mr. GREGG. I appreciate the appropriate comments of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss devastating cuts to Medicaid included the fiscal year 2006 budget we are now debating. Medicaid has been the most successful health care safety net program our nation has ever established, protecting low-income children, the elderly and the disabled from being uninsured. Fifty-two million people count on this program and without it, these individuals would be forced to seek out care in our emergency rooms, and would likely mean that many low-income seniors in nursing homes would not have appropriate care in older age.

As you know, the budget before us includes \$14 billion in cuts to the Medicaid program over the next 5 years. This is a startling number and represents the single largest cut to any program in this budget. Fourteen billion in cuts is almost as large as the entire State Health Insurance Program or SCHIP budget for the next 3 years, and equal to Federal Medicaid spending in six mid-sized States or 18 small States. If we allow this reconciliation instruction to move forward, it will have very harmful effects for those most in need all across America. These reductions will force states to cut services as well as cut access entirely for certain populations.

In my home State of South Dakota, it is estimated that these Medicaid cuts could cause a loss of coverage for 800 elderly people. These are largely individuals with severe chronic illnesses that require nursing home care. It will also cut coverage for 4,000 children in South Dakota by the end of 2010; children who would have otherwise been covered under the program if the Federal dollars would continue. These are the most vulnerable citizens in my State whose families have likely sold

the farm and exhausted all of their resources just to pay for health care. They are the sickest and the poorest, and this budget tells them that we do not care.

Beyond the devastating effect on those most in need, the budget cuts will inappropriately shift the entire burden of care to cash-strapped States that are already struggling with growing health care costs and will not be able to afford these additional burdens. More than half of all States will see their Federal matching rates decline in 2006 and they will also be required to start making payments back to the Federal Government to finance the new Medicare drug coverage for dual eligibles or those people eligible for both Medicare and Medicaid. Additional Medicaid burdens are of great concern to me and the majority of Governors have also expressed their opposition to the current Medicaid budget.

These budget cuts not only mean that many South Dakotans will lose State coverage, but it also means that the State will have to cut services for those who are lucky enough not to be dropped from the Medicaid program. Cuts in services may mean that people on Medicaid will no longer be able to obtain health services such as breast cancer treatment, rehabilitative care or prescription drugs. The impact of these cuts in care will not just go away because Medicaid stops paying for treatment. Hospitals, health centers and other providers will wind up treating those patients in our emergency rooms and as charity care patients, absorbing those costs. Also, individuals who lose coverage will not have access to preventive care and will likely delay treatment until hospital care is needed. This increases the costs to the system, since a trip to the hospital is going to be much more expensive than if they would have had coverage to go to the doctor or get a prescription drug before getting sick.

Costs within the program are rising, but this is not because the Medicaid program is inefficient. The driving force behind rising costs is the result of many things. The surge in costs are due in part to Congress having failed to deal with the millions of low-income workers who are uninsured, and that Medicare does not pay for long-term nursing home care. Census data has revealed that there were 5.1 million more people uninsured in 2003 than in 2000. An unstable economy has left workers with lower incomes and employers dropping health coverage. Statistics show that two-thirds of those losing coverage are in low-income jobs. Because of these access to coverage problems, Medicaid is filling a critical gap that most in our nation support—ensuring kids have basic medical care, providing low-income working families with health coverage that keeps them healthy and productive, and making sure that seniors have the care they need in old age. These factors do not make the case for cuts to Medicaid, but

rather indicate that we should be doing more to expand the program for those who lack coverage. The SCHIP program was a great example of that, and we should be doing more to pull those that are low-income and uninsured under this umbrella.

The overall rise in health care costs are also contributing to the increased expenses in Medicaid. New technologies and the skyrocketing costs of prescription drugs are sending all health care costs through the roof. Under these circumstances, Medicaid's spending per enrollee has actually been more efficient than other health care payors. The program spending has increased more slowly than private insurance spending and Medicare.

More and more poor people will need programs like Medicaid if the trends continue as they have in recent years. We should be working on solutions to reduce the costs of health care in the United States, but cutting Medicaid is not the answer. We need to closely examine our care system broadly and reduce costs by promoting the use of information technology in health, emphasizing prevention techniques that keep people healthy, and reducing the costs of prescription drugs. It will also be crucial that we closely examine our long-term care system, which accounts for almost one-third of Medicaid spending and will likely increase as our senior population increases in numbers. This is where the discussion must turn to, rather than placing the blame on the Medicaid program which has been a cost efficient, successful program ensuring coverage for millions of Americans most in need.

We will be voting soon on an important amendment offered by Senators SMITH and BINGAMAN, as well as many others, that will strike the reconciliation instructions to the Finance Committee for Medicaid, and strike the function that directs that committee to cut the \$14 billion for that program. In its place, the amendment will create a \$1.5 million reserve fund to create a Medicaid Commission. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this amendment. We do have a need to address the skyrocketing costs of our Federal health care programs and health care in general, and I think the establishment of a commission on Medicaid is a smart way to begin to find solutions. I will support this amendment and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same. We need to get our priorities straight with this budget. A budget that proposes to cut billions in health care coverage for our most vulnerable citizens while at the same time including \$23 billion in tax cuts for capital gains and dividends is not a budget that represents my values or the values of the American people.

AMENDMENT NO. 204

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, our Nation is facing very difficult fiscal realities which are only going to become more difficult and expensive the longer we wait to take action. The Federal

Government can no longer afford "business as usual." According to the GAO, the unfunded Federal financial burden for public debt, including future Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid payments, totals more than \$40 trillion or \$140,000 per man, woman and child. At what point do we listen to the wake up call?

The Federal Reserve Chairman, Alan Greenspan, has recently warned Congress and the Nation that, "In the end, the consequences for the U.S. economy of doing nothing could be severe. But the benefits of taking sound, timely action could extend many decades into the future." We must all work together to reduce the crippling \$412 billion budget deficit and the mounting unfunded Federal financial burden.

I commend the administration for submitting a budget request that proposes reduced funding for a number of programs. I clearly understand that every program is important to certain constituencies, and Medicaid is at the top of the list for many. The Medicaid program provides critical services to some of the most vulnerable people in our nation. In my home State of Arizona, we have an outstanding Medicaid program, the Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System, that represents a model for other States.

Unfortunately, not every state Administers its program as efficiently as Arizona. The reality is, Medicaid costs are skyrocketing out of control. It is time we took a long hard look at this program—as every other program for that matter and develop proposals to ensure that Medicaid will continue to serve the neediest Americans over the long term.

Let me be clear. I do not support across the board cuts to the Medicaid program. In fact, I believe such an action could have a disastrous effect on many important efforts that ensure access to care for many Americans who have nowhere else to turn. Additionally, I recognize that cuts to Medicaid that result in reduction of covered individuals would flood hospital emergency rooms with additional uninsured patients, forcing hospitals to absorb additional cost for uncompensated care. Arizona has one of the highest uninsured populations in the country and a large number of undocumented immigrants, our hospitals are already struggling to absorb the cost of providing uncompensated care, dramatically reducing medicare eligible populations could severely impact the hospital system in my State and in many others.

In debating potential cuts to the Medicaid program, we must work to ensure that the federal government does not further exacerbate these existing problems. Any effort to reform Medicaid must be made in a cautious and deliberative manner.

We simply must start to control spending and make some very difficult decisions among competing priorities. I was pleased to have joined with Sen-

ators SMITH and BINGAMAN in cosponsoring S. 338, the bipartisan commission on Medicaid Act of 2005, which was introduced on February 9, 2005. I cannot vote for the pending amendment because I believe strongly that the fiscal reality of Medicaid must be addressed sooner rather than later. And I have been around here long enough to know that too often we need to have our feet held to the fire to really make meaningful progress on difficult issues. So I hope that we can agree to cut waste in the Medicaid program and also create a bipartisan task force to provide recommendations for how best to reform the program for the long run. In my judgment, only through comprehensive reforms can we prevent across the board cuts in Medicaid in the long term. We should begin our reform efforts today.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the Smith-Bingaman amendment. I am proud to cosponsor this amendment to strike the proposed \$15 billion in cuts to Medicaid and instead create a Medicaid Commission.

In an effort to climb our way out of record Federal budget deficits, the Budget resolution we are considering this week will cut Medicaid by \$15 billion over the next 5 years. This cut would be devastating to millions of low-income families, children, disabled and senior citizens who are served by Medicaid.

I recognize that Medicaid—like all health care programs continues to face higher health care costs. But it is unconscionable to arbitrarily slash billions of dollars from a safety net program like Medicaid, and at the same time, give away billions of dollars worth of tax cuts in the same budget.

The main problem causing Medicaid spending growth is not that it is bloated or inefficient. New studies by the Urban Institute and the Kaiser Family Foundation show that Medicaid spends less, per patient, than private health insurance plans and that its costs have grown more slowly in the last four years than private-sector insurance premiums.

The real cost driver in Medicaid is the economy, which continues to cause a strain on the ability of businesses to offer health insurance coverage to their employees. More and more employers are dropping health insurance coverage, pushing low-wage working families onto public programs, while the overall cost of health care continues to skyrocket. Cutting \$15 billion from Federal Medicaid spending is only going to make matters worse by forcing the problem down to States, which already face severe budget crises.

A \$15 billion cut in Medicaid could translate to a loss of \$300 million for Wisconsin. It would be extremely difficult for Wisconsin and other States to absorb a cut of this magnitude while continuing to provide the level of services on which families depend. A cut of this size has the potential to deprive

thousands of poor families needed medical care and greatly increase the already record number of uninsured Americans.

I do not object to having a thorough discussion about how we can make Medicaid work better to serve low-income Americans. But it is unacceptable to force arbitrary cuts in Medicaid without first taking the time to consider the future efficiency and operation of the Medicaid program. Medicaid is an essential source of health care for 53 million of our nation's most vulnerable citizens, and any changes to the program should be driven by informed, reasoned policy and not by arbitrary budget targets.

I urge my colleagues to reject these harmful cuts.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about Medicaid, a program that is very important to my home State of West Virginia. Over the past few days I have listened to my colleagues characterize the \$15 billion in Medicaid cuts contained in this budget as marginal, minor, and not a big deal. I want to remind my colleagues that this budget isn't simply about numbers. It is about the policies behind the numbers that have an impact on real people who would not have access to health care in the absence of Medicaid.

Medicaid is the absolute bedrock of our nation's health care system. It is the fulfillment of the promise the Federal Government has made to our Nation's most vulnerable citizens that they will have access to affordable health care when times get tough.

It finances nearly 40 percent of all births in the United States. Without it, many pregnant women would forego the prenatal visits and pregnancy-related care that are vital for a child's healthy start. Medicaid provides coverage for one in five of our Nation's children, many of whom would otherwise be uninsured. It pays for half of all nursing home care and is the largest single purchaser of long-term care services in the country.

In every State throughout our Nation, Medicaid keeps hospitals, doctors, nursing homes, and clinics operating in our communities. And, more importantly, it provides our most vulnerable citizens—pregnant women, children, the elderly, and the disabled—with access to meaningful and affordable health care.

The \$15 billion in Medicaid cuts being proposed by this administration matter to the more than 50 million children, pregnant women, seniors, and disabled individuals who rely on Medicaid to meet their health care needs. Some of my colleagues would have you believe that these cuts will have no impact at all on the number of kids covered by Medicaid or the number of people who can access care in nursing homes. They even argue that these cuts will lead to Medicaid expansions because Governors will have greater flexibility over the use of their dollars.

Well, these statements simply are not true. Fewer dollars do not equal

greater flexibility. Fewer dollars mean that States, medical providers, and individual beneficiaries are going to have to shoulder more of the burden of rapidly rising health care costs. Cost-shifts of this magnitude will undoubtedly lead to eligibility restrictions, benefit reductions, increased beneficiary cost-sharing, and provider payment cuts or freezes.

States are already struggling with the numerous unfunded mandates that the Federal Government has passed down in recent years. Twenty-nine states, including my home state of West Virginia, are facing a drop in their Federal medical assistance percentage, FMAP, next year because of a change in the statutory formula used to compute FMAP.

When the Medicare drug benefit starts on January 1, 2006, states will be required to finance a significant portion of the cost. This will be the first time since the enactment of Medicare and Medicaid in 1965 that a specific Medicare benefit will be financed in significant part by state payments. The Congressional Budget Office, CBO estimates that, at a minimum, states will pay \$48 billion toward the Medicare prescription drug benefit in the first 5 years. These costs could be much greater if more dual eligibles sign up for prescription drug coverage or if States have to cover the costs of drugs for dual eligibles that private drug plans do not cover.

West Virginia is scheduled to lose \$36 million in Federal Medicaid matching funds in 2006. And, it is still unclear how much implementation of the Medicare prescription drug law will cost. The additional cuts proposed by the President could result in West Virginia losing as much as \$100 million in Federal Medicaid matching funds next year alone. The hospitals, doctors, nursing homes and clinics in my State cannot afford to absorb cuts of this magnitude.

This budget isn't about reducing the Federal deficit. Otherwise, we would have eliminated the \$70 billion in tax cuts that are contained in this budget. We would have taken an objective look at entitlement spending, and not just focused on the program that provides health benefits to the working poor. We would have reined in excessive overpayments to private plans under Medicare and found ways to lower Medicare prescription drug costs.

This budget isn't about reforming the Medicaid program for the better. Otherwise, it would have addressed the real reasons Medicaid cost are going up: significant decreases in employer-sponsored health coverage and Medicare's gaps in long-term care coverage. Otherwise, the administration would have provided specific policy proposals for strengthening Medicaid for the future, instead of vague ideas that even the Congressional Budget Office could not score. If this budget were truly about improving Medicaid, then the administration would not be attempting

to shoehorn sweeping changes to the program into an arbitrary budget number. Instead, Medicaid policy would determine the budget number.

I would like to say to my colleagues that Democrats are happy to discuss strengthening the Medicaid program for the future. We are happy to work toward reforming the program for the better. However, the prescription for Medicaid must adequately address the larger problems with our health care system that have an impact on the program. This is clearly not the case with this budget.

The bottom line is that this budget is about choices, and this administration has chosen to unfairly target low-income working families. This budget robs the most vulnerable in our society, while simultaneously giving greater tax breaks to the rich. This is unacceptable. The Federal Government has a responsibility to maintain its commitment to Medicaid in order to protect access to health care for working Americans.

That is why I oppose the \$15 billion in Medicaid cuts included in the budget and will vote for the Smith-Bingaman amendment to strike these cuts from the budget resolution.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I support the floor amendment offered by my colleagues Senators BINGAMAN and SMITH to strike the cuts from Medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Program, SCHIP, in the budget resolution.

The budget resolution includes \$15.2 billion in reductions in mandatory programs that are part of Function 550, which is limited to health programs. Medicaid and SCHIP are the only mandatory programs in this category that are under the jurisdiction of the Senate Finance Committee.

The reductions in Medicaid included in the budget resolution will lead to further cuts in coverage and benefits for people in need. They will prevent individuals from being able to access health care, which will increase the burden on our public health system. In Hawaii, Medicaid and QUEST, Hawaii's program that provides health coverage through managed care plans for eligible lower income residents, provided essential health services to nearly 190,000 people in 2002. For those in rural Hawaii, particularly the elderly, Medicaid provides access to health care that they might otherwise have to go without. The Medicaid cuts will further erode the ability of hospitals, clinics, physicians, and other medical providers to meet the health care needs of our communities. These very same health care providers already are confronted with inadequate reimbursements, rising costs, and an increasing demand to provide care for the uninsured.

Without doubt, the Medicaid reductions in the Senate budget plan would adversely affect health care coverage for low-income, uninsured Americans. Medicaid programs are demanding a

larger share of state spending than they have in recent years. Reducing the Federal commitment to Medicaid will push additional costs to the States and increase the number of people who are uninsured or under-insured.

Contributing to the obstacles in delivering quality health care to those who need it the most are the critical losses that a majority of states will see in their Federal Medical Assistance Percentage, FMAP. The FMAP formula is designed to pay a higher FMAP to states with lower per capita income relative to the national average. According to the Federal Funds Information for States in its report, Fiscal year 2006 FMAP projections, 30 States are projected to experience cuts in their FMAP. This aggregate FMAP cut translates into an \$850 million reduction in FY 2006 Medicaid grants to the impacted states. The five states facing the largest FMAP decreases include Alaska, Wyoming, New Mexico, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

Hawaii faces a projected FMAP decline of 0.7 percent for FY 2006, which translates to a loss of \$655,000 that could be used to provide health care to the citizens of my state. While it may seem like a small decline compared to larger, more prosperous states, let me assure you that the loss will be felt. In a June 2004 report by the Families USA organization, nearly one out of three people under the age of 65 went without health insurance for all or part of the 2-year period from 2002-2003 in Hawaii. More alarming is the statistic that nearly 82 percent of uninsured people in Hawaii are members of working families. The report went on to make the distinction that 61 percent of families in Hawaii, at or below 200 percent of the Federal poverty level, were uninsured.

In 2005, it is estimated that the Hawaii Medicaid program will spend just over \$929 million. Of this, the Federal Government will contribute nearly \$544 million. A substantial portion of Hawaii's health care industry relies on Medicaid spending. In 2002, Medicaid payments infused Hawaii's hospital system with more than \$106 million. In addition, Medicaid is the primary payer for 70 percent of Hawaii's certified nursing facility residents. Any cut in Medicaid funding will have a profound effect on the economic viability of Hawaii's health care system and its ability to care for people in need.

Medicaid costs for States have soared in recent years, driven by rising health-care costs, an aging population that relies largely on Medicaid to pay for nursing homes, and a recession that sent more people to state-supported health care. Medicaid reform needs to have a reform discussion that is not driven by an arbitrary budget number.

While I support improving the health care delivery system for all citizens of our country, the need for unique legislation to satisfy an essential, fundamental need is indicative of the flaws

in the current Medicaid system and an issue that the commission proposed by this amendment can address. Medicaid needs more funding, not less. Escalating costs, the increase in the number of uninsured, FMAP cuts, and the clawback provision in the 2003 Medicare drug benefit legislation only serve to put more pressure on state budgets. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to restore dollars available to provide essential Medicaid coverage to our country's most vulnerable citizens.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, Medicaid provides a critical safety net for 53 million Americans—low-income children, parents, disabled and elderly citizens who have nowhere else to turn for health care. Medicaid now provides health care for 1 in every 5 children. It pays for one-third of all births in this country, almost 40 percent of all long-term care expenses, a sixth of all drug costs, and half of the States' mental health services. It also is the largest payer of services for AIDS patients.

What does it say about the leadership of this Senate that it proposes to cut \$15 billion from Medicaid? That program provides health care for 25 million children, 13 million low-income adults, and 15 million disabled and elderly Americans. These cuts are proposed at the very same time the budget once again proposes large new tax cuts tilted toward higher income households. Our colleagues say they have no choice but to make these cuts to Medicaid because of the large deficit. But the large deficit was created by the large tax breaks for the rich, not by Medicaid.

The budget is a blueprint of Congress' priorities for the Nation. This Congress once again shows that it cares more about those who have the most than it does about those who have the least. How can we possibly continue to give tax breaks each year to the wealthy, and reduce health benefits for the poor to pay for them. Those are not the values we stand for.

In fact, the budget cuts in the Senate resolution are even deeper than the cuts proposed in the administration budget. Even if the Finance Committee adopts every cut the President proposed to Medicaid, they will still need to come up with an additional \$7 billion in cuts to meet the target in this bill.

We need to maintain the Federal commitment to medical care for the poorest of the poor. If we weaken the Federal commitment, these men, women, and children will go without care, or show up at the emergency room door. We know that lack of access to care causes harmful consequences. We cannot abandon our responsibility to provide for those among us who are less fortunate.

This budget will force the States to pick up costs that the Federal Government should be covering. It will result in a massive shift of responsibility from the Federal Government to the

States. We already have shifted much of the cost of the elderly to the States, costs that should be covered by Medicare. More than 40 percent of all Medicaid expenditures are used to fill the gaps in Medicare. Medicaid pays for their long-term care, their prescription drugs, and their cost-sharing.

Medicaid is the largest source of long-term care today. The more than 7 million persons who are eligible for both Medicare and Medicaid are among the most vulnerable. Seventy percent of them have incomes below \$10,000. Nearly one in four live in long-term care facilities. They are twice as likely to have Alzheimer's disease, and more likely to have diabetes and stroke than others on Medicare beneficiaries. They are a small proportion of the Medicaid population, but their costs are among the highest. Medicare will start paying for prescription drugs for the dually eligible next January, but the states will see little or no relief. In fact, because of the so-called "clawback" formula in the prescription drug law, many states will end up sending the federal government more money for picking up these drug costs than they would have spent without the drug bill. What kind of relief is that?

We can all agree that we need to improve Medicaid. We have an opportunity to improve the program, but that is not what this budget does. This budget is not driven by policy—it is driven by an arbitrary number that was picked by the leadership as their deficit reduction target. The Federal Government needs to maintain its commitment to health care, not try to weaken it and dump the costs on the states. We need to help the states provide health care, not cut federal funding and put a bigger burden on them. But that is exactly what this budget does.

Some on the other side describe these cuts as minor, or as reductions in growth, or as necessary Medicaid reforms. Don't believe a word of that. Nothing is further from the truth. There are no policy reasons for these cuts. They are large, harmful cuts that are being made so that they can say they are reducing the deficit. But if you look at the numbers, this budget doesn't reduce the deficit—it increases it over the next 5 years. Despite these harmful cuts in Medicaid, they add yet another round of tax breaks. Where is the fairness in that? It is Robin Hood in reverse steal from the poor to give to wealthy.

Our colleagues say we need to cut Medicaid because it is growing too fast. The reason is obvious. It is growing because over the past 4 years, more people are losing their jobs and their health care, falling into poverty, and finding themselves with no option but Medicaid. That is what is responsible for Medicaid's growth.

Over the past 4 years, the number of uninsured has climbed from 40 million to 45 million, and it is expected to continue growing for the foreseeable fu-

ture. The number of uninsured would have been much greater without Medicaid. During the same time period that the number of uninsured increased by 5 million, the number of Americans on Medicaid grew by 9 million. If Medicaid had not been available to them, we would be facing 54 million uninsured. Is that the kind of policy the Nation wants to promote?

Medicaid enrollment grew 40 percent over the past 5 years, and it is projected to grow another 5 percent this year. Enrollment growth is causing Medicaid's rising cost, not inefficiencies, or fraud, or abuse. In fact, the cost of private employer-sponsored health insurance has grown at twice the rate of Medicaid. The percentage of Americans with employer-sponsored health insurance fell, but the number of Americans on Medicaid grew, and that growth was largely caused by the bad economy, the continuing decline of employer health insurance, and the soaring cost of prescription drugs.

Cutting costs is the wrong prescription for Medicaid. This amendment will give us time to assess Medicaid fairly, and base any changes on sound policy, not arbitrary budget cuts. These cuts will have a real impact on real people. Millions may lose their only hope for health care if we allow these cuts to stand. Emergency rooms will have more and more patients with nowhere else to turn, and the Nation's health care safety net will continue to fray. That is not the kind of budget we ought to be approving.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Smith-Bingaman amendment. Our goal on Medicaid is to improve it, not dismantle it.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, over the last century, the Nation has witnessed tremendous advances in medical science and technology. We now have treatments and cures for diseases and conditions that were at one time surely fatal. Thirty years ago, if children developed cancer, doctors couldn't save their lives. Today, more than three-quarters of children with cancer survive. Heart disease is no longer the leading cause of death because of significant improvements in medical treatment and surgical procedures. Americans with AIDS are living many years longer and spending more time at home and not in hospitals because of new drug cocktails that prevent infections and other deadly complications.

The unfortunate and bitter irony is that while the number of medical breakthroughs continues to increase, so does the number of Americans who will never benefit from them. Right now, 45 million Americans have no health care coverage, and this number continues to rise. Over a 2-year period, over 85 million Americans have not had continuous insurance coverage. In this land of plenty and opportunity, 350,000 uninsured children with earaches and sore throats will never see a doctor. Sixteen million uninsured Americans

cannot afford to fill prescriptions. Uninsured women who develop breast cancer are 40 percent more likely to die, as are 50 percent of uninsured men with prostate cancer. The Institute of Medicine has reported that 18,000 adults die every year because they are uninsured.

For many Americans, Medicaid represents their only real hope of obtaining health care. Nationally, 53 million people rely on Medicaid coverage, including 25 million children, 13 million low-income adults, and 15 million disabled and elderly Americans. Nearly 16 percent of people who live in rural areas have Medicaid coverage, including more than 1 in 4 children in these areas. One quarter of African Americans and 20 percent of Hispanics rely on Medicaid, as do 9 percent of women.

In my home State of Illinois, Medicaid provides health coverage for 2 million residents. Over 30 percent of children in Illinois receive health care through KidCare. Nearly 65 percent of nursing home residents rely on Medicaid coverage.

Despite Medicaid's critical role in providing access to care, the Republican budget proposes to cut Medicaid by \$15 billion. This cut translates into an estimated \$287 million loss for Illinois. Experts report this funding could provide health care coverage for 200,000 children or 135,000 working parents in my State.

Some of my colleagues argue that we have no choice but to make large cuts to Medicaid because of the deficit. But these deficits were created by huge tax breaks for the rich, not by Medicaid, and we should not balance the budget at the expense of health care for low-income children, their parents, pregnant women and seniors. We cannot keep tax cuts for the rich and cut basic health care for the poor. We cannot retreat from our Federal commitment to Medicaid and leave the States holding the bag.

I agree the Medicaid Program is not perfect. The Smith-Bingaman amendment to create a commission to study the program and make recommendations for improvement is a reasonable approach. Sound policy, not politics or deficit concerns, should guide any changes to the Medicaid Program, and I am not convinced that we have examined or discussed the full range of Medicaid-related issues and options before us.

We cannot and should not deny millions of Americans access to basic health care. Medicaid is the Nation's safety net, and we should strengthen it, not destroy it. I am going to vote yes for the Smith-Bingaman amendment to strike proposed cuts in funding for Medicaid, and I urge my colleagues to join me.

AMENDMENT NO. 229

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). Without objection, the pending amendment will be set aside, and the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG], for Mr. FRIST, proposes an amendment numbered 229.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding medicaid reconciliation legislation consistent with recommendations from the secretary of health and human services)

Beginning on page 58, strike line 11 and all that follows through page 61, line 24, and insert the following:

SEC. 504. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING MEDICAID RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION CONSISTENT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Medicaid program provides essential health care and long-term care services to more than 50,000,000 low-income children, pregnant women, parents, individuals with disabilities, and senior citizens. It is a Federal guarantee that ensures the most vulnerable will have access to needed medical services.

(2) The Medicaid program will spend \$189,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2006.

(3) During the period from fiscal year 2006 through fiscal year 2010, the Medicaid program will spend \$1,100,000,000,000.

(4) Over the same period, spending for the Medicaid program will increase by 40 percent.

(5) Medicaid provides critical access to long-term care and other services for the elderly and individuals living with disabilities, and is the single largest provider of long-term care services. Medicaid also pays for personal care and other supportive services that are typically not provided by private health insurance or Medicare, but are necessary to enable individuals with spinal cord injuries, developmental disabilities, neurological degenerative diseases, serious and persistent mental illnesses, HIV/AIDS, and other chronic conditions to remain in the community, to work, and to maintain independence.

(6) Medicaid supplements the Medicare program for more than 6,000,000 low-income elderly or disabled Medicare beneficiaries, assisting them with their Medicare premiums and co-insurance, wrap-around benefits, and the costs of nursing home care that Medicare does not cover. The Medicaid program spent nearly \$40,000,000,000 on uncovered Medicare services in 2002.

(7) This resolution assumes \$163,000,000 in spending to extend Medicare cost-sharing under the Medicaid program for the Medicare part B premium for qualifying individuals through 2006.

(8) Medicaid provides health insurance for more than 1/4 of America's children and is the largest purchaser of maternity care, paying for more than 1/3 of all the births in the United States each year. Medicaid also provides critical access to care for children with disabilities, covering more than 70 percent of poor children with disabilities.

(9) More than 16,000,000 women depend on Medicaid for their health care. Women comprise the majority of seniors (71 percent) on Medicaid. Half of nonelderly women with permanent mental or physical disabilities have health coverage through Medicaid. Medicaid provides treatment for low-income

women diagnosed with breast or cervical cancer in every State.

(10) Medicaid is the Nation's largest source of payment for mental health services, HIV/AIDS care, and care for children with special needs. Much of this care is either not covered by private insurance or limited in scope or duration. Medicaid is also a critical source of funding for health care for children in foster care and for health services in schools.

(11) Medicaid funds help ensure access to care for all Americans. Medicaid is the single largest source of revenue for the Nation's safety net hospitals, health centers, and nursing homes, and is critical to the ability of these providers to adequately serve all Americans.

(12) Medicaid serves a major role in ensuring that the number of Americans without health insurance, approximately 45,000,000 in 2003, is not substantially higher. The system of Federal matching for State Medicaid expenditures ensures that Federal funds will grow as State spending increases in response to unmet needs, enabling Medicaid to help buffer the drop in private coverage during recessions. More than 4,800,000 Americans lost employer-sponsored coverage between 2000 and 2003, during which time Medicaid enrolled an additional 8,400,000 Americans.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Committee on Finance shall not report a reconciliation bill that achieves spending reductions that would—

(A) undermine the role the Medicaid program plays as a critical component of the health care system of the United States;

(B) cap Federal Medicaid spending, or otherwise shift Medicaid cost burdens to State or local governments and their taxpayers and health providers, forcing a reduction in access to essential health services for low-income elderly individuals, individuals with disabilities, and children and families; or

(C) undermine the Federal guarantee of health insurance coverage Medicaid provides, which would threaten not only the health care safety net of the United States, but the entire health care system;

(2) the Secretary of Health and Human Services, working with bipartisan, geographically diverse members of the National Governors Association and in consultation with key stakeholders, shall make recommendations for changes to the Medicaid program that reflect the principles specified in paragraph (3); and

(3) the Committee on Finance, consistent with such recommendations, shall report a reconciliation bill that—

(A) allows any Medicaid savings to be shared by the Federal and State governments;

(B) would emphasize State flexibility through voluntary options for States; and

(C) would not cause Medicaid recipients to lose coverage.

Mr. GREGG. I yield back such time as I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I ask what the time situation is and the parliamentary situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will have 15 minutes equally divided on the amendment.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield myself 3 minutes of the 7½ minutes that I have available.

AMENDMENT NO. 156

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk.

MARCH 4, 2005.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], for himself, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. REED, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DODD, Mr. OBAMA, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BYRD, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. LIEBERMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 156.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To restore funding for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program and other programs proposed to be eliminated and to retain the administration of these programs at their current agencies by adopting proposals to close certain tax loopholes that were approved by the Senate in the last Congress)

On page 3 line 10, increase the amount by \$427,000,000.

On page 3 line 11, increase the amount by \$627,000,000.

On page 3 line 12, increase the amount by \$455,000,000.

On page 3 line 13, increase the amount by \$214,000,000.

On page 3 line 14, increase the amount by \$103,000,000.

On page 3 line 19, increase the amount by \$427,000,000.

On page 3 line 20, increase the amount by \$627,000,000.

On page 3 line 21, increase the amount by \$455,000,000.

On page 4 line 1, increase the amount by \$214,000,000.

On page 4 line 2, increase the amount by \$103,000,000.

On page 4 line 7, increase the amount by \$1,890,000,000.

On page 4 line 16, increase the amount by \$427,000,000.

On page 4 line 17, increase the amount by \$627,000,000.

On page 4 line 18, increase the amount by \$455,000,000.

On page 4 line 19, increase the amount by \$214,000,000.

On page 4 line 20, increase the amount by \$103,000,000.

On page 16 line 15, increase the amount by \$1,219,000,000.

On page 16 line 16, increase the amount by \$38,000,000.

On page 16 line 20, increase the amount by \$365,000,000.

On page 16 line 24, increase the amount by \$442,000,000.

On page 17 line 3, increase the amount by \$207,000,000.

On page 17 line 7, increase the amount by \$103,000,000.

On page 17 line 16, increase the amount by \$671,000,000.

On page 17 line 17, increase the amount by \$389,000,000.

On page 17 line 21, increase the amount by \$262,000,000.

On page 17 line 25, increase the amount by \$13,000,000.

On page 18 line 4, increase the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 30 line 16, decrease the amount by \$427,000,000.

On page 30 line 17, decrease the amount by \$1,826,000,000.

On page 48 line 6, increase the amount by \$1,890,000,000.

On page 48 line 7, increase the amount by \$427,000,000.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, first, let me say at the outset, because I neglected to do so the other day in the general debate, that I commend both the chairman of the Budget Committee and the ranking minority member of the Budget Committee for the fair and expeditious way in which consideration of this resolution was conducted in the committee. We have a new chairman. It is always a challenge, and I want to express to him my recognition of the fair process conducted in the committee, which is, of course, essential to the Senate working through controversial issues and trying to reach a solution.

This amendment would restore approximately \$1.89 billion in cuts that are in the administration's proposed budget to the Community Development Block Grant Program and a number of other development programs that have been proposed for elimination. It would bring all of those programs back to the 2005 level. It is my view, and the view of a majority of the Members of the Senate expressed in a letter sent to Chairman GREGG and Senator CONRAD, that the administration of these 18 programs should remain as they are currently constituted.

In other words, the community development block grant should continue to be housed at HUD, the rural programs at USDA, and this effort to shift all of them over to the Department of Commerce, an idea which has not been considered, not examined, not brought to the floor of the Congress, ought not to be carried through.

I am going to focus on the CDBG Program primarily because very substantial cuts have been proposed in the budget.

Roy Bernardi, the Deputy Secretary of HUD, a former mayor of Syracuse, has said that the foundation of virtually all community and economic development occurring across the Nation is CDBG. This is the Deputy Secretary of HUD, formerly mayor of Syracuse. He said:

We must continue to support and build upon programs that work, those that have a proven record of flexibility and the ability to fit in with locally determined needs. CDBG is such a program and ranks among our Nation's oldest and most successful programs.

I have two letters strongly supporting full funding for the CDBG Program at HUD, signed by a host of State, city, and county organizations, such as the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Association of Counties, and the National Governors Association.

I ask unanimous consent those two letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. JUDD GREGG,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. KENT CONRAD,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GREGG AND RANKING MEMBER CONRAD: As you prepare to consider the FY 2006 Budget Resolution, we the undersigned organizations want to convey our opposition to proposed cuts in the FY 2006 Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) budget. We respectfully request that you craft a Budget Resolution that will provide adequate budget authority for all HUD programs and maintain important community and economic development functions and funding at HUD.

Of particular concern to us is the proposed elimination of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program along with 17 other federal community and economic development grant programs. We oppose in the strongest terms the elimination of CDBG, and we urge you to reject the proposed "Strengthening America's Communities" (SAC) Initiative and support full funding for the CDBG program at HUD.

As you know, the FY 2006 Budget would effectively eliminate 18 community and economic development programs, including CDBG, and create an entirely new initiative to be operated by the Department of Commerce. Proposed funding for this "consolidated" program would be \$3.7 billion, a 35% reduction in funding when compared to total FY 2005 appropriations for the 18 programs targeted for elimination under the initiative. Consider that Congress funded the CDBG program alone at \$4.7 billion in FY 2005, \$1 billion more than the entire proposed budget for the SAC initiative.

Eliminating these 18 programs and substantially reducing the federal investment in community and economic development would have a devastating impact on state and local governments. Each of these existing programs is an important and necessary component of urban, suburban, and rural communities' efforts to revitalize neighborhoods, expand affordable housing opportunities and create economic growth. We believe that CDBG is the glue that holds these efforts together.

For 30 years, the CDBG program has served as the cornerstone of the federal government's commitment to partnering with state and local governments to strengthen our nation's communities and improve the quality of life for low- and moderate-income Americans. Since its inception, CDBG has made a real and positive difference in communities across America, and there is no shortage of CDBG success stories. Many of the groups that signed this letter have been working in partnership with HUD and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in a good faith effort to improve the CDBG program's ability to measure performance. As a result of this effort, HUD plans to unveil a new outcome-based measurement system in early 2005. As recently as November 2004, OMB endorsed this undertaking. We believe this new system will verify what is already obvious: CDBG works.

CDBG's emphasis on flexibility and local determination of priority needs through citizen participation is allowing state and local governments to achieve real results. According to HUD's "Highlights of FY 2004 CDBG Accomplishments," CDBG funding led to the creation or retention of more than 90,000 jobs in the last year alone. Thanks to CDBG, in 2004 over 130,000 rental units and single-family homes were rehabbed, 85,000 individuals received employment training, 1.5 million youth were served by after-school enrich-

ment programs and other activities, and child care services were provided to 100,065 children in 205 communities across the country. CDBG also funded nearly 700 crime prevention and awareness programs. Additionally, more than 11,000 Americans became homeowners last year thanks to CDBG funding. CDBG remains a smart, efficient form of investment, as it continues to leverage around three dollars for every dollar of federal investment. It certainly did not come as a surprise to us when HUD Secretary Alphonso Jackson, in a March 2nd appearance before the House Financial Services Committee, stated, "The program works."

The CDBG program's design is especially successful at targeting resources to those who need them most. In 2004, 95 percent of funds expended by entitlement grantees and 96 percent of state CDBG funds expended were for activities that principally benefited low- and moderate-income persons. A full half of persons directly benefiting from CDBG-assisted activities were minorities, including African Americans, Hispanics, Asians, and American Indians. Despite the fact that economic challenges and pockets of poverty exist in almost all American communities, adoption of the SAC initiative would almost certainly result in a complete loss of funding for a significant number of communities.

For all of the reasons detailed above, we believe that CDBG should remain at HUD and receive full funding of at least \$4.7 billion in FY 2006. We also believe it is premature for the Budget Resolution to even address such a far-reaching change to the program before the numerous committees of jurisdiction have had sufficient opportunity to hold appropriate hearings on the topic. We urge you to craft a Budget Resolution reflecting those sentiments. More specifically, we strongly encourage you to include language in your Resolution clearly stating that the Resolution "does not assume enactment of the proposed 'Strengthening America's Communities' Initiative nor the proposed reduction in funding for the CDBG program included in the Administration's FY 2006 budget."

We thank you for your favorable consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Council of State Community Development Agencies.

The Enterprise Foundation.
Habitat for Humanity International.
Housing Assistance Council.
Local Initiatives Support Corporation.
National Association for County Community and Economic Development.
National Association of Counties.
National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials.
National Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies.
National Community Development Association.
National Conference of Black Mayors.
National League of Cities.
National Low Income Housing Coalition.
United States Conference of Mayors.

MARCH 15, 2005.

Hon. BILL FRIST,
Majority Leader, Office of the Senate Majority Leader, Capitol Building, Washington, DC.
Hon. HARRY REID,
Minority Leader, Office of the Senate Minority Leader, Capitol Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER FRIST AND MINORITY LEADER REID: As a diverse coalition of organizations representing the nation's community and economic development practitioners, elected officials and constituency groups, we are writing to express our overwhelming opposition to the Administration's

proposal to eliminate 18 federal community and economic development programs and reduce federal grant assistance for distressed and underserved local communities by \$2 billion each year. We strongly urge you to restore these vital resources as part of the FY2006 congressional budget resolution.

At a time when nearly every American business and community is confronting intense competition from emerging and developing nations, the federal government should be expanding its resources and assistance for local community and economic development. Instead, the Administration is recommending a 34 percent funding cut and more unfunded mandates for our nation's state and local governments. The President's plan would also significantly diminish and eviscerate the federal role in community development projects such as providing first-time access to clean and drinkable water, affordable housing and community facilities for our nation's poorer areas and citizens.

From our perspective as the constituencies at the frontlines of community and economic development, we feel strongly that the current federal investment of \$5.7 billion each year is a solid, wise and effective investment in our nation's local communities. While we understand and recognize the current federal budget climate, we must point out that the proposed funding cut represents less than one-half of a percent of last year's federal deficit. More importantly, the \$2 billion reduction in federal investments will result in the loss of at least \$18 billion in matching and leveraging investments by the private sector and other governmental and nonprofit programs at the state and local level.

Our nation's distressed regions, communities and neighborhoods need national leadership, models of innovation and matching funds for locally-led projects and initiatives. Instead, we fear the Administration's proposal will result in more communities marking time in the land of lost opportunity.

Sincerely,

American Planning Association.
American Public Works Association.
Association for Enterprise Opportunity.
Center for Rural Affairs.
Coalition of Community Development Financial Institutions.
US Conference of Mayors.
Council of State Community Development Agencies.
Local Initiatives Support Corporation.
National Association of Counties.
National Association of Development Organizations.
National Association of Regional Councils.
National Association of RC&D Councils.
National Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies.
National Community Capital Association.
National Community Development Association.
National Farmers Union.
National Low Income Housing Coalition.
National Rural Funders Collaborative.
National Rural Housing Coalition.
Northeast-Midwest Institute.
Rural Community Advancement Program.
The Enterprise Foundation.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, the private sector strongly supports CDBG.

Doug Woodruff, Senior Vice President of the Bank of America, said at a recent Hill briefing:

From the perspective of the private sector, the CDBG program provides a valuable and irreplaceable function in the continuum of efforts that surround many revitalization projects.

The success of CDBG is unquestionable. It has produced over 2 million jobs in its 30-year history, and generated more than \$50 billion in personal earnings.

I want to address one other point; that is, how do we restore the funding? That is always a question. It is a matter of priorities.

This amendment proposes to restore the funding by eliminating tax loopholes that were closed by this body in the last Congress. Ninety-two Members voted to do this. A lot of those provisions were dropped in conference.

Just 2 weeks ago, colleagues supported closing these loopholes in the context of the minimum wage debate. Obviously, these loopholes should be closed. The headlines are screaming "abusive tax shelter schemes." The GAO recently reported that 60 of the Nation's largest corporations used and abused tax shelter services in recent years.

Some want to cut other programs but this would mean taking from Peter to pay Paul. We have a perfect opportunity here to recoup valuable revenues that are now being lost through these tax shelter schemes. That is the tradeoff in this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support it.
How much time do I have remaining?
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes forty seconds.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield half of that time to the Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I appreciate very much having an opportunity to support this amendment and to be a cosponsor. I thank my colleague from Maryland for his leadership.

This is a small way in which we support local communities to create jobs, revitalize neighborhoods, support infrastructure, water, sewer, roads—those things that help create jobs.

From the highlights of the 2004 CDBG accomplishments, they show very specifically that they created or had the retention of more than 90,000 jobs last year. In a State like Michigan, this is incredibly important. Over 130,000 rental units and single-family homes were rehabbed, 85,000 individuals received employment training, 1.5 million children were served with afterschool enrichment programs, childcare services were provided to over 100,000 children and their families, 700 crime prevention and awareness programs, and 11,000 Americans became homeowners.

What is more important to each of us as parents than to be able to make sure we have shelter and a home for our children?

These are partnerships with local communities, small amounts of revenue that we bring together with our communities to make major impacts on the quality of life. That is what we are about—to partner with our local communities.

I urge the support of the amendment.
Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I strongly support the Sarbanes amendment, which will prevent one the greatest failings of this President's Budget—the elimination of more than \$2 billion

from critically needed economic development and social service programs and the proposed consolidation of 18 valuable Federal programs into a single block grant under the so-called "Strengthening America's Communities Initiative."

I am heartened that so many of my colleagues have come together in opposition to these cuts—55 Senators wrote to the Budget Committee in an important show of bipartisanship 2 weeks ago.

Under the President's plan most American cities can expect at least a 35 percent cut in assistance from the Federal Government to help secure investment, house the poor, provide health care to the uninsured, and counsel the abused.

If the administration dislikes helping cities, they should have the decency to say so, instead of this charade where they try to hide massive cuts under the cloak of streamlining.

Their proposal insults the intelligence of mayors, community development officials, and social service agencies across the country—by cynically suggesting that somehow these cuts are going to make life better and be helpful to cities across America.

What makes these cuts so objectionable is they come at a time of great stress and difficulty for Americans who live in poverty. We are the wealthiest nation on earth. We are blessed with great abundance. Yet despite our great wealth, too many of our fellow citizens remain in the shadows, the prisoners of persistent and increasing urban and rural poverty.

The numbers are alarming. Today, nearly 36 million Americans live in poverty, and 3 million more working Americans live in hunger or on the verge of hunger today than in 2000. One out of five American children goes to bed hungry each night. We have it in our power to eliminate so much of this poverty.

At the very least, we shouldn't do anything to make it worse which is exactly what this "Strengthening America's Communities" plan from the White House would do. In the powerful words of the Gospel, "To whom much is given, much is required."

We need to pass the Sarbanes amendment, so that the work of tens of thousands of public officials, health officials, educators, community development experts toiling to improve living conditions in our cities isn't made any more difficult.

Mayors across the country on the front lines every day are struggling to create new jobs and attract capital investment. They are struggling to educate and house the children of the poor, and they are not fooled by this administration's misleading slogan "Strengthening America's Communities," because they know it is the exact opposite.

My friend, Mayor Clare Higgins of Northampton isn't fooled. She recently wrote me urging Congress to save Com-

munity Development Block Grants, one of the very few tools she has to meet Northampton's needs and one of the biggest programs on the President's chopping block.

Most recently, Northampton invested \$300,000 of these Federal funds to acquire the Interfaith Cold Weather Emergency Homeless shelter—the only cold weather shelter serving Hampshire County. It is a collaborative effort between area church groups and ServiceNet Inc., a local human service provider. Without these funds, there would be no cold weather shelter in Hampshire County.

Mayor Higgins wrote:

Without CDBG funds, the City will be unable to develop a planned senior center, public services that provide emergency food, homeless services, child care and after school programming, literacy skills and health care would not be funded; the City's ability to promote and develop affordable housing will be severely limited, parks and playgrounds will not be improved, and the City's ability to provide funding for the redevelopment of the former Northampton State Hospital will cease.

Mayor Tom Menino of Boston—the former head of the U.S. Conference of Mayors—isn't fooled. He knows what's at stake and recently conducted an analysis of the budget cuts on his city.

Since 1998 alone—

Mayor Menino stated at a recent press conference—

the City of Boston has permitted almost 5,000 new units of affordable housing and permitted more than 12,000 other units. We have invested a total of \$7.8 million in CDBG funds in 19 large developments that have created a total of 1,175 apartments including 517 units for the formerly homeless.

He went on to say that this budget for housing, community development, and social services threatens to "throw the nation into the dark ages."

That doesn't sound like he believes his community will be "strengthened" by the Bush administration's cuts.

Mayor Menino believes the President's budget will mean the loss of \$8 million in Community Development Block Grant funding for Boston and the loss of \$5.5 million in Community Services Block Grant funding.

On any given night in the City of Boston, there are nearly 6,000 homeless men, women, and children in the city. Shelters in Massachusetts have been overflowing for 6 straight years, with 4 beds available for every 5 adults.

Yet the very support he has relied on to help build 133 units of affordable housing for homeless people, to help 500 low-income homeowners rehabilitate their properties, and to provide 130 first-time homebuyers with their down payments is now in grave danger.

How exactly is the mayor supposed to strengthen Boston when the support he needs to do it is getting the axe under this budget?

Other local officials tell the same story.

A letter I recently received from Elizabeth Cohen, Executive Director of Rape Crises Services of Greater Lowell, says:

Dear Senator Kennedy:

We need your help . . . We use CDBG Funds to support multilingual sexual assault support services. We are the only program in the Greater Lowell area and the only agency to have certified rape crisis counselors who speak Spanish and Khmer. With the elimination of this funding, we will have to cut back on these services, which will result in 100 Khmer-speaking clients being unable to have a counselor in their language . . .

As you know, immigrants and refugees already have many struggles when they move to a new city or new country. Having to deal with the trauma of sexual violence on top of the difficulties in housing, education, food and school can paralyze a family . . . Please don't let the President take away this funding for Lowell.

I ask the Senate, does this sound like we are strengthening communities with this budget?

In Lawrence—one of Massachusetts' and the Nation's poorest cities—CDBG funds have been used to amazing effect to leverage nearly \$110 million of investment in the remediation and redevelopment of an abandoned industrial brownfield site known as the Lawrence Gateway Project.

The city has invested nearly \$6 million of its CDBG funds in the project and formed a model partnership with GenCorp, a private company that has invested \$75 million so far in the redevelopment.

Today, Lawrence is continuing to use its CDBG funds to meet debt service payments on loans made to clean the properties.

Without these Federal funds, the partnership with GenCorp could not exist, and the City would not be able to do anything about this 15-acre, fenced-in, desolate property, which would stand as a stark reminder of the city's industrial past rather than as a symbol of the kind of innovative development needed to build a stronger future for the city.

How will we be strengthening Lawrence by eliminating one of the best ways they have to create investment partnerships with private businesses?

In addition to the community development block grant, the Sarbanes amendment will also preserve the community services block grant. These funds strengthen communities by funding local agencies, which provide services such as literacy, child health care, after school activities, low-income housing, food stamps, emergency shelter, and other support.

In Worcester, Patsy Lewis of the Worcester Community Action Council sent me a letter on just how devastating the President's plans to eliminate this program are.

Simply put, Patsy wrote, they would have to reduce or close their GED classes and partnerships for at-risk students in the public schools. The agency may even be forced to close.

Perhaps the President can explain how a community can be "strengthened" by eliminating GED programs.

Another person who isn't fooled about the effect of the President's devastating "Strengthening America's

Communities," budget cuts is Steve Teasdale, executive director of the Main South Community Development Corporation in Worcester, which is doing incredible work attacking poverty in one of Massachusetts most economically distressed neighborhoods.

The Main South Community Development Corporation was formed in 1986, when concerned citizens came together to revitalize the neighborhood surrounding Clark University, which was reeling from the economic and social devastation wrought by the loss of Worcester's industrial base.

The obstacles in Main South's path are considerable:

Between 1960 and 2000, the population of the neighborhood fell 35 percent from 5,600 to 3,700. The housing stock fell by 29 percent.

Over 40 percent of the population lives below the poverty line—and 17 percent have incomes lower than 50 percent of the poverty level.

At 11.4 percent, unemployment is double the city's rate of 6.3 percent. Over half of neighborhood households are headed by single parents.

The challenges confronting the community are great, and Federal funds made available through the community services block grant, the community development block grant, and HUD's section 108 loan program have been absolutely essential to the extraordinary successes of Main South in recent years.

CDBG funds were used at the outset to match a challenge grant from the Ford Foundation that provided for the creation of the entity, and enabled Main South to attract outside investment. The result is numerous accomplishments for the neighborhood.

Since 1988, Main South has acquired and rehabilitated 246 units of low and moderate income housing—137 of which had been abandoned, and 78 of which were fire-damaged, many from arson. The new homes added \$500,000 annually to Worcester's tax rolls.

In addition, as a direct result of Main South's housing rehabilitation, over \$20 million of investment has flowed back into the community. Three ongoing private developments represent another \$40 million of capital brought into the area.

Because of this Federal support, Main South has been able to be a true partner to Clark University, providing greater educational opportunity to neighborhood families—through a homework center, computer training classes, and career placement services.

In fact, because of the success of the partnership, Clark University lets neighborhood high school students take college classes and provides full tuition to neighborhood students who make the grade academically. This is extraordinary.

All of this has been made possible by the commitment and dedication of concerned community leaders—and the relatively modest sums of Federal support that are in danger with this budget before us.

Now Main South is taking on its greatest project, the Kilby-Gardner-Hammond Neighborhood Project.

This partnership between the Boys and Girls Club, the City, Clark University, and Main South will revitalize 30 acres of distressed industrial property consisting of over 40 vacant, trash-strewn lots.

It aims to transform the neighborhood through the construction of a \$7 million new Boys and Girls Club, between 70 to 80 affordable housing units, and a new outdoor track and field complex for Clark University students and neighborhood children alike.

It is a transformative project, with a total investment impact of \$30 million, much of that made possible by Section 108 loan guarantees that this budget would eliminate.

Without Section 108, Teasdale and Main South would never have been able to acquire the properties to put this project together. This fact alone should cause us to reject the administration's "strengthening communities" proposal—because it will do nothing of the sort.

The question has to be asked, [Teasdale recently wrote] is what would happen in these neighborhoods if such funding was severely restricted or cut back. The answer can only be assumed to be that the current problems in these areas would get worse as capital investment once again withdraws to safer havens and the social service needs of the resident populations are stripped away. Crime, substance abuse, lack of recreational and educational opportunities for the youth of these areas and the incidence of poverty can all be expected to increase if CDBG funding is no longer available.

The long-term social and financial costs associated with such cut backs would be deeply damaging and although the immediate impact would be most severely felt in our poorer urban communities the resulting social distress would eventually affect everyone.

Steve Teasdale and the leadership of the Main South Community Development Corporation know more about the day-to-day challenges affecting our poorer urban communities and the difficulties associated with urban economic revitalization than any of us, because they live it every day.

I ask my colleagues to consider his words and vote for the Sarbanes amendment, so we can save these critically important poverty prevention and economic development programs.

The Senate has a moral obligation not to make it harder for communities to solve the complicated issues of poverty and community development they face. Without the Sarbanes amendment, that is exactly what the Senate will allow to happen.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I rise today in support of Senator SARBANES' amendment to the Budget resolution that would restore funding to the Community Development Block Grant, CDBG, program and 17 other community and economic development programs proposed to be eliminated.

These programs are vital to our Nation's low and moderate income neigh-

borhoods, as these are the communities who need these programs the most.

Despite the proven results of the CDBG program and the other 17 community and economic development programs, the fiscal year 2006 budget proposes to consolidate these programs into a single Commerce Department program, resulting in a \$1.89 billion cut.

In fiscal year 2005, the total budget for all 18 community and economic development programs proposed to be consolidated, including CDBG, was \$5.6 billion.

The administration's proposal only provides \$3.7 billion for all 18 programs, leading to a \$1.89 billion cut in community development funds.

This major reduction would have a devastating impact on our Nation's neediest communities and families who rely on these programs.

The loss of funds would also impact our Nation's economy, affecting small businesses who receive loans to finance projects that lead to the creation and retention of jobs.

The Sarbanes' amendment would restore the proposed \$1.89 billion cuts to the CDBG program and 17 other community and economic development programs, such as the Community Development Loan Guarantees Program and Community Development Financial Institutions Fund; retain the administration of these important programs at their current agencies. For example, the CDBG program would remain at HUD and not be transferred to the Department of Commerce; accomplish this by closing tax loopholes that an overwhelming majority of Senators voted to close in the last Congress.

While the vote to close tax loopholes was not enacted, it offers us a bipartisan way to save community and economic development programs.

The Community Development Block Grant Program is one of the most effective Federal domestic programs to revitalize urban and rural communities.

Over the past 30 years, cities, counties, and States have used more than \$105 billion in CDBG funds.

Over 95 percent of CDBG funds have gone to projects and activities principally benefiting low- and moderate-income individuals and families such as housing development, recreation centers, clinics, day-care facilities, and job creation and training.

According to HUD's "Highlights of Fiscal Year 2004 CDBG Accomplishments," CDBG funding led to the creation and retention of more than 90,000 jobs and 85,000 individuals received employment training nationwide in the last year alone.

In 2004, CDBG funds also helped with the rehabilitation of over 130,000 rental units and single family homes, and allowed more than 11,000 Americans to achieve the American Dream and become homeowners.

Additionally, nearly 700 crime prevention and awareness programs were

funded and child care services were provided to 100,065 children in 205 communities across the country.

In my State of California, CDBG grants are critical to both urban and rural cities who rely on these funds to serve many low-income neighborhoods.

In fiscal year 2005, California received over \$526 million in CDBG funds, accounting for 12.8 percent of the total \$4.1 billion grant program.

Of these funds, for example, California cities and counties received \$82.8 million to the city of Los Angeles and \$34.6 million to Los Angeles County; \$24.6 million to the city of San Francisco; \$11.5 million to Riverside County; \$8.4 million to San Bernardino County; and \$5.5 million to Fresno County.

Over the past 5 years, the diverse use of CDBG funds have allowed Los Angeles County to develop almost 9,000 affordable housing units, to create and preserve over 2,000 jobs, to remove over 32 million square feet of graffiti, and to provide loans and technical assistance to over 5,000 businesses among other programs.

Cuts to the CDBG program would greatly hurt Los Angeles County's low income residents, the primary beneficiaries of CDBG-funded services.

According to 2000 Census data, 17.9 percent of Los Angeles County residents had incomes below the poverty level, a far higher poverty rate than the 12.4 percent national average.

CDBG funds have not only benefited large urban counties like Los Angeles, but rural counties and cities in California as well. Here are a few examples:

The city of Porterville in the Central Valley, which has a population of over 39,000 and an unemployment rate of 12.3 percent, has utilized CDBG funds to rehabilitate over 50 homes and assist more than 200 first time homebuyers purchase their first home. Many of these first time homebuyers are farm worker families.

The city of Victorville, located in San Bernardino County, served over 2,900 senior citizens, youth, homeless, disabled, victims of domestic violence, and low-income families in 2004 with CDGB funds. Over \$551,550 in CDBG grants were provided to low-income senior and disabled homeowners to rehabilitate their homes, ensuring that Victorville citizens have a safe place to live.

As you can see, CDBG funds are crucial to closing the disparity between rich and poor in so many communities in California and throughout the country.

As a former mayor, I know that CDBG resources are the most flexible dollars within city government, making them extremely valuable to the economic vitality of local communities.

We cannot allow these funds to be cut.

To do so would send the wrong message to our country's neediest communities and families who rely on these funds the most.

Although CDBG is one of the main community development programs slated for consolidation and cuts in the fiscal year 2006 budget, there are 17 other important programs that would be impacted as well.

Specifically, I would like to touch on a few of the following programs that have had a substantial benefit to counties and cities:

Community Development Loan Guarantees, section 108 loan program, funded at \$7 million in fiscal year 2005, is used often with CDBG funds to finance the construction of new facilities and economic development activities such as business loans.

Through the section 108 Loan Program, the city of San Francisco has been able to construct 13 new childcare facilities which created 599 new slots for children of low-income families, and created 200 new jobs through 8 business start ups and expansions.

Brownfields Economic Development Initiative, which received \$24 million in fiscal year 2005, used with the section 108 loan program, helps finance the redevelopment of seriously contaminated sites.

Cities throughout California and the Nation have received assistance through these funds to conduct environmental engineering assessments for site cleanup activities.

This amendment would also restore funding for the Community Development Financial Institutions, CDFI, which provides private sector investors with tax credits to raise money for hard to finance development projects in low-income areas, as well as other economic development programs. CDFI received \$55 million in funding this year.

These community and economic development programs proposed to be cut in the fiscal year 2006 budget put Federal dollars where they are needed most by funding projects that are unique to the problems they address.

The proposed cuts to the CDBG program and 17 other programs would result in higher unemployment, diminish business creation and retention, increase the number of blighted buildings, and the number of homeless people who cannot find affordable housing.

The loss of these dedicated funds would profoundly affect our country's low and moderate income communities and residents.

We must not allow this to happen.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Sarbanes amendment to restore funding for CDBG and the 17 other community and economic development programs proposed to be eliminated.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise today to address shortfalls in the budget resolution for key community and economic development programs. The budget before us includes a reduction of roughly \$2 billion in Federal assistance to distressed and underserved communities. These cuts are shortsighted, ill-advised and represent a significant retreat from our long-standing

commitment to invest in our Nation's communities. I join Senator SARBANES in offering an amendment to restore funding for these programs to their fiscal year 2005 levels.

Last year the Federal Government invested \$5.7 billion in communities across the country through a network of community and economic development programs. These programs were used to enhance social services, invest in infrastructure, promote affordable housing, provide public services and revitalize our downtowns. These investments changed the face of our cities and helped improve the standards of living across the Nation.

Unfortunately, the President has proposed to eliminate this network of programs and replace them with a single block grant at the Department of Commerce. Eighteen programs are on the chopping block, including the Community Development Block Grant, CDBG, the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, CDFI, the Community Services Block Grant, CSBG, Brownfields Economic Development Initiatives and the Economic Development Agency, EDA. I find this proposal underwhelming and unacceptable. To add insult to injury the President has proposed, and this budget includes, only \$3.7 billion for community and economic development activities covered under this initiative—a 34-percent reduction in all programs combined. This is simply not adequate.

Each of the programs slated for elimination was created for a specific purpose, each serves targeted constituencies and addresses distinct needs. Consolidating and under funding these programs would leave critical gaps in the web of support for our Nation's cities and towns. I question the President's assertion that these programs are ineffective or inefficient and I question the wisdom of starting a new program at a new agency when the old system is not broken.

I am particularly concerned with the elimination of the Community Development Block Grant program. CDBG is the centerpiece of the Federal government's efforts to help States and localities meet the needs of low-income communities. CDBG funds vital housing rehabilitation, supportive services, public improvements and economic development projects in communities across the Nation. It serves more than 1,100 entitlement communities, urban counties and States, and more than 3,000 rural communities.

Last year over 95 percent of CDBG funds went to activities benefiting low and moderate income persons. CDBG housing projects assisted over 160,000 households, public service projects benefited over 13 million individuals, and economic development projects helped create or retain over 90,000 jobs. Vermont used CDBG grants to rehabilitate over 270 units of affordable housing and help create or preserve over 150 jobs.

I recently led a bipartisan letter with Senator COLEMAN to the Budget Committee attesting to the effectiveness of CDBG and urged that it be fully funded and retained at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Fifty-seven members of the Senate joined me in this letter.

I ask unanimous consent to print this letter in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, March 2, 2005.

Hon. JUDD GREGG,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. KENT CONRAD,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GREGG AND RANKING MEMBER CONRAD: The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program funds housing rehabilitation, supportive services, public improvements and economic development projects in communities across the nation. CDBG serves more than 1,100 entitlement communities, urban counties and states, and more than 3,000 rural communities. We urge the Budget Committee to maintain the Federal government's current commitment to community development programs at the Department of Housing and Urban Development and support a budget allocation of \$4,732 billion in Function 450 for CDBG, Section 108 economic development loan guarantees, and the Brownfields Economic Development Initiative.

HUD is the Federal Department principally responsible for community economic development. CDBG is the center piece of the Federal government's efforts to help states and localities meet the needs of low-income communities. Section 101 of the Housing and Community Development Act created the CDBG program to consolidate a number of complex and overlapping programs of financial assistance in order to encourage community development activities which are consistent with comprehensive local and areawide development planning; to further the national housing goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family; and to foster the undertaking of housing and community development activities in a coordinated and mutually supportive manner by Federal agencies and programs, as well as by communities. HUD's community development programs coupled with HUD's housing and homeless programs and supportive services, provide communities with a comprehensive approach to serving the needs of residents. CDBG is the glue that holds other Federal programs serving low-income communities together.

The Strengthening America's Community proposal aims to create strong accountability standards, offer flexibility to communities and create a more unified federal approach. These goals are already hallmarks of the CDBG program. On the 30th Anniversary of CDBG in 2004, HUD Deputy Secretary Roy Bernardi said the following about the program: "HUD has a long history of 'being there' and providing help for people, particularly those with the greatest needs—our lower income constituents. CDBG has certainly been there, during boom years and most importantly in times of tightening budgets, which place greater demands on existing services. We must continue to support and build upon programs that work, those that have a proven record of flexibility and the ability to fit in with locally determined needs. CDBG is such a program and ranks

among our nation's oldest and most successful programs. It continues to set the standard for all other block grant programs."

The Strengthening America's Communities proposal would recreate a block grant program similar to CDBG within the Department of Commerce. The Department of Commerce, however, does not have the vital infrastructure or institutional capacity to provide a comprehensive approach to neighborhood development. Replicating HUD's CDBG program within the Department of Commerce would require rebuilding HUD's "infrastructure" and would result in inefficiencies, greater complexity and less aid to fewer cities, an approach which does not serve America's communities or taxpayers. CDBG's success depends on a locally driven, citizen participation process that provides flexibility and does not take a "one-size-fits-all" approach. The needs of Nashua, New Hampshire; Bismarck, North Dakota; Cincinnati, Ohio and Kansas City, Missouri are very different from the needs of Miami, Florida; El Paso, Texas; Pueblo, Colorado; or San Diego, California. CDBG is capable of addressing the diverse needs of these communities whether it is housing rehabilitation, homeownership, supported services for the elderly or children, business development or infrastructure improvements.

CDBG is one of the most effective Federal domestic programs to revitalize neighborhoods with proven results. Over 95 percent of CDBG funds went to activities principally benefiting low- and moderate-income persons. Twenty-eight percent of CDBG funds supported housing activities in distressed communities, 24 percent supported public improvements, 15 percent went to the provision of public services, and 7 percent supported economic development activities. In FY2004, CDBG housing projects assisted 168,938 households. Public service projects funded with CDBG served 13,312,631 individuals. Economic development programs funded by CDBG in fiscal 2004 created or retained 90,637 jobs for Americans and public improvement projects benefited 9,453,993 persons. CDBG also has a strong record in business retention: CDBG ensured that over 80 percent of the businesses assisted through the program were still in operation after three years.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to working with you to ensure that communities across the country can provide good jobs, affordable housing, and public services to meet the needs of all Americans.

Sincerely,

Norm Coleman, Patrick Leahy, Jack Reed, Kit Bond, Mike DeWine, Paul Sarbanes, Evan Bayh, Barbara Mikulski, Ted Kennedy, George Voinovich, Jeff Bingaman.

Debbie Stabenow, Rick Santorum, Frank R. Lautenberg, Carl Levin, Olympia Snowe, Jon S. Corzine, Charles Schumer, Lincoln Chafee, Dick Durbin, Herb Kohl, Kay Bailey Hutchison.

Chris Dodd, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Mel Martinez, Max Baucus, Joe Lieberman, Arlen Specter, Byron L. Dorgan, Tom Harkin, John F. Kerry, Conrad Burns, Mary L. Landrieu.

Barbara Boxer, David Vitter, Maria Cantwell, Tim Johnson, Gordon Smith, Mark Dayton, Patty Murray, Jim Talent, Russ Feingold, Ken Salazar, Barack Obama.

Bill Nelson, Dianne Feinstein, Ron Wyden, Jay Rockefeller, Daniel K. Akaka, Jim Jeffords, Blanche L. Lincoln, E. Benjamin Nelson, Joe Biden, Tom Carper, Mark Pryor, Saxby Chambliss, Daniel K. Inouye.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I believe you will find similar support for each

of the other programs under this umbrella.

I challenge each Member to go back to their State and find one community that has not reaped the benefits of a CDBG investment. I challenge each member to visit with their local community action groups and hear how they use the Community Services Block Grant to support the neediest in their communities. These programs fill a real need and have proven results. A cut of \$2 billion in Federal funds will result in the loss of at least \$18 billion in matching funds from local and State governments and nonprofit and private sector investments. I fail to see the wisdom in dismantling programs that are so vital to our communities.

Our amendment would restore nearly \$2 billion for community and economic development programs and urges the Senate to retain the administration of these programs at their current agencies. We fully pay for the increase in funds by closing egregious tax loop holes that over 90 Members of this Chamber has already gone on record in support of closing.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment and express their support for these important programs.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the amendment of my friend and to express my support of the Community Development Block Grant Program, the Economic Development Administration, and the 16 other economic and community development programs that are dramatically underfunded in this budget. It is no surprise to see this amendment coming from my distinguished colleague from Maryland. I thank him for his work on this issue, both now and in the past. Throughout his career in the Senate he has been a powerful advocate for CDBG and similar community development programs.

The CDBG Program has for 31 years provided vital funding to communities all over the United States and throughout my home State of Montana. CDBG is especially valuable to economically distressed communities that often lack basic public infrastructure. It funds a diverse range of projects. Just last year, CDBG dollars helped fund head start facilities in Havre and Kalispell, and money to help Dodson modernize their wastewater system.

A CDBG grant helped Big Horn County renovate Memorial Hospital. In Anaconda, where we have a Jack Nicklaus-designed golf-course, a CDBG loan helped renovate the Old Works Hotel, dramatically improving the region's tourism industry.

These CDBG investments leveraged millions of State and local dollars. In Montana, CDBG dollars are primarily administered at the State level, so local officials can direct the funding to the areas of greatest need. CDBG is a program that works. It is a good investment of taxpayer money that communities leverage to fund vital

projects they could not complete on their own.

And the CDBG Program has been supporting community development for the past 30 years with great success. Providing small infusions of Federal funding to jumpstart projects, CDBG has touched hundreds of Montana communities, and thousands of lives.

Unfortunately, CDBG isn't the only program on the chopping block. The Economic Development Administration is a small but crucial program that invests to help communities—particularly economically distressed communities—get ready for new businesses. EDA has a documented record of success. Since its inception in 1964, the EDA has created more than 4 million jobs and leveraged more than \$18 billion in private sector investment in thousands of communities all across the country.

EDA investments in Montana have helped Montana farmers, suffering from years of draught. The Bear Paw economic development district in northern Montana used an EDA planning grant to help farmers study the feasibility of growing carrots and other vegetables in a region dominated by wheat growth for more than a century. The study demonstrated the viability of these crops, and farmers are excited to have a variety of crops to choose amongst.

Why, then, does this budget propose to eliminate it? At a time when it is critical for our country to maintain competitiveness in the global economy a proposal to eliminate a successful catalyst for economic growth is a mistake.

The growing budget deficit is a concern. But continued economic growth is central to everyone's plan to reduce the deficit. Why then are we cutting programs that spur economic growth? EDA creates jobs, more than 4 million in its history. It is essential that we preserve this job creating agency.

Our economy is in recovery, and as this recovery continues, EDA is working to make sure that all of America recovers. EDA targets its funding at economically disadvantaged communities. Areas that have recently experienced a factory closure, or a military base closure. The people who benefit the most from EDA are those who have been hurt the most by outsourcing.

States, counties, and cities are experiencing ever greater demands on their budgets. The choices they make, just like the choices we make here in the Senate, are tough, and getting tougher. The rising costs of health care, education, and other investments programs are straining local budgets to the breaking point. In some communities they have been forced to raise local taxes so high the benefits from recent tax cuts are all but gone.

We are robbing Peter to pay Paul. And it doesn't make sense to do it with agencies that have the ability to leverage their funds and ripple through their communities. For us here in

Washington to eliminate Federal programs like the CDBG and EDA would devastate communities.

Cities will be forced to choose between school for our children or housing for our seniors, between improving decaying infrastructure needed to create new jobs and providing health coverage for our children. This amendment doesn't solve all of these problems, but it is a giant step to improving our communities.

Once again, I thank my colleague from Maryland, as well as all of our other cosponsors. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. These programs create jobs and improve lives and communities all over our country. Let's not shortchange our communities that need this help the most.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today many Americans in communities across the Nation are being left behind in our economy. Federal community and economic development programs, such as Community Development Block Grants, Community Development Financial Institutions, and Economic Development Administration grants, have a history of "being there" for communities—providing funding for housing rehabilitation, job creation, and infrastructure. I thank Senator SARBANES for offering his amendment to save these important programs from elimination, and I am glad to be a cosponsor. Senator SARBANES' amendment will restore funding to these vital programs by closing tax loopholes that the majority of the Senate supported closing in the FSC/ETI bill.

The President's Strengthening America's Communities Initiatives, SACI, would fundamentally change Federal economic and community development programs serving our communities. The President's fiscal year 2006 budget eliminates 18 successful programs serving low-income urban, rural, and Native American communities. It reduces the Federal commitment to funding community development by 33 percent, cutting funding from \$5.6 billion to \$3.71 billion. And the President's proposal will also reduce the number of communities served. A program that serves fewer Americans with less resource can only place more families and low-income neighborhoods at risk, rather than create vibrant and strong economies as CDBG, CDFI, EDA, the Brownfields Economic Development Initiative and Section 108 loan guarantees are doing.

The real issue with federal community development assistance is the lack of financial resources for the thousands of communities struggling to remain economically competitive, not the current structure of the existing programs. While the budget resolution includes funding for tax loopholes that the Senate voted to close last year, it fails to adequately fund programs that provide affordable housing to American workers, programs that create or retain jobs in the economy, and programs that provide vital public services to our senior citizens.

In fiscal year 2003, the economy lost 486,000 jobs. CDBG projects created or retained 108,700 jobs for Americans. CDBG also has a strong record in business retention. While businesses have left American shores for other countries, CDBG ensured that over 80 percent of the businesses assisted through this program were still in operation after 3 years.

There is overwhelming opposition to the Strengthening America's Community Initiative. Mayors, local and State community development agencies, housing assistance agencies, and others from Rhode Island to Utah, and from Michigan to Texas, have written letters to Congress and to the administration opposing these devastating cuts and changes to Federal economic and community development assistance. They know that CDBG, CDFI, and EDA programs are the foundation of strong communities—these programs are literally the building blocks of community development. A unified grant program, as proposed by the administration, will leave gaping holes in community and economic development assistance.

CDBG is the glue that holds other Federal programs serving low-income communities together. On the 30th Anniversary of CDBG in 2004, HUD Deputy Secretary Roy Bernardi said the following about the program:

HUD has a long history of 'being there' and providing help for people, particularly those with the greatest needs—our lower income constituents. CDBG has certainly been there, during boom years and most importantly in times of tightening budgets, which place greater demands on existing services. We must continue to support and build upon programs that work, those that have a proven record of flexibility and the ability to fit in with locally determined needs. CDBG is such a program and ranks among our nation's oldest and most successful programs. It continues to set the standard for all other block grant programs.

I want to tell my colleagues about CDBG's history of "being there." In Rhode Island, CDBG was there when the West Elmwood Housing Development Corporation, a not-for-profit community based organization, needed to build and renovate affordable homes. CDBG gave Rhode Island families, who would otherwise be unable to achieve the American dream of homeownership, the chance to own their own home. In Florida, Congress turned to CDBG to provide relief after last year's devastating hurricane season, and in New York City, CDBG helped the city rebuild after the September 11 tragedy. In New Hampshire, CDBG is there for the Concord Area Trust for Community Housing to layer with Low-Income Housing Tax Credits to build affordable housing. In Ohio, Community Development Financial Institutions are there for communities across the State helping to finance businesses and micro-enterprises that support new jobs in the economy. And EDA was there to provide planning and technical assistance to help save 466 existing jobs and

create 78 new jobs near Billings, MT. There are no other Federal programs or tax loophole that have the history of "being there" like CDBG, CDFI, and EDA.

Senator SARBANES' amendment to restore funding to these programs deserves the full support of my Senate colleagues, whether Republican or Democratic, representing an urban state such as Rhode Island or a rural state such as Montana. I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for Senator SARBANES' amendment so that all workers, families, neighborhoods, and communities can participate in our Nation's economic growth.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, what is the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has 7 minutes 25 seconds.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, this amendment increases spending by \$2.5 billion, exceeding the cap, and it increases taxes by the same amount of money. It is a tax-and-spend amendment. Therefore, I would oppose it. There are a lot of other reasons I would oppose it, but I wanted to give the Senator from Missouri an opportunity to say a couple of words on something else.

I yield to the Senator from Missouri, and I yield the remainder of my time on this amendment.

Mr. TALENT. Madam President, I thank my friend, the chairman. I would like to speak briefly on a separate amendment that I am going to offer and ask for a vote on it during the vote-arama today.

I am pleased to be joined in this effort by Senators THUNE, STABENOW, and WYDEN.

This amendment is endorsed by all the major transportation groups—including ASSHTO, Associated General Contractors, the Road Builders, the American Public Transportation Association, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the Heavy Highway Alliance, representing major trade unions. These groups understand the importance of this amendment and many will be scoring it as one of their key transportation votes of this session.

As has been the case in past resolutions, the current budget resolution in the Reserve Fund section allows the budget chairman to make adjustments to the allocation for surface transportation.

However, the Senate language as written significantly restricts the transportation reauthorization funding options available to the Finance Committee.

In the fiscal year 2004 budget resolution, last year's resolution, we agreed to reserve fund language that allowed new transportation funding so long as it was offset by an increase in receipts of any kind to the highway trust fund. That is as it should be. We ought to allow the Finance Committee to have the full range of funding options.

As written in this year's resolution, the resolution takes away the flexi-

bility of the Finance Committee, the EPW Committee, the Banking and Commerce Committees, to consider all available funding mechanisms for the reauthorization bill. It precludes the use of resolutions used in past authorization bills, some of which the administration has agreed to and which passed last year by 74 bipartisan votes. Among the funding options that would be blocked are interest on the highway trust fund's unexpended balances; the motor fuels refund reform for over-the-road and lend-lease vehicles; and draw-down of the highway trust fund balance.

My amendment simply changes the language to be consistent with the language in the House budget resolution and the fiscal year 2005 conference report. The amendment is narrowly targeted and does not affect the budget neutrality of the final transportation bill. The amendment simply ensures we have that debate at the right time on the highway bill with all the funding options on the table. I urge my colleagues who support transportation funding to vote for this amendment. It restores the flexibility to use revenue sources approved in the past and gets us out of the box that the current language traps us in and makes it easier to adequately fund our transportation needs within the limits of a revenue-neutral bill.

I will be asking for a vote at the appropriate time on the amendment. I thank my cosponsors, including the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GREGG. What is the time situation on Senator SARBANES' amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire controls 4 minutes and the Senator from Maryland controls 1 minute 19 seconds.

Ms. STABENOW. As the cosponsor with my colleague from Missouri, I would appreciate a couple of minutes to speak on the Talent-Stabenow amendment before proceeding with the other amendments.

Mr. GREGG. We do not have any time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. STABENOW. I ask for 2 minutes off the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time remaining.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The balance of the time is 1 minute 19 seconds.

Ms. STABENOW. To my colleagues, I rise to speak in support of the Talent-Stabenow amendment. It is very simple, as my colleague indicated. It is extremely important as the Senate begins the work of SAFETEA transportation legislation.

As in past resolutions, the current budget resolution in the reserve fund section allows the budget chairman to make adjustments to the surface trans-

portation allocation. However, this budget resolution as written ties the hands of the Finance Committee and restricts the transportation funding options available to them such as using interest from the highway trust fund and drawing down the trust fund balance.

All the Talent-Stabenow amendment would do is modify the language to put all the funding options on the table. This change would be identical to the provision in the current House budget resolution and what has been included in past House and Senate budget resolutions.

We all know how critical SAFETEA is. Transportation issues in each of our States are absolutely critical. The transportation bill creates jobs. It supports communities. It uplifts all of our roads and highways and bridges in a critically important way. I am hopeful this amendment will receive strong bipartisan support so we can pass a strong safety bill with all the options on the table and make sure we have the options available to make it the very best bill we possibly can, given all of the concerns regarding funding.

Mr. GREGG. We yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 230

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. COLEMAN. Madam President, I have an amendment I send to the desk for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. COLEMAN] proposes an amendment numbered 230.

Mr. COLEMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Mr. COLEMAN (for himself) proposes an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18 setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2006 through 2010; as follows:

(Purpose: To fully fund the Community Development Block Grant Program and related programs, including Community Services Block Grant Program, Brownfield Redevelopment, Empowerment Zones, Rural Community Advancement Program, EDA, Native American CDBG, Native Hawaiian CDBG, and Rural Housing and Economic Development)

On page 16, line 15, increase the amount by \$1,454,000,000.

On page 16, line 16, increase the amount by \$29,080,000.

On page 16, line 20, increase the amount by \$465,280,000.

On page 16, line 24, increase the amount by \$610,680,000.

On page 17, line 3, increase the amount by \$203,560,000.

On page 17, line 7, increase the amount by \$72,700,000.

On page 17, line 16, increase the amount by \$619,000,000.

On page 17, line 17, increase the amount by \$359,020,000.

On page 17, line 21, increase the amount by \$241,410,000.

On page 17, line 25, increase the amount by \$12,380,000.

On page 18, line 4, increase the amount by \$6,190,000.

On page 26, line 14, decrease the amount by \$2,073,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, decrease the amount by \$388,100,000.

On page 26, line 18, decrease the amount by \$706,690,000.

On page 26, line 21, decrease the amount by \$623,060,000.

On page 26, line 24, decrease the amount by \$209,750,000.

On page 27, line 2, decrease the amount by \$72,700,000.

Mr. COLEMAN. Madam President, let me express my thanks to my colleague from Maryland, Senator SARBANES, for his work on this issue and for his leadership in the Senate. We serve together on the Foreign Relations Committee. It is a great honor. He brings great compassion, great respect, great dignity to the committee, to the institution, and his service is greatly appreciated. It is my honor as a relatively new Senator to be working on an issue that is so important to him as it is to me and to the folks I represent, both as a Senator from Minnesota, but as I represented as mayor in the city of St. Paul.

My amendment is simple. It says no cuts to the Community Development Block Grant Program. It says no moving CDBG, no to program changes that limit CDBG's effectiveness.

I share the President's goal of reducing the deficit and bringing fiscal accountability to Washington. But like so many things in Washington, the devil is in the details. In the case of CDBG, the details in the budget need to be reworked quite a bit.

I have a simple philosophy: Don't kill those things that build the economy and help cut deficits. I strongly supported tax cuts that create investment and grow jobs. CDBG grows jobs. Community development block grants grow communities.

When I talk to the folks back in Minnesota, whether they are city administrators or mayors or county commissioners, they all say the same thing: The Community Development Block Grant Program is the lifeblood of community development. That is why I am offering this amendment to fully fund CDBG along with the Community Service Block Grant Program, the Brownfield Redevelopment Program, and the Rural Housing and Economic Development Program, to name a few. These are things that work. Let's change and reshape things that do not work. But when you go home and folks say across the board—big town, small town, urban, rural—that it works, work with it.

CDBG was enacted in 1974 and has been assisting America's communities for 30 years. It is a program that helps State and local government tap their most serious community development challenges, including infrastructure, housing, and economic development. Over the first 25 years, it has created 2 million jobs and contributed in excess of \$129 billion to the Nation's gross domestic product.

CDBG and public-private partnerships are the cornerstone of the economic revitalization across the country and in many of our cities in recent years. They have provided the tools to provide economic opportunity and hold jobs.

When you deal with the budget, there is a question of fiscal responsibility. Does the program work? Fair question. Is it cost effective? Fair question. What does it achieve?

I know CDBG works because when I was mayor, before coming to Washington, I worked with it. In coming here, my hope was to be Minnesota's mayor in Washington. I always take pride in the fact that a mayor's focus is on getting things done. They are at the bottom of the political food chain but really responsive. That was the bottom line. It was getting things done. If streets were unplowed in the city of St. Paul, I heard about it. So as a former mayor I know something about fiscal responsibility, about having to reduce needless bureaucracy, about turning deficits into surpluses, and setting money aside for a rainy day, all while submitting budgets that contained no tax increases in 8 years. Part of my ability to do that was the growth I saw in my communities and the public-private partnerships that CDBG created and shaped and was a part of. Community centers and crime prevention, affordable housing, and business and economic development—the heart and soul of Federal help to our cities.

The Presiding Officer serves the great State of Alaska, which has challenges. They are not awash in a surplus of cash. The Presiding Officer understands, as I understand, we have to support those things that grow our communities.

The fact is, jobs in St. Paul's economy have not grown without CDBG. We used CDBG to revitalize neighborhoods, and it is through this effort we were successful.

I can personally testify that dollar for dollar there is no better initiative to help States and localities renew and rebuild our cities and create economic growth and jobs than the Community Development Block Grant Program.

As Minnesota's mayor in Washington, I still believe that Government is beholden to the people; that individuals, with the help of their local representatives, can plan their lives better than bureaucrats in some distant capital.

That is what I like, and the idea behind CDBG, a very conservative idea that we should not have 1,500 command

and control programs rush out of Washington trying to micromanage the needs of communities. Instead, we should help communities meet those needs and priorities through one block grant. With all the unfunded mandates coming from Washington, CDBG is a way we help communities across the country meet some very critical priorities. CDBG is a fiscally responsible program that exponentially produces more than it costs and is a truly conservative initiative enabling local leaders to meet local needs.

CDBG works. Last year, the Office of Management and Budget celebrated CDBG under the theme "performance counts." Since then, the Office of Management and Budget may have changed its mind, but America hasn't.

Let me state what CDBG means to my home State in Minnesota. When I became mayor of St. Paul, we got businesses and jobs growing. But not all St. Paul was benefiting from the turnaround. An area around Ames Lake on the east side of St. Paul, one of my toughest neighborhoods, needed help, needed growth. They could not take part in the surrounding economic boom because the buildings were in total disrepair and businesses were looking to move out, not move in. It would have been an impossible situation if not for CDBG. But thanks to CDBG, we were able to leverage Federal funds to attract millions of private dollars to improve infrastructure and replace the blight of city sprawl with green space, and build a community center to keep kids off the street.

I was at the League of City meetings the other day and talking to the member who represents the east side of St. Paul. In that community, they had a shopping center that was blighted, with nothing there. Reeds grew up through the concrete. We figured out the Good Lord was saying there was a wetland in the heart of the city. We got rid of the shopping center, got rid of the concrete, and created wetlands. Now he is telling me we have housing in the worst areas of St. Paul; the most blighted areas are growing and prospering. Again, CDBG was an important part of it.

In other words, thanks to CDBG, Ames Lake is now moving in the right direction. St. Paul is located within Ramsey County. And like all counties with a big city, Ramsey County struggles with sort of a split identity. On one hand, it has suburbs that are doing well compared to parts of the big city. Within the city is land intense with industrial projects such as car parks and truck sites that big cities need. Now these projects are great to have when they are up and running, but when they shut down, they are so large they take whole communities with them that is happened with the Glendenning Truck site.

It was in bad condition, and local officials knew something had to be done about it. Using CDBG, they were able to replace a dilapidated truck site with thriving businesses and jobs.

Ramsey County also used CDBG to transform the Vadnais Highlands apartment complex into safe, attractive and affordable housing.

I give another example of how community development becomes economic development. There is a town of 502 people in Minnesota called Brewster. In 1997, Brewster was awarded a one time community development block grant. This grant allowed Brewster to renew and rejuvenate its infrastructure by tearing down its dilapidated structures and replacing them with 40 homes. As a result of this investment, when Minnesota Soybean Processors was looking for a new home, there was no better place than Brewster.

The relocation of Minnesota Soybean Processors immediately created 40 jobs. In fact, that CDBG grant is still creating jobs as Minnesota Soybean Processors are now opening a biodiesel division which will employ 10 more people.

In another example, the city of Rochester, MN, used CDBG to fund the Aldrich Memorial Nursery School, providing pre-school kids with a safe place to be while mom and dad are working.

The city of Minneapolis uses CDBG to improve housing, stimulate job growth, improve public infrastructure, provide public health services, and school readiness programs.

A reduction in CDBG could hinder the city's current efforts to help 200 moms and dads to find jobs; efforts to develop 150 multifamily homes; efforts to acquire and demolish 110 vacant and boarded up houses; efforts to provide capital improvements to child care facilities, and efforts to reduce lead hazards in 70 homes and provide youth employment training to 300 kids. That is a lot of bang for the buck.

Minneapolis is a big city, but community development block grants are just as important to our rural communities. As you may know, America's rural communities often lack the resources to improve their infrastructure and housing.

The town of Detroit Lakes is located in Becker County, MN, and has about 7,500 residents. It is the heart of Lake Country in the land of 10,000 lakes. If you have not visited there, you should. Spend some money there while enjoying the lakes. The beach is right in town. At 119 Pioneer Street is the Graystone Hotel.

Built in 1916 to accommodate the region's growing tourism industry, the Graystone Hotel had since fallen on hard times. Its once grand exterior had degenerated into an unsightly mess, and its rooms all but abandoned. In short, what was once one of Detroit Lakes' flagship buildings, was now its biggest detraction.

Using CDBG along with private funding, the Graystone Hotel now includes 41 residential units and a variety of businesses and nonprofit enterprises ranging from Lakeland Medical Health Center to Godfather's Pizza.

St. Louis County, which is located in northern Minnesota and is one of the more rural areas in Minnesota, has also used CDBG. Since 1993, CDBG has helped create 560 jobs in St. Louis County; it has provided 2,900 residents of St. Louis County with business training resulting in 159 new start-up businesses; 450 homes were improved through local housing rehabilitation programs in the county.

Hundreds of first-time home buyers participated in a first-time home buyer program, resulting in the purchase of 600 single family homes.

In St. Louis County, CDBG also helps fund community soup kitchens, emergency shelters, child daycare projects, programs combating domestic violence, and a number of infrastructure improvements such as the water treatment facility in Aurora. St. Louis County has been able to leverage \$5 in private dollars for every dollar they received through the CDBG program.

CDBG works, but don't take my word for it, just I ask the folks in Detroit Lakes, St. Paul, or St. Louis County.

I was pleased to work with Senator PATRICK LEAHY in leading a bipartisan coalition of 57 Senators in sending a message to the Senate Budget Committee signifying our strong commitment to CDBG and reminding folks that cities from Montpelier to Minneapolis need CDBG to create economic opportunity and to grow jobs.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, March 2, 2005.

Hon. JUDD GREGG,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. KENT CONRAD,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GREGG AND RANKING MEMBER CONRAD: The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program funds housing rehabilitation, supportive services, public improvements and economic development projects in communities across the nation. CDBG serves more than 1,100 entitlement communities, urban counties and states, and more than 3,000 rural communities. We urge the Budget Committee to maintain the Federal government's current commitment to community development programs at the Department of Housing and Urban Development and support a budget allocation of \$4.732 billion in Function 450 for CDBG, Section 108 economic development loan guarantees, and the Brownfields Economic Development Initiative.

HUD is the Federal Department principally responsible for community economic development. CDBG is the centerpiece of the Federal government's efforts to help states and localities meet the needs of low-income communities. Section 101 of the Housing and Community Development Act created the CDBG program to consolidate a number of complex and overlapping programs of financial assistance in order to encourage community development activities which are consistent with comprehensive local and areawide development planning; to further the national housing goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family; and to foster the under-

taking of housing and community development activities in a coordinated and mutually supportive manner by Federal agencies and programs, as well as by communities. HUD's community development programs coupled with HUD's housing and homeless programs and supportive services, provide communities with a comprehensive approach to serving the needs of residents. CDBG is the glue that holds other Federal programs serving low-income communities together.

The Strengthening America's Community proposal aims to create strong accountability standards, offer flexibility to communities and create a more unified federal approach. These goals are already hallmarks of the CDBG program. On the 30th Anniversary of CDBG in 2004, HUD Deputy Secretary Roy Bernardi said the following about the program:

"HUD has a long history of 'being there' and providing help for people, particularly those with the greatest needs—our lower income constituents. CDBG has certainly been there, during boom years and most importantly in times of tightening budgets, which place greater demands on existing services. We must continue to support and build upon programs that work, those that have a proven record of flexibility and the ability to fit in with locally determined needs. CDBG is such a program and ranks among our nation's oldest and most successful programs. It continues to set the standard for all other block grant programs."

The Strengthening America's Communities proposal would recreate a block grant program similar to CDBG within the Department of Commerce. The Department of Commerce, however, does not have the vital infrastructure or institutional capacity to provide a comprehensive approach to neighborhood development. Replicating HUD's CDBG program within the Department of Commerce would require rebuilding HUD's "infrastructure" and would result in inefficiencies, greater complexity and less aid to fewer cities, an approach which does not serve America's communities or taxpayers. CDBG's success depends on a locally driven, citizen participation process that provides flexibility and does not take a "one-size-fits-all" approach. The needs of Nashua, New Hampshire; Bismarck, North Dakota; Cincinnati, Ohio; and Kansas City, Missouri are very different from the needs of Miami, Florida; El Paso, Texas; Pueblo, Colorado; or San Diego, California. CDBG is capable of addressing the diverse needs of these communities whether it is housing rehabilitation, homeownership, supported services for the elderly or children, business development or infrastructure improvements.

CDBG is one of the most effective Federal domestic programs to revitalize neighborhoods with proven results. Over 95 percent of CDBG funds went to activities principally benefiting low- and moderate-income persons. Twenty-eight percent of CDBG funds supported housing activities in distressed communities, 24 percent supported public improvements, 15 percent went to the provision of public services, and 7 percent supported economic development activities. In FY2004, CDBG housing projects assisted 168,938 households. Public service projects funded with CDBG served 13,312,631 individuals. Economic development programs funded by CDBG in fiscal 2004 created or retained 90,637 jobs for Americans and public improvement projects benefited 9,453,993 persons. CDBG also has a strong record in business retention: CDBG ensured that over 80 percent of the businesses assisted through the program were still in operation after three years.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to working with you to ensure that

communities across the country can provide good jobs, affordable housing, and public services to meet the needs of all Americans.

Sincerely,

Norm Coleman, Patrick J. Leahy, Jack Reed, Mike DeWine, Evan Bayh, Edward M. Kennedy, Jeff Bingaman, Rick Santorum, Carl Levin, Jon S. Corzine, Christopher S. Bond, Paul S. Sarbanes, Barbara Mikulski, George V. Voinovich, Debbie Stabenow, Frank R. Lautenberg, Olympia J. Snowe, Charles E. Schumer, Lincoln Chafee, Herb Kohl, Christopher J. Dodd, Mel Martinez, Joseph I. Lieberman, Byron L. Dorgan, John F. Kerry, Mary L. Landrieu, Richard Durbin, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Max Baucus, Arlen Specter, Tom Harkin, Conrad R. Burns, Barbara Boxer, David Vitter, Tim Johnson, Mark Dayton, Jim Talent, Ken Salazar, Bill Nelson, Ron Wyden, Daniel K. Akaka, Maria Cantwell, Gordon Smith, Patty Murray, Russell D. Feingold, Barack Obama, Dianne Feinstein, John D. Rockefeller IV, James M. Jeffords, Blanche L. Lincoln, Joseph R. Biden, Mark Pryor, E. Benjamin Nelson, and Thomas R. Carper.

Mr. COLEMAN. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter of support for the community development block grant program from the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Governors Association, the National Community Development Association, National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, the Council of State Community Development Agencies, the Local Initiatives Support Corporation, the Enterprise Foundation, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, the National Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies, the National Council of State Housing Agencies, and the National Congress for Community Economic Development.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 4, 2005.

Hon. JUDD GREGG,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. KENT CONRAD,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GREGG AND RANKING MEMBER CONRAD: As you prepare to consider the FY 2006 Budget Resolution, we the undersigned organizations want to convey our opposition to proposed cuts in the FY 2006 Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) budget. We respectfully request that you craft a Budget Resolution that will provide adequate budget authority for all HUD programs and maintain important community and economic development functions and funding at HUD.

Of particular concern to us is the proposed elimination of the Community Development

Block Grant (CDBG) program along with 17 other Federal community and economic development grant programs. We oppose in the strongest terms the elimination of CDBG, and we urge you to reject the proposed "Strengthening America's Communities" (SAC) Initiative and support full funding for the CDBG program at HUD.

As you know, the FY 2006 Budget would effectively eliminate 18 community and economic development programs, including CDBG, and create an entirely new initiative to be operated by the Department of Commerce. Proposed funding for this "consolidated" program would be \$3.7 billion, and 35 percent reduction in funding when compared to total FY 2005 appropriations for the 18 programs targeted for elimination under the initiative. Consider that Congress funded the CDBG program alone at \$4.7 billion in FY 2005, \$1 billion more than the entire proposed budget for the SAC initiative.

Eliminating these 18 programs and substantially reducing the Federal investment in community and economic development would have a devastating impact on State and local governments. Each of these existing programs is an important and necessary component of urban, suburban, and rural communities' efforts to revitalize neighborhoods, expand affordable housing opportunities and create economic growth. We believe that CDBG is the glue that holds these efforts together.

For 30 years, the CDBG program has served as the cornerstone of the Federal government's commitment to partnering with state and local governments to strengthen our Nation's communities and improve the quality of life for low- and moderate-income Americans. Since its inception, CDBG has made a real and positive difference in communities across America, and there is no shortage of CDBG success stories. Many of the groups that signed this letter have been working in partnership with HUD and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in a good faith effort to improve the CDBG program's ability to measure performance. As a result of this effort, HUD plans to unveil a new outcome-based measurement system in early 2005. As recently as November 2004, OMB endorsed this undertaking. We believe this new system will verify what is already obvious: CDBG works.

CDBG's emphasis on flexibility and local determination of priority needs through citizen participation is allowing state and local governments to achieve real results. According to HUD's "Highlights of FY 2004 CDBG Accomplishments," CDBG funding led to the creation or retention of more than 90,000 jobs in the last year alone. Thanks to CDBG, in 2004 over 130,000 rental units and single-family homes were rehabbed, 85,000 individuals received employment training, 1.5 million youth were served by after-school enrichment programs and other activities, and child care services were provided to 100,065 children in 205 communities across the country. CDBG also funded nearly 700 crime prevention and awareness programs. Additionally, more than 11,000 Americans became homeowners last year thanks to CDBG funding. CDBG remains a smart, efficient form of

investment, as it continues to leverage around three dollars for every dollar of Federal investment. It certainly did not come as a surprise to us when HUD Secretary Alphonso Jackson, in a March 2nd appearance before the House Financial Services Committee, stated, "The program works."

The CDBG program's design is especially successful at targeting resources to those who need them most. In 2004, 95 percent of funds expended by entitlement grantees and 96 percent of State CDBG funds expended were for activities that principally benefited low- and moderate-income persons. A full half of persons directly benefiting from CDBG-assisted activities were minorities, including African Americans, Hispanics, Asians, and American Indians. Despite the fact that economic challenges and pockets of poverty exist in almost all American communities, adoption of the SAC initiative would almost certainly result in a complete loss of funding for a significant number of communities.

For all of the reasons detailed above, we believe that CDBG should remain at HUD and receive full funding of at least \$4.7 billion in FY 2006. We also believe it is premature for the Budget Resolution to even address such a far-reaching change to the program before the numerous committees of jurisdiction have had sufficient opportunity to hold appropriate hearings on the topic. We urge you to craft a Budget Resolution reflecting those sentiments. More specifically, we strongly encourage you to include language in your Resolution clearly stating that the Resolution "does not assume enactment of the proposed 'Strengthening America's Communities' Initiative nor the proposed reduction in funding for the CDBG program included in the Administration's FY 2006 budget."

We thank you for your favorable consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Council of State Community Development Agencies.

The Enterprise Foundation.

Habitat for Humanity International.

Housing Assistance Council.

Local Initiatives Support Corporation.

National Association for County Community and Economic Development.

National Association of Counties.

National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials.

National Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies.

National Community Development Association.

National Conference of Black Mayors.

National League of Cities.

National Low Income Housing Coalition.

United States Conference of Mayors.

Mr. COLEMAN. I urge my colleagues to adopt my amendment and show their support for these community leaders by fully funding the community development block grant program, keeping it at HUD, and rejecting any harmful changes.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of Senate proceedings.

Today's Senate proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS
OF ATASCOSA COUNTY JUDGE
DIANA BAUTISTA

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the many contributions of Judge Diana Bautista.

Judge Bautista works day after day for the betterment of the 40,000 members of Atascosa County in Texas. It is because of people like her that the legislation we do on this very floor is able to run the country so efficiently. Through her post as Judge of Atascosa County, Diana Bautista works for the betterment of the people in the community that she so vigorously serves.

Judge Bautista's service did not begin with her current position as a county judge; she has held other public service positions in law enforcement. She has been an official of the Pleasanton Police Department and the Atascosa County Sheriff's Office where she ensured the safety of the general public. It was during her tenure with public service offices such as these that she gained the necessary experience to understand what the people of Atascosa County need.

In 2002, she was elected to her post as the Atascosa County Judge, and has served there ever since. Judge Bautista always puts the people of Atascosa County first in whatever she does. She serves on numerous committees throughout the area to make sure her constituents are getting all the necessary tools from the local government they need.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have this opportunity to recognize the contributions of Atascosa County Judge Diana Bautista.

IN HONOR OF ALBERT O'NEILL JR.

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Albert O'Neill Jr. upon his nomination as a Jefferson Award finalist. Mr. O'Neill Jr. is a patient care volunteer with Delaware Hospice and a member of the Delaware Lions Foundation. Mr. O'Neill Jr. is instrumental in collecting donated items and distributing them throughout the world to persons in need.

Since 1998, Mr. O'Neill has donated over 15,000 pairs of shoes and over 1.2 million pounds of donated items. Mr. O'Neill's efforts have meant that thousands of needy people have not gone without.

Mr. Speaker, I commend and congratulate Mr. O'Neill Jr. upon his nomination as a finalist for the Jefferson Award. Mr. O'Neill's selflessness serves as an example to us all.

A TRIBUTE TO JANICE Y. JONES

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Janice Y. Jones in recognition of her strong commitment to her family and dedication to educating our children.

Janice Y. Jones was born in the Bedford-Stuyvesant neighborhood of Brooklyn, New York to James and Clara Jones. At the age of five the family moved to East New York, where Janice attended local public schools, P.S. 159, I.S. 218 and Franklin Lane High School. Janice won a scholarship to Connecticut College. After a year at Connecticut, she returned home to help her mother care for her three younger brothers due to the death of her father.

Janice went back to Lane where she was hired as an Educational Assistant. She went through the Career Training Program and obtained her degree from York College and her Teaching License.

During her tenure at Lane, she worked closely with the activities director, the guidance department and was one of the coaches for the cheerleading squad. She accompanied her mother to numerous community and school meetings as well.

Although Lane did not have a teaching position for Janice, Transit Tech High School hired her as a Special Education Teacher. After one year of teaching, Janice became the Coordinator of Student Activities at Transit Tech. The title included many duties such as the leadership program for students, senior activities, the Transit Tech Volunteer Program, SkillsUSA (VICA), and a parent and community liaison.

She worked closely with and underwent training by the Anti-Defamation League, the National Conference of Community, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Education Conflict Resolution and Negotiation Team where she now is a trainer herself. Janice has served on the Board of Trustees for New York City VICA and as the Vice Chairperson of the New York State VICA Board of Trustees.

Janice is very devoted to her students and tries to encourage them to reach for greatness and realize their potential. When time allows, she is also an active volunteer in the community.

Mr. Speaker, Janice Y. Jones has dedicated herself to her community and to educating our children. As such, she is more than worthy of receiving our recognition today and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring this truly remarkable person.

CONGRATULATING THE FRIENDLY
SONS OF ST. PATRICK OF
LACKAWANNA COUNTY ON THEIR
100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask you and my esteemed colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to a group of men from the past and present who are part of a proud tradition in Northeastern Pennsylvania. The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Lackawanna County will celebrate its 100th anniversary on St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 2005.

The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick is a group of men who gets together each year on St. Patrick's Day to partake in dinner and camaraderie in a celebration of the Irish-American experience. The Friendly Sons dinners are a tradition in Lackawanna County that have grown considerably since the first one in 1906—from about 80 men in 1906 to 1,200 this year. This year's dinner was sold out months in advance.

The Friendly Sons had its beginning as the Irish-American Society of Lackawanna County, formed by Judge Edward F. Blewitt, former Scranton Diocese Bishop M.J. Hoban, Col. F.J. Fitzsimmons and Scranton Times publisher E.J. Lynett. The organization wanted a more formal way to mark St. Patrick's Day than with the parades in downtown Scranton.

The Lackawanna County group called itself the Irish-American Society until 1940. Members felt that a hyphenated name was no longer appropriate. World War II was just beginning and the organization wanted to have people united as Americans, not identified because of their descent.

For the first few years, the dinner took place at the old Hotel Jermyn. It moved to the former Hotel Casey in 1911, where it remained for 60 years. As time went on, the Friendly Sons had to find another venue because the Hotel Casey could not accommodate the expanding guest list. Some attendees were even forced to sit in the hotel coffee shop or in the nearby Preno's Restaurant and watch the evening's festivities on tiny television monitors.

Eventually, the dinner moved again—this time to St. Mary's Center and then in 1984 to Genetti Manor in Dickson City, where it has been held since.

The dinner has earned quite a reputation for hosting one notable speaker after another. Typically, the organization tries to have two main speakers—a lay person and a member of the clergy. The list of prominent names dates back to the dinner's 1909 speaker, John Mitchell, revered labor leader and international president of United Mineworkers of America.

President Harry S. Truman spoke at the dinner twice—in 1943 and 1956. In 1943, he was a little-known senator from Missouri who spoke about foreign policy during the Cold

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

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

War. When he came back to the Friendly Sons dinner in 1956, he had served two terms as president.

Perhaps the most notable speaker came in 1964. The Friendly Sons dinner was the first public appearance made by then-U.S. attorney general Robert F. Kennedy following the assassination of his brother, President John F. Kennedy. In September of that year, Robert Kennedy resigned to run for the U.S. Senate in New York. A column written 10 years later by one of his aides stated that Mr. Kennedy made his decision to remain in public service because of the amazing support and outpouring of affection shown to him in Scranton as 2,000 people lined the streets to greet him.

Many politicians have spoken at the Friendly Sons dinner. Beginning with John K. Tener in 1911 and including our current governor, Ed Rendell, in 2003, almost all Pennsylvania governors have attended the dinner, including Lackawanna County residents William W. Scranton and the late Robert P. Casey, who himself was a member of the Friendly Sons.

My good friend former U.S. Rep. Joseph McDade, also a Friendly Sons member, spoke in 1986. U.S. senators, including Eugene McCarthy, Henry "Scoop" Jackson, John Glenn, and Delaware's JOSEPH BIDEN—a native of Scranton—have spoken at the dinner.

Guests from abroad have also graced the stage, including former Irish Prime Ministers Garret FitzGerald and Albert Reynolds, Sinn Fein leader Gerry Adams and British Parliament member Martin McGuinness.

The Friendly Sons organization has about 900 members and elects officers each year. The president has the intimidating job of organizing the dinner and arranging for the speaker.

This year's president is Dr. Joseph T. Kelly Sr. and the speaker is Alex Maskey, the first Catholic mayor of Belfast, Northern Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, please join me and my fellow colleagues in the House of Representatives in congratulating the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Lackawanna County, an organization steeped in rich traditions, as they celebrate their 100th anniversary.

RECOGNIZING THE WE THE PEOPLE CIVICS TEAM FROM FREMONT, CALIFORNIA'S IRVINGTON HIGH SCHOOL

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the 2005 "We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution" class of Fremont, California's Irvington High School in my district for winning the state championship in January.

The We the People competition is an educational program administered by the Center for Civic Education of Los Angeles and funded by the U.S. Department of Education. The main focus of the program is to commemorate the framing and adoption of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and to revitalize educational programs on the Constitution in our Nation's schools. It provides a course of instruction on the basic principles of our Nation's constitutional democracy and the history of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Par-

ticipants then enter into competitive simulated congressional hearings following the course of study.

Students who wish to participate in the program must go through an interview process the year prior to the start of the class. The applicants must answer questions similar to the ones they will be asked during competition.

Accepted applicants learn and familiarize themselves with current event topics along with curriculum taught in the class. There are six different areas that are taught in the course and each participant must become an expert in each and every area.

The participants prepare for several months before testifying to a panel made up of judges representing the community. The judges ask detailed follow-up questions regarding the presentation, which require the students to think quickly and provide spontaneous answers. They compete first at two competitions at the local level before going to the state championships. Those who win at the state level go on to compete nationally.

In January, students from ten schools representing various areas of California came to Sacramento to compete in the state We the People championship. I am proud to say that the Irvington High School team, coached by their teacher Mrs. Cook-Kallio, won the competition and will be representing California during the national finals, which will be held from April 30th through May 3rd here, in Washington, DC.

The victory reflects the hard work and dedication these students put together after about nine months of preparation. The Irvington team spent countless hours in and out of class getting ready for the competition. Most groups stayed past 10 p.m. on some nights to take part in practice sessions where their teacher, Mrs. Cook-Kallio, along with other teachers and alumni of Irvington High School, drilled them on their subjects to try and simulate the environment of the competition.

I applaud the We the People class, Mrs. Cook-Kallio, and Irvington High School in reaching the national finals and am honored to have them represent the state of California at the national level. I join with other admirers and members in the community of Fremont in wishing the team luck. I hope to be giving another congratulatory speech once they become National champions.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF BEXAR COUNTY CONSTABLE ROBERT "MIKE" BLOUNT

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Constable Robert Blount in my congressional district, for his exceptional career in law enforcement.

Robert Blount was elected as Constable of Precinct Four in January 2005, but has been actively serving his community for the last sixteen years. He believes in establishing a solid law enforcement agency that is committed to the needs of the community, and has devoted his department to serve the public through honesty and integrity.

Constable Blount is an excellent example of an elected official who understands the needs of his community. The mission for his department is to promote safety in the community by enforcing court orders, supporting early intervention activities, and to work together with neighboring law enforcement agencies.

Constable Blount is a man who believes in the value of community involvement and intervention. Currently he is focusing his department on lowering truancy levels and high school dropout rates, reducing neighborhood crime, and maintaining clear communication within the people in his community.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Bexar County Constable Robert "Mike" Blount for his dedication and service to the community.

IN HONOR OF AUDREY HOPE-MILTON

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker it is with great pleasure that I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Audrey Hope-Milton upon her nomination as a Jefferson Award finalist. Ms. Hope-Milton is a volunteer to the Stop the Violence Coalition, as the program administrator for the Playstation Too Mentoring Program. Ms. Hope-Milton is predominately concerned with the health, welfare and safety of young people and takes great care to make sure that they are not overlooked or forgotten.

Ms. Hope-Milton's passion for volunteer work comes from a religious family legacy of working with today's youth. Ms. Hope-Milton's success is a result of her giving back what was given to her. Ms. Hope-Milton's tireless efforts to help young people have touched the lives of many in our community.

Mr. Speaker, I commend and congratulate Ms. Hope-Milton upon her nomination as a finalist for the Jefferson Award. Ms. Hope-Milton's selflessness serves as an example to us all.

DEATH OF AGENT DAVID WILHELM

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my condolences to the family, friends, and colleagues of Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agent David Wilhelm who was killed by a gunman in Atlanta, Georgia this past weekend. I join Agent Wilhelm's family, including the law enforcement community in America, in mourning the tragic loss of Agent Wilhelm.

Mr. Wilhelm dedicated his 18-year career in law enforcement to protecting America. He was one of the many men and women who put their lives on the line every single day, no matter what the danger. He was one of the good guys who helped to make America safer by putting away the bad guys. His specialty was investigating financial crimes, narcotics smuggling, and human smuggling.

Agent Wilhelm's service was distinguished. He was awarded the 2001 Blue Eagle Award for his work on a narcotics investigation—Operation Prospero. Mr. Wilhelm received the award because he went far beyond the call of duty. Indeed, he was the sole recipient of the award in 2001.

Agent Wilhelm's service will not be forgotten. His service will be remembered every day as our law enforcement officers continue his work, carrying on the mission Agent Wilhelm loved so much and did so well.

I would also like to extend my sincere sympathies to the families of Superior Court Judge Rowland Barnes, Julie Brandau, and Hoyt Teasley, who were killed at the Fulton County Courthouse. Our hearts go out to their families and loved ones as well. Their lives will be remembered in the work we do here in Congress.

CHINA'S ANTI-SECESSION LAW

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, late last year, the Standing Committee of the Chinese National People's Congress took a very destabilizing action when it voted to submit an "Anti-Secession Law" to the full Congress, which convened on March 5. That Anti-Secession Law was subsequently adopted by the full Congress and is now Chinese law.

There can be absolutely no doubt about the intent of this law, which is to create the legal justification for a military attack against Taiwan.

The law spells out a range of activities which, if taken by the Taiwanese people and their democratically elected leaders, would legally constitute secession to the Chinese. Many of these activities, such as Constitutional reform and popular referenda, are the mainstay of any democracy. Yet the Chinese would use them as an excuse for a military attack on the 21 million people on Taiwan.

The United States fully understands Taiwan is in a very difficult bind. It is a flourishing democracy, one of the most vibrant in Asia, with freedoms of speech, the press and assembly and intensely competitive free political parties. Yet it is claimed as a sovereign territory by the People's Republic of China, which is not a democracy and has no freedom of the press, speech or assembly. And this neighbor now threatens to annex Taiwan by force.

Under the terms of the Taiwan Relations Act, which is the legal bedrock of our policy, the United States insists that the future of Taiwan must be determined by peaceful means. And we have stated that no actions should be taken by either Taiwan or the People's Republic of China, that endanger the peace and stability that now exists across the Taiwan Strait.

Mr. Speaker, during the past year, the Bush Administration cautioned Taiwan about actions which might appear to challenge this status quo. Now the PRC, through this provocative legislation, is challenging the status quo in a very big way. The State Department said this legislation is highly unhelpful. I strongly agree with this position and register my strong opposition to the enactment of the Anti-Secession Law.

IN HONOR OF JENNIFER CROUSE

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Jennifer Crouse upon her nomination as a Jefferson Award finalist. Ms. Crouse is the founder of Fun Packs. Fun Packs are for use by children patients at area hospitals to help young children through difficult times in their lives. In 2001, the program was expanded to include Care Packs, which were distributed to service people who were deployed through the Dover Air Force base. Ms. Crouse has volunteered within the community for more than 10 years, and has logged more than 3,200 volunteer hours.

Ms. Crouse's volunteer efforts have touched the lives of many in our community. Ms. Crouse is a deserving candidate for the Jefferson Award.

Mr. Speaker, I commend and congratulate Ms. Crouse upon her nomination as a finalist for the Jefferson Award. Ms. Crouse is truly worthy of this honor.

A TRIBUTE TO BEATRICE JACKSON-WALLS

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Beatrice Jackson-Walls in recognition of her commitment to her church and her community.

Beatrice is a vivacious, effervescent Virginia Belle. A member of Cornerstone Baptist Church in Brooklyn for 57 years, she has dedicated her teenage and young adult life to serving in the Youth Fellowship, Young People's Choir and as a teacher in the Baptist Training Union, Junior Department.

Professionally, Beatrice serves Cornerstone Baptist Church as a skillful efficient Administrative Assistant and has had the honor and pleasure of working with three spiritual giants: the late Pastor Emeritus, Reverend Dr. Sandy F. Ray; the Reverend Dr. Harry S. Wright; and her present Pastor, the Reverend Lawrence E. Aker, III.

Artistically, Beatrice is a gifted soprano soloist in the Senior Choir and has performed in concerts throughout the New York Metropolitan area, including Carnegie Recital Hall and the prestigious St. Peters Church in Manhattan. A past Sunday School Teacher, she continues to utilize her educational and volunteer leadership skills as Secretary of the Board of Directors of the Cornerstone Day Care Center, Inc., Chair of Special Projects of the Capital Fund Raising Committee, President of the Senior Choir, Corresponding Secretary of the Brooklyn Ecumenical Choir of Bedford Stuyvesant, and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Food Pantry. She also served on the Board of Directors of the American Lung Association of Brooklyn.

A product of the school systems in Virginia and Delaware, she pursued her education at New York Community College (now New York Technical College) in Brooklyn. She is the re-

ipient of numerous religious, community and business awards and honors. Her hobbies include stained glass designing, traveling, serving, gardening, poetry and people.

God blessed her with 39 years of marriage to the late Deacon Joseph M. Walls. She is mother of two sons, Joseph Demetrius and Darryl Christopher and the grandmother of three of the most precious and special children, Jasmyne Marie, D. Christopher II, and Amara Aurellia.

Mr. Speaker, Beatrice Jackson-Walls has strengthened her community through her numerous volunteer efforts with her church. As such, she is more than worthy of receiving our recognition today and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring this truly remarkable person.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF HAYS COUNTY COMMISSIONER SUSIE CARTER

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the many accomplishments of Hays County Commissioner Susie Carter.

Susie Carter is a proud lifelong citizen of Hays County. She and her husband, John, live on the same farm where Susie grew up. She earned degrees from Southwest Texas State University and the University of Texas at Austin, and returned to rural Hays County to serve her neighbors.

Susie has served Hays County in a variety of capacities: as a health professional, college instructor, character education consultant, and public servant. She was elected President of the Concerned Taxpayers of Hays County, and remains an advocate for taxpayer rights and fiscal responsibility.

As county commissioner, Susie has consistently worked to make Hays County a better place to live. She led the reconstruction of some of the county's worst roads, installed traffic signals to make intersections safer, passed resolutions to protect the local environment and water supply, and fought against illegal dumping. She has been an advocate for low taxes and budget discipline, and a watchdog for the rights of taxpaying citizens and local government. Susie Carter has been a farsighted and effective advocate for her county.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had this opportunity to recognize the many achievements of Hays County Commissioner Susie Carter.

CONGRATULATING MICHAEL PATRICK HINCHEY ON BEING NAMED MAN OF THE YEAR BY THE WILKES-BARRE FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask you and my esteemed colleagues in the

House of Representatives to pay tribute to Michael Patrick Hinchey, who will receive the Man of the Year Award from the Wilkes-Barre Friendly Sons of St. Patrick on St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 2005.

Mr. Hinchey, a native of Kingston, is the son of the late John H. Hinchey Jr. and Margaret Jennings Hinchey. He has three brothers: John III, Frank and Edward.

Michael had a distinguished professional career as vice president of the Matheson Transfer Company. He is also co-owner and vice president of the Matheson Warehouse Company, where he still serves in his official capacity along with his three brothers.

Michael is a member of St. Ignatius Church in Kingston, as well as the Church's Holy Name Society. He was a past president of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in 1984 and was dinner chairman in 1983. Michael is a founding Legacy Member of the Forty Fort Lions Club, an organization in which he served as president, vice president and secretary. He is a board member, golf chairman and building chairman of the Fox Hill Country Club and an active member of the Westmoreland Club as development chairman, historical committee chairman and golf club co-chairman. He is also a committee member of the Pennsylvania Movers Storage Association.

Michael is active in many service organizations, including the American Heart Association, American Red Cross, American Cancer Society, Boy Scouts, Keystone College, King's College, St. Vincent de Paul Kitchen, United Way, YMCA and Wilkes University.

Michael has been married to the former Sharon Cravatta for 28 years. He is the proud father of two beautiful daughters, Westyn Layne and Collyn Michael.

Michael was raised by two wonderful parents who instilled in him a love of family and devotion to community. Michael attributes his pride in his Irish heritage to his grandfather, who was a first generation immigrant.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Michael Patrick Hinchey upon being named Man of the Year by the Wilkes-Barre Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

CONSTRUCTIVE DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT IN TURKEY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we spend a great deal of time in this chamber speaking about democracy and how to ensure its continuance at home and how to instill it abroad. Encouragingly, one of our most important friends and allies, Turkey, has worked very hard over the past few years to deepen, strengthen and ensure democracy in that country.

Over the past several years Turkey has debated, in the fullness of an open legislature, measures covering human rights, foreign investment, governance, protection of minority interests, freedom of speech and association. A majority of the duly elected members of that body have voted in the affirmative to amend old laws and pass new ones. Many of these changes have been enshrined as permanent parts of Turkish law through amendments to its national constitution.

There are literally hundreds of changes but among the most important are abolition of the death penalty, ability to broadcast in minority languages, ability to be educated in minority languages and cementing civilian control over the military. While we still look forward to more improvements to their democratic infrastructure, Turkey's future looks promising.

Many of these reforms were driven by the demands of the European Union. But to be fair, and to give Turkey its due, irrespective of the reasons why there was a consideration of the need for reform, no reforms would have occurred without the political will of that nation's people and government to squarely face these issues, debate them and overturn, in some cases, policies that have been in existence since the 1923 founding of the Turkish Republic.

Last December 17th, the European Union extended the formal invitation to our friend and ally to begin discussions that will lead to eventual Turkish membership in the EU—the first predominantly Muslim nation to be so considered.

Muslim nations wrestling with the movement toward democracy. I hope all of my colleagues welcome and applaud Turkey's actions.

RECOGNIZING SANDY ALLMON ANDERSON AND HER INDUCTION INTO WOMEN IN AVIATION INTERNATIONAL PIONEER HALL OF FAME

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Sandy Allmon Anderson, from Lewisville, located in the 26th Congressional District of Texas, for her contributions of women in the aviation field.

I congratulate Sandy Anderson for this outstanding achievement. Anderson helped pave the way for women in aviation. She was the first female pilot to check-out in the left seat and the captain's seat, of both the Boeing 727 and 747, first Northwest Airlines Boeing 727 female instructor and check airman, first female Fleet Check Captain among the major U.S. airlines, and the first and only female chief pilot that Northwest Airlines has ever had. Ms. Anderson is the senior female on every flight she takes and one of five females on the Boeing 747-400. She was the second female hired to Northwest Airlines some twenty-two years ago. As a fellow pilot, I recognize the dedication and continual commitment to education that flying demands.

Ms. Anderson was inducted into the Lewisville High School Hall of Fame in 2001 and honored as a Distinguished Alumna at Texas Woman's University in 1996. Sandy Anderson established and managed the first endowment fund as a founding board member representing the airline aviation industry for international organization. In the first seven years of the fund's existence, it has distributed more than \$3 million in aviation scholarships.

Today, Anderson speaks at conferences and schools to spread the message of reaching for your dreams. She has an especially close connection with the young girls who have dreams of being in traditionally male oc-

cupations. Anderson believes that these girls need support along the way if they too are to accomplish their dreams.

I am proud of representing such a heroine. Sandy Anderson is an astonishing example of a determined person who would not settle and made her dreams a reality against the odds. She is a role model not only to women but also for everyone who has obstacles to overcome in reaching their goals.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION CONDEMNING RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION AND INTOLERANCE IN INDIA

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Mr. PITTS and myself to introduce this Resolution to condemn the alleged statements and actions of complacency by the government authorities in Gujarat, led by Chief Minister Narendra Modi, in the face of the religious persecution of the Gujarati people.

In February of 2002, India experienced its greatest human rights crisis in a decade: orchestrated violence against Muslims in the state of Gujarat that claimed at least 2,000 lives in a matter of days. Three years after that horrific incident, Narendra Modi, the Chief Minister of Gujarat has been indicted by various Indian and International human rights organizations for lending his hand to the violence.

Mr. Modi himself has not been shy about proudly professing his anti-Christian, anti-Muslim, and anti-tribal stances. He has repeatedly dehumanized the Muslim population of his state by accusing them of treachery; he has actively sought to interfere in the practice of the Christian faith in Gujarat, and he has caused wide-scale displacement of indigenous populations in the State in the face of stiff popular resistance. I find Mr. Modi's actions to be of the most reprehensible sort.

In an article in the Hindu Times on March 2, 2005, former Indian President K.R. Narayanan stated that "there was a 'conspiracy' between the BJP governments at the Centre and the state behind the 2002 Gujarat riots . . .". Further, a number of Indian human rights organizations, international human rights organizations, and a former Supreme Court Justice all recognize Chief Minister Modi's complicity in the violence.

He has attacked Muslims and Christians with vile venom, and according to both India's highest court and many international human rights groups, has condoned terrible, violent religious hate crimes, all the while, shielding those said to have committed them. In fact, in a scathing indictment of Mr. Modi, the Supreme Court of India referred to the Chief Minister and his government as "the modern day Neros". Moreover, in a recent unprecedented order, the Supreme Court of India ordered the reopening of all the criminal cases that Mr. Modi has closed, regarding over 2000 police cases in which the non-Hindu victims filed reports of rapes, killings, and destruction of their property.

Such actions by high ranking government officials of any religion are unacceptable and must not be tolerated.

I urge my colleagues to join me in condemning religious intolerance and promoting religious freedom, so that others may see what our great democracy stands for.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF
FORMER U.S. REPRESENTATIVE
WILLIAM LEHMAN

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today we mark the passing of William Lehman, retired Member of this august body and exemplary human being. Mr. Lehman was born in Selma, Alabama on October 5, 1913. His reputation for honesty was developed early in life when he moved to Miami and opened a used car business. Television viewers got to know "Alabama Bill" through his commercial advertising. Auto buyers in Dade County quickly realized that he always treated his customers fairly.

In the early 1960s, he began teaching English literature in Dade County public schools, where he was highly valued and greatly respected by his colleagues and his students. Building on his success as an educator, he was elected to the school board in 1966 and became its chairman in 1970.

In 1972, Bill ran for Congress in the newly created 13th District, winning easily. From then until his retirement in 1992, he was a tireless advocate for the citizens of northeast Dade County. He quickly rose to a position of prominence in the House of Representatives, becoming chairman of the Appropriations Committee's subcommittee that oversaw highways, seaports and mass transit systems. Public transit was always important to Bill Lehman, as he knew it was a lifeline to employment, grocery shopping, doctor visits and other necessary services for poor and working class citizens.

In addition to normal Congressional business, Mr. Lehman's career in the House of Representatives was noted for many remarkable deeds. Among those were his trips to Cuba and Argentina to secure the release of political prisoners and the brave venture of smuggling an artificial heart valve into the Soviet Union to save the life of a critically ill woman. Throughout his career in Congress, Bill Lehman was known as an "unbending liberal." This is one of many characteristics that endeared him to me. He was a friend of more than thirty years, a mentor and a very important role model. By his very nature, he was a constant source of inspiration and encouragement to people who work every day to make our world a better place.

Florida, America, and the world have lost a giant with the passing of William Lehman. To paraphrase another famous American political leader known for his honesty, Abraham Lincoln, the world will greatly note and long remember the life of Bill Lehman. May he rest in peace.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS
OF WEBB COUNTY JUDGE LOUIS
BRUNI

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell the Congress about a man who works constantly to ensure the people of Webb County Texas get the services they need from the local government. Judge Louis Bruni is and always has been committed to working for others; he is the ideal public servant.

The sixth-generation Laredoan has held multiple positions of service to the community from his first position in 1994 as a Laredo City Councilman up to his current position as the Webb County Judge. Every post Judge Louis Bruni has occupied he has pumped out results to the people he so faithfully serves. As Laredo City Councilman he played an influential role in securing funding for roads and recreational areas within his district and also was a driving force behind the construction of the city library.

In 2001 he was elected to serve as the Webb County Judge. It can be seen in this position that he currently holds how dear to his heart the people of Webb County are. He has efficiently allocated the resources of Webb County to better serve the populace in a countless number of ways. Take for instance his environmentally conscious idea of turning all carbon-based waste materials into electric power creating an extra energy source sufficient enough to power 800 additional houses. Not only is he a crusader for the proper usage of the environment, he also wants to ensure all his fellow members of Webb County get the first-class economy they deserve. His life in the public sphere should be a model for people who want to give all they can to their communities.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Bruni is not alone a public servant but also a father of two amazing children Fredick and Allison, and I am proud to that him for everything he had done for our community.

IN MEMORY OF JUNE RITCHIE
CHAMBERS, M.D.

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a distinguished American, Dr. June Ritchie Chambers, who died on January 24, 2005, at the age of eighty.

June Ritchie was born in Parkersburg, West Virginia, and graduated from West Virginia University. She attended its School of Medicine before transferring to the Western Reserve University School of Medicine in Cleveland, Ohio. She completed residencies in Internal Medicine and Psychiatry at Charleston Area Medical Center Memorial Hospital, practicing Psychiatry at Shawnee Hills and working as an Internal Medicine specialist as well.

June Ritchie Chambers was married to her husband John T. "Jack" Chambers, also a Charleston physician, for 57 years. In 2002,

together with their son and wife, John and Elaine Chambers, my constituents, they donated \$1.5 million to their alma mater, West Virginia University, establishing a program to train students in electronic business techniques.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our deep sympathy to the family of June Ritchie Chambers and to honor her lifetime of remarkable accomplishments and service to her community and her country.

HONORING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF
MRS. MARGIT WORSHAM

HON. WILLIAM L. JENKINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mrs. Margit Worsham, a resident of the First Congressional District of Tennessee. Mrs. Worsham is being recognized for her extraordinary efforts by the Tennessee General Assembly, and I would appreciate having the opportunity to recognize her efforts here in the United States House of Representatives as well.

Margit, along with her husband Earl, has been a tireless contributor to Sevier County, Tennessee. Through her efforts she has been directly involved and/or responsible for raising over \$2,500,000 in benefits to aid those in need.

Margit has served as the Sevier County United Way Chairman, breaking fundraising records during her tenure. She has also served in a variety of capacities within the community; serving as Board Chair of the Sevier County Arts Council, Board Member of the Gatlinburg Gateway Foundation, Board member of Leadership Sevier, member of the Gatlinburg First and Lasting Impressions Committee, Board Member of the Sevier County Bear & Boar Club, and the Sevier County Representative on the Nine Counties One Vision organization. On top of that, Margit has also served as an organizing member of Gatlinburg's Fourth of July Parade, Taste of Autumn event, Vision Conference, and the Leadership Sevier Graduation Event.

While those missions should be enough to keep Margit fully occupied, she also serves with several conservation groups working to protect the Great Smoky Mountains National Park and the Atlantic Salmon.

When asked to describe her personality, a fellow volunteer remarked that her enthusiasm, friendliness, positive attitude, and energy made her a natural leader. It was also noted that Margit never delegates a job she is not willing to do herself, and never asks for contributions until and unless she has done so herself.

Mr. Speaker, residents like Margit Worsham are the reason many local communities flourish. Margit, and thousands like her, contributes so much time and effort to ensure that important causes and important people continue to be assisted or protected. We should always recognize these valuable personal assets to our local communities, and I ask that the House join me in honoring this remarkable woman.

IN HONOR OF ROBERT BRANDT

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Robert Brandt upon his nomination as a Jefferson Award finalist. For nearly 19 years, Mr. Brandt has aided Delawareans confronting personal crisis. Mr. Brandt has logged over 8,000 hours of volunteer service and over 3,000 hours as a help line listener.

Mr. Brandt's tireless dedication to the well being of others is an inspiration to all Americans. Mr. Brandt has touched the lives of countless individuals as one of the organizations most committed rape crisis volunteers. He is a most worthy candidate for the Jefferson Award and a truly outstanding Delawarean.

Mr. Speaker, I commend and congratulate Mr. Ellison upon his nomination as a finalist for the Jefferson Award. Mr. Brandt's selflessness serves as an example to us all.

A TRIBUTE TO MAGGIE HARVEY

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Maggie Harvey who has committed herself strengthening her community and has had an accomplished thirty-year career in finance.

Maggie was born in Georgetown, Guyana. The second of two girls and two boys, she was born to Uric and Gwendoline Harris-Haynes. She was baptized in St. George Cathedral.

During her early years, she was dedicated as a soldier in the Salvation Army and worshiped at the Citadel Corp. She received her early education and professional training in Guyana and upon graduation, accepted the position of personal secretary to the Divisional Commander of the Salvation Army.

In 1970, she immigrated to the United States and married Ronald Harvey, who is also Guyanese. Maggie and Ronald have three daughters.

During her 30 years of employment with JP Morgan Chase & Co., she has worked in various departments of the bank. Presently, she is in the Legal Department, Corporate Compliance/Money Laundering and Foreign Assets Control.

In 1988, she was received into fellowship at Miracle Temple Ministries in Brooklyn (formerly Church of the First Born), where Bishop E. Stewart is the Pastor. She serves on the Bishop's Anniversary Committee and also has responsibility for the Church's weekly bulletin.

She is also a Home League Member of the Salvation Army Bedford Temple Corp. in Brooklyn. Members of the organization sew handmade blankets, lap throws, cosmetic bags for personal items and smocks, which are given to the homeless, sick and nursing home shut-ins. Maggie finds this work very rewarding, and takes a leading role in the organization as the Service Chairperson for the Home Leaguers. She looks forward to doing

greater things through Christ, which strengthens her.

Mr. Speaker, Maggie Harvey has served her community while launching a successful career in the financial industry. As such, she is more than worthy of receiving our recognition today and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring this truly remarkable person.

CONGRATULATING JAMES CONLON JR. AS HE IS NAMED MAN OF THE YEAR BY THE GREATER PITTSSTON FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask you and my esteemed colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to James Conlon Jr. as he receives the Man of the Year Award from the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick on St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 2005.

Mr. Conlon is a lifelong resident of Inkerman. He is the son of the late James and Mary McAndrew Conlon. James graduated from Jenkins Township High School in 1944 and was drafted into the Army the following September. He served overseas with the Third Army, 90th Division, fighting in campaigns in Central Europe and Rhineland, Germany.

In 1956, James took a position with the Wilkes-Barre Record and worked there until 1978, when unionized workers went on strike and formed The Citizens' Voice newspaper. He was a member of the board of directors of The Citizens' Voice and was foreman of the plate department until he retired in 1989.

James has been a member of the Jenkins Township Volunteer Fire Department since 1948 and served as Fire Chief from 1970 through 1991. He also belonged to the Luzerne County Fire Chiefs Association and the Greater Pittston Mutual Aid.

James is a member of the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, Fox Hill Country Club, Knights of Columbus JFK Council #372 as Fourth Degree Knight, and a lifelong member of St. Mark's Church in Inkerman.

James and his wife, the former Jean McGarry, celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary last year. The couple has five children: James III, Mary Jo Pacchioni, William, Robert and Maureen Fetchko. They have seven grandchildren: Kathryn, James IV, Kelly, Mary Kate, William Jr., Michael and Megan.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating James Conlon Jr. upon being named Man of the Year by the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

HONORING THE DEDICATION OF HARLANDALE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD MEMBER JOSHUA J. CERNA

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the dedication of Harlandale Inde-

pendent School District Board Member Joseph J. Cerna, of my Congressional District for a lifetime of distinguished public service.

Mr. Cerna is a San Antonio native and a graduate of Harlandale High School. He received a Bachelor's of Science Degree at Mississippi State University. Currently he is serving his community as an educator, contributing much of his time and efforts to educational matters.

Joshua Cerna was elected to District 1 Board of Trustees in 2002, and through his years of service he has held the position of the Board's Vice President, Secretary, and currently he serves as President. His active role in the District has led him to join various committees such as the Building Committee, Finance Committee, and for the past three years he has been the Chairman of the Curriculum Committee.

Mr. Cerna was one of the architects of the Bexar County School Board Coalition, which brings together different School Board leaders to communicate ideas that will lead to a higher level of education for students, parents, and teachers. He also serves as a member of the TASB Legislative Advisory Council, and TASB School Board Advisory network.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have had this opportunity to thank Harlandale Independent School District Board President Joshua J. Cerna for all he has done in my community.

TRIBUTE TO DAWN STALEY

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Dawn Staley, a three-time Olympic and World Championship gold medalist who is also the outstanding coach of the Temple University women's basketball team. The team, the Temple Women's Owls, just last week captured the Atlantic Ten Conference NCCA tournament championship. The Owls team has won a school record 27 games which includes the last 24 which represents the longest current winning streak for any Division I basketball team, men's or women's.

As a member of the 2004 U.S. Olympic team Ms. Staley was voted by other U.S. team Olympic captains to carry the flag and lead the U.S. delegation into the coliseum, in Athens, Greece. A fixture on U.S. basketball teams since the 1989 Junior World Championship, she competed in the old American Basketball League (ABL) from 1997-1999 where she was a two-time all ABL honoree. She is also just one of three University of Virginia Cavaliers to have their number retired. She twice was named National Player of the Year, during her junior and senior seasons at UVA.

Born in North Philadelphia, as a young girl Ms. Staley played basketball with the boys as a way of staying out of trouble. She attended Dobbins High School and the University of Virginia, where she was all-American. As a sports phenomenon she strives to be the role model that she says she was in search of as a child. In 1996 she created the Dawn Staley Foundation whose mission is to create a future of hope for at-risk youth by providing opportunities to help them realize their dreams and become productive and responsible citizens. Because of her efforts to give back to

her community she was awarded the 1998 American Red Cross Spectrum Award and she also received the 1999 WNBA Entrepreneurial Spirit Award.

Dawn Staley is an outstanding athlete, coach and inspiration. She is a champion in the truest sense of the word.

RECOGNIZING TOM HARPOOL FOR HIS ENDLESS COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Tom Harpool, from Denton, Texas, in the heart of the 26th Congressional District of Texas, for his dedicated service to the community.

Tom Harpool makes helping his community a high priority in his life. He has spent so much of his time dedicated to assisting others in throughout the community. From education to banking, Tom Harpool has made a difference in our lives.

In 1954, Mr. Harpool began the first of six terms on the Denton Independent School District Board of Trustees serving as its board president from 1969 until 1973. Mr. Harpool has also been a part of the United Way of Denton County, Boy Scouts of America, 4-H Club and Saint Andrew Presbyterian Church for years. In addition, Mr. Harpool has served on the boards of a local bank and savings & loan before becoming a board member of the Upper Trinity River Authority.

In his own, Mr. Harpool has become a "Master Gardener" and enjoys sharing this hobby with the community through a gardening organization. He has been an active member of the Kiwanis Club for over 50 years and dutifully served on their board. Mr. Harpool has even dabbled in politics by being an active supporter of many candidates in both local and national races.

I am proud to represent Tom Harpool—a man who has given so much back to his community. Mr. Harpool's advice, council and support to the community, whether directly or indirectly, over the years, are certainly something for which to be thankful. I am grateful that can represent such wonderful citizens like Mr. Harpool.

TRIBUTE TO TEMPLE BETH JACOB ON THE OCCASION OF THE SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF ITS FOUNDING

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Temple Beth Jacob as it celebrates the 75th anniversary of its founding. As the oldest congregation on the San Francisco Peninsula, Temple Beth Jacob stands as a testament to the long tradition of involvement of the Jewish community in the religious and public life in the Bay Area.

Founded in 1930, Temple Beth Jacob was the first Jewish religious institution created be-

tween the cities of San Francisco and San Jose. Its membership today is burgeoning with a vibrant congregation of more than 450 families from throughout the Peninsula to worship, to learn, and to strengthen both the Jewish community and the Bay Area community as a whole.

The congregation is led by Rabbi Nathaniel Ezray, who is now in his tenth year as the head of this congregation. Over the years, he's demonstrated a sincere commitment to translating the lessons of faith into actions that will benefit the community. In a 1995 interview, he said, "What's compelling for me is the social justice of Judaism. I want our congregation to respond together to domestic violence, AIDS, black-Jewish relations. My passion is teaching, but the pulpit allows me the opportunity to teach in many different ways and to create meaning and relevance." He lives with his wife, Mimi, and their daughter, Emily, and son, Ethan, in Redwood City.

In the decades before Rabbi Ezray began at the synagogue, Rabbi H. David Teitelbaum led the congregation at Temple Beth Jacob for 38 years. Under his leadership, the congregation grew from only 100 active families to its present size of nearly four times that number. A longtime advocate for civil rights, Rabbi Teitelbaum traveled to Selma, Alabama in the 1960's to march with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., believing that the history of persecution of the Jewish people creates in them a special obligation to protect the human rights of all. He continues to serve as a beacon for the community and his former congregation in his current role as Executive Director of the Board of Rabbis of Northern California.

Temple Beth Jacob has a long tradition of coordinating with other religious institutions in the Bay Area to provide vital services to the community at large. In addition to providing a school and a pre-school to the community, Temple Beth Jacob's efforts have helped to house the homeless through the Interfaith Homeless Network and feed the hungry through the Urban Ministry's "Breaking Bread" program. They are annual cosponsors of the Martin Luther King observance in Redwood City, and have hosted the event over the years. All told, Temple Beth Jacob is a model of dedicated community action.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to honor Temple Beth Jacob as it celebrates its 75th anniversary. After three quarters of a century, Temple Beth Jacob remains a source of pride for the Peninsula, and promises to be a center of our community for decades to come.

UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA ENERGY DIALOG

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, much attention has been paid to the recent conversations President Bush and President Putin have had about democracy. Less attention has been paid to their other discussions regarding market economics, supply and demand, and U.S. energy security.

Although there are varying ideas in American political discourse about the proper role of government, in the post-September 11th

world there can be no disagreement that our government's main concern is security of American citizens. National security discussions usually focus on threats to public safety, but I would like to call attention to a less-noticed facet of American security: the importance of our energy security. One of the great strengths of our nation is our access to affordable, reliable energy. Safeguarding that energy security means ensuring that access to energy continues.

In earlier Administrations, energy policies concentrated on lowering the United States' increasing dependence on imported oil. But the oil embargo of 1973 changed America's approach to energy policy. The focus shifted to reducing dependence on other countries to meet our energy needs and to minimizing the economic impact of future oil disruptions. The measures put in place (enhanced energy efficiency, increased industrial fuel switching capabilities, decreased use of oil for power generation, and others) altered America's use of energy by decoupling energy growth from GDP growth and decreasing our average energy intensity, important factors in making the U.S. less vulnerable to oil supply disruptions. Other measures such as developing strategic stocks (building and filling the strategic petroleum reserve, or SPR), developing international institutions to respond collectively to energy disruptions, and diversifying the sources of oil imported into the United States have brought more certainty and stability to the energy market. While energy security policies have not stopped oil disruptions (nor stopped the growth of oil imports which are at 58 percent of to day's consumption) they have enhanced our ability cope with disruptions while limiting economic and market impacts.

Diversifying the sources of energy refers to both fuel and geographic diversity, as well as work to develop other types of energy supplies. Increasingly, America is looking to imports of liquefied natural gas (LNG) to fill the supply gap with diverse, reliable, long-term supplies as United States demand increases, domestic supplies decrease and imports from Canada stabilize. The Bush Administration has identified liquefied natural gas (LNG) imports as one important way to decrease our over-dependence on a small number of countries.

Russia plays an important role in both gas and oil markets, as the location of the world's largest gas reserves and the world's largest producer and exporter. In the international oil market, Russia is challenging Saudi Arabia as the largest crude oil producer. The Bush Administration recognized Russia's increased importance in energy markets, and launched an energy dialogue in May 2002 to enhance United States investment opportunities in Russia and to enhance Russian opportunities for energy trade with the United States.

Results under the Energy Dialogue have been mixed. American company investment opportunities in Russia have been dampened by recent events. Despite President Putin's attempts to mollify the international investment community by indicating that Russia is open to foreign investment, the Russian investment environment has deteriorated through actions undermining the rule of law and contract sanctity such as renationalizing oil assets and limiting bidding on strategic leases in oil, gas, and mining sectors. U.S.-Russian oil trade, however, has been stymied through lack of Russian infrastructure (a deepwater port that

would make it economical to ship crude in large vessels to the U.S.) and pipeline decisions directing future crude oil shipments to the Far East. The more rational, economic choice of a pipeline to the Barents Sea in the north of Russia and the development of a deepwater port near Murmansk has been delayed despite backing by both Russian and American firms.

But there is positive news coming from the Russian gas market, which is dominated by Gazprom, of which the government owns 38 percent. Gazprom exports one third of its production to Europe via pipeline supplying about 25 percent of Europe's gas needs. Over the last two or three decades of service, there has been only one day of interruption in gas service due to a payment problem in Belarus. Gazprom now is seeking to expand and diversify its markets, through both expansion of its pipelines and entry into the LNG trade. Gazprom spoke at the U.S. LNG Summit in December 2003, and the U.S. held a workshop at Gazprom's headquarters in June 2004, again urging Gazprom to focus on the U.S. market. Gazprom President Alexsey Miller signed agreements last year with three U.S. multinationals to explore developing Russian gas and LNG facilities, and marketing the LNG to the U.S. In fact, Gazprom expects to enter the U.S. LNG market indirectly by 2006, and directly by 2010. After the summit meeting, the joint communiqué from President Bush and President Putin referred to this issue, saying, "We are interested in increasing U.S. commercial investment in Russia, so as to create additional capacity for liquefied natural gas (LNG) in Russia, and also with the aim of increasing LNG exports to U.S. markets. We would welcome increased Russian oil exports to the world market and an increased presence of imports from Russia in the United States." That would be welcome news to the U.S. market.

The U.S. must remain engaged in the U.S.-Russia Energy Dialogue, despite recent adversities. We should not shrink from discussing these setbacks openly, frankly and seriously. But we need to support the May 2002 agreement to increase energy trade between the U.S. and Russia in both oil and gas, since it would enhance U.S. energy security through diversity of supply, while helping to stabilize Russia's economy and tie its interests to American success. Both countries will benefit from a long-term, stable trade in both oil and gas.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS
OF LAREDO POLICE CHIEF
AGUSTIN DOVALINA III

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the important achievements of Laredo Police Chief Agustín Dovalina III in Laredo, TX in my Congressional District.

Agustín Dovalina III was named interim police chief for the City of Laredo Police Department in 1996, and was subsequently named as the LPD chief in 1997. He began his law enforcement career with the Laredo Police Department in 1978 as a patrolman and rose

through the ranks of Laredo's finest. He has served prior posts as a Patrol Officer, Detective, Sergeant, Lieutenant, and Captain.

Under this administration, the police department has evolved into a thriving, highly successful, and professional organization with unprecedented personnel and equipment growth. He currently oversees a multi-million dollar departmental budget and over 500 employees, including over 400 full-time police officers. Recognized nationally, Chief Dovalina is a firm believer and staunch advocate of community-based policing philosophies as evidenced by the continued commitment of the Laredo Police Department to continually enhance its delivery of Community-Oriented Policing Services in our city. Chief Agustín was one of the featured speakers at the 2002 National Community Policing Conference, where the Laredo Police Department was honored for the success of its community-based policing efforts.

Police Chief Dovalina has both a Bachelor and a Master of Science Degree in Criminal Justice and is a graduate of the Harvard University Kennedy School of Government's State & Local Executives Program. He is also a graduate of the 178th session of the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy. He holds a Master Peace Officer Certification and Police Instructor Certification from the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officers Standards & Education and, is an active member of the Texas Chapter of FBI NA Associates. He also serves as Regional Representative to the National Criminal Justice Association and is an adjunct professor of Criminal Justice.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have this opportunity to recognize the dedication of Laredo Police Chief Agustín Dovalina III.

IN HONOR OF VIRGINIA LANIER
BIASOTTO

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Virginia Lanier Biasotto upon her nomination as a Jefferson Award finalist. Ms. Biasotto is the founder of Reading ASSIST® Institute. This institute is a nonprofit organization that trains volunteer tutors to implement a one-on-one help method using scientific research-based instruction for struggling readers. This program is provided at no cost to families or schools.

Beginning in 1980, Ms. Biasotto developed a reading curriculum based on the Orton-Gillingham model, and trained friends at her kitchen table. One sound at a time, one child at a time, the groups persistence offered the education community a way to deal with the challenge of reading difference.

Mr. Speaker, I commend and congratulate Ms. Biasotto upon her nomination as a finalist for the Jefferson Award. Ms. Biasotto's determination and drive to educate and empower others serves as an example to us all. She is truly worthy of this honor.

A TRIBUTE TO QUEENIE MARY
CORLEY WOOTEN

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Queenie Mary Corley Wooten in recognition of her public service and numerous contributions to her community.

Queenie has made a difference in many people's lives. She was born into a family of ten in Salley, South Carolina to the late James and Estella Hunt Corey. She is the wife of the late James Wooten and the companion of Dr. Raymond B. Croskey for the past 21 years.

She has encountered many challenges during her life and has embraced them all with courage and dignity, which exemplifies the type of person she is. Queenie graduated from Medgar Evers College in 1974 with a Bachelor of Arts degree in education. She took additional courses, which enhanced her long and remarkable career in education. Presently, she is working in Region #5 as a Coordinator of External Community Programs. In addition to networking with East New York and Brownsville city agencies, she serves on the cabinets of Planning Board #5 and #16.

Queenie is developing innovative and creative external programs to improve educational and developmental outcomes for students. She coordinates activities with the external community, also assists the director with setting priorities and selecting high quality collaborative programs. She mobilizes resources for regional and school priorities, collaborates with schools in Region #5 to create inter-agency regional advisory councils, and volunteers on Planning Board #5, working with the committee on education. Additionally, she works diligently with students to help them get credit for community service.

Queenie is one of the founders of the American College of Counselors, for the New York Branch, and was recently honored by the Department of Education for her service of 41 years. In fact, she has received numerous honors and awards for her work including: an award from Medgar Evers College as one of its first graduates; the Sojourner Truth Award from the Brooklyn Club of the Negro Business & Professional Women's Club; an honoree of the Women's League of Science and Medicine Inc; and the education award from Van Sicken Block Association. Organizations such as National Sickle Cell Research and the Latin Souls Little League Baseball have honored her as well. Queenie serves on the Board of Directors for Medgar Evers Alumni Association, as the Youth Advisor for the Brooklyn Youth Club, and the chair of North East Committee of Elections.

She notes that all of her accomplishments would not have been possible without the spiritual leadership of Rev. Jacob Underwood. Queenie has been a faithful member of Grace Baptist for the past 35 years.

Mr. Speaker, Queenie Mary Corley Wooten has been dedicated to serving her community through her work on numerous community boards and volunteer efforts. As such, she is more than worthy of receiving our recognition today and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring this truly remarkable person.

CONGRATULATING JOSEPH J. CARMODY AS HE IS AWARDED THE W. FRANCIS SWINGLE AWARD BY THE GREATER PITTSSTON FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask you and my esteemed colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to Judge Joseph J. Carmody as he is awarded the W. Francis Swingle Award by the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick at their annual banquet on St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 2005.

W. Francis Swingle, a lifelong Pittstonian, was a professor of English at King's College and tirelessly aided the community and encouraged college students to give back to society. To that end, Judge Carmody has proven himself a worthy recipient of this award.

Judge Carmody is a lifelong resident of Greater Pittston and a former Past President of the Friendly Sons. He was elected to serve as the West Side District Justice in 2004.

Judge Carmody has been an attorney in the area for more than 27 years. In his career, he has served as First Assistant District Attorney of Luzerne County and Solicitor to the Wyoming Area School District and several municipalities. He is a member of St. Mary of Assumption Church and a 4th Degree member of the Knights of Columbus. He has served on numerous boards, including St. Michael's School for Boys and the Fox Hill Country Club.

Judge Carmody is the son of Jule Carmody of West Pittston and the late Joseph Carmody. He is married to the former Catherine Sowa, and the couple has five children: Joseph, Christopher, Matthew, Sara and Michael.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Judge Joseph J. Carmody as he receives the W. Francis Swingle Award from the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

SALUTING THE GRAND OPENING OF THE TRI-STATE Warbird MUSEUM IN CLERMONT COUNTY, OHIO

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the grand opening on May 20, 2005 of the extraordinary new Tri-State Warbird Museum in Clermont County, Ohio.

The museum, based at the Clermont County Airport, will showcase the history of fighter planes in World War II and Vietnam. Housed in a new 20,000 square foot state of the art facility, the museum features an exhibit area for historic artifacts; a library of reference books; a classroom; a professional restoration shop for the preservation and restoration of original historic aircraft; and a storage area for specialized tools and parts.

Historic aircraft are invaluable to understanding our nation's history, and examples of

these planes are few in number and in danger of being lost forever. With the museum's painstaking preservation efforts, they will come to life for everyone to learn from and enjoy. Thanks to this museum, the importance of these airplanes to our enduring freedom and the sacrifice of those involved—from engineers to mechanics to the pilots—will never be lost.

The Tri-State Warbird Museum's unique building has resulted from the hard work and expertise of man volunteers and supporters. In 2003, a group of volunteers, led by business leader David O' Maley, formed to preserve the memory of those who sacrificed their lives for our freedom. Museum President Paul Redlich, a pilot and professional technician with more than twenty years of historic aviation expertise, closed his business and moved his family to Cincinnati to run the museum. The facility also boasts two professional technicians committed to Warbird painstaking restoration and maintenance: Greg Muir and Nathan Dalrymple.

The museum also boasts an advisory board composed of a broad group of area citizens who have unique talents and experience in aviation and history. Members of the advisory board include: Neil Armstrong; Howard Becker; Jim Bushman; Jack Brown; Joe Campanella; Mark Clark; Richard Cross; Tad Lawrence; Dr. Francis LeRoy; Phil Myers; Buck Niehoff; David O'Maley; Jim Orr; Scott Robertson; Hal Shevers; Dudley Taft; and Oliver Waddell. Of particular note is the extraordinary commitment of the advisory board members and the museum's capital campaign committee, which resulted in the museum's entire cost being funded by private donations.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in Southern Ohio congratulate the many professionals and volunteers who have helped to make this wonderful new museum a reality.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF STAFF SERGEANT MICHAEL PAUL BARRERA

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the outstanding contributions of SSG Michael Paul Barrera, and to acknowledge the renaming of Veterans Elementary School as SSG Michael P. Barrera Veterans Elementary.

After enlisting in the Army in December of 1995 at the age of 18, he completed his basic training in Fort Knox, KY. Michael was always passionate about his job and strove to be the best.

His commanding officers recognized him with such commendations and achievement awards as a Bronze Star and a Purple Heart.

On April 9 of 2003 Michael was sent to Iraq with the 4th Infantry Division from Fort Hood, TX, in support of "Operation Iraqi Freedom." During a routine trip for food as Michael and his crew were returning to camp, an improvised explosive device that had been buried in the sand was set off by remote control as the tank rolled over it. As a result of his injuries, Michael passed away on October 28, 2003, at the age of 26.

Michael joined a long list of family members in service. In light of his outstanding service,

he was appointed Sergeant by the young age of 20. He sought to make a career in the Army, aspiring to become an ROTC instructor.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to have this opportunity to recognize the bravery and dedication of SSG Michael Paul Barrera.

ANTHONY BARSAMIAN SPEAKS ELOQUENTLY ABOUT THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last month, Anthony Barsamian, Chairman of the Board of Directors for the Armenian Assembly of America, made an eloquent speech at the "International Refuge, Relief and Recognition Tribute" hosted by the Armenian-American community in California. Mr. Barsamian eloquently stressed the importance to all of us of remembering that "the history of genocide must remain inviolable and periodically affirmed regardless of political discomfort or cost so that we may learn its lessons."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a grave error that this Congress has not been allowed to vote on a resolution affirming this important point with regard to the terrible history of the genocide perpetrated against the Armenians. We cannot allow current foreign policy considerations to override our obligation in this critical area. Anthony Barsamian cogently and forcefully reminds us why such an omission is unacceptable, and I ask that his moving, thoughtful remarks be printed here.

ASSEMBLY BOARD OF DIRECTORS CHAIRMAN ANTHONY BARSAMIAN'S REMARKS AT THE "INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE, RELIEF AND RECOGNITION TRIBUTE"—FEBRUARY 24, 2005

Your Eminence, Reverend clergy, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

This remembrance and recognition highlights two issues of critical importance to the horrific recurrence of Genocide and the apparent impotence of the world to stop this crime against us all.

First, the history of genocide must remain inviolable and periodically affirmed regardless of political discomfort or cost so that we may learn its lessons.

Second, the actions of 3rd parties are vital to raising awareness about the crime as soon as it becomes known, to taking resolute steps to end the genocidal process, to bring to account the perpetrators, to provide comfort to the survivors, and to forever remember all instances of genocide.

This is why the Armenian Assembly joined with the AGBU and the Diocese to remember those nations and organizations that took action while the Armenian Genocide was being carried out and subsequently. Armenians remain deeply indebted to all who refused the easy path of indifference and inaction. You saved lives, you affirmed the truth, and you bore witness so that the world would be better equipped to act on the meaning of "Never Again".

As is evident today, the Republic of Turkey refuses to accept the judgment of history that the Ottoman Turkish government committed genocide against its Armenian minority. Instead, Turkey attempts to impose its revisionism on a civilized world that knows better, but occasionally succumbs to Turkish demands and intimidation by refraining from affirming the truth. Nations

who had initially committed to participate in this recognition commemoration withdrew in the face of such Turkish pressure. This solves nothing. The dead are not honored for their sacrifice. The actions of the righteous are not recalled. And ironically, the descendants of the victimizers are not allowed to come to terms with the truth.

Nevertheless, we pause today as we begin this 90th commemorative year to give thanks to all nations and organizations that came to our aid—but particularly to those that attended today despite the Turkish government's campaign to stop you.

For Turkey's state sponsored denial effort, having this event is a defeat. This is a good day for the truth. As Armenian-Americans, we recall with special appreciation the leading role of the United States in attempting to prevent the Armenian Genocide and in aiding those that survived. As Armenian-Americans, we look to the United States to continue this proud chapter of American history by reaffirming the facts of this most calamitous chapter of Armenian history. There is an inevitability to universal affirmation of the Armenian Genocide, and America has not and will not be an exception.

A case in point is the recently concluded visit of U.S. Ambassador to Armenia John Evans with major Armenian-American communities across the country. In his public commentaries, Ambassador Evans repeatedly employed the words "Armenian Genocide" to properly characterize the attempted annihilation of our people by Ottoman Turkey.

This is in keeping with President Reagan's proclamation of April 22, 1981 where he stated in part, "like the genocide of the Armenians before it, and the genocide of the Cambodians which followed it—and like too many other persecutions of too many other people—the lessons of the Holocaust must never be forgotten". . .

And also with the thrust of President Bush's 2001 to 2004 April 24 messages that set forth the textbook definition of genocide without using the word. Ambassador Evans completed the thought.

The Ambassador's characterization also is in keeping with the public declarations of over 120 renowned Holocaust and Genocide scholars regarding "the incontestable fact of the Armenian Genocide".

Further, Ambassador Evans' characterization conforms to the summary conclusion of the International Center for Transitional Justice on the use of the term Armenian Genocide. ICTJ stated that "the Events, viewed collectively, can thus be said to include all of the elements of the crime of genocide as defined in the Convention, and legal scholars as well as historians, politicians, journalists and other people would be justified in continuing to so describe them."

The Armenian-American community will not rest until the United States formally and irrevocably reaffirms the Armenian Genocide. By so doing, we forever advance the special role of the United States in genocide prevention.

Today, we are here to honor 17 nations who have joined the movement towards universal affirmation of the Armenian Genocide. You have appropriately remembered this instance of man's inhumanity to man. You have stepped forward to combat denial and revisionism. We will never forget your solidarity.

As Voltaire said, "to the living we owe respect, but to the dead we owe only the truth".

REGARDING S. 384, TO EXTEND THE NAZI WAR CRIMES AND JAPANESE IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT RECORDS INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP FOR 2 YEARS

SPEECH OF

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 2005

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 384, a bill extending the Nazi War Crimes and Japanese Imperial Government Records Interagency Working Group for two years. This crucial legislation amends the Japanese Imperial Government Disclosure Act of 2000 to extend from four to six years the existence of the Nazi War Crimes and Japanese Imperial Government Records Interagency Working Group. H.R. 842 extends by two years this worthy working group, which was originally created by Congress through Public Law 105-246 in 1998. The group is made up of government agency representatives who are directed to oversee the declassification of U.S. Government records that contain information about Nazi war crimes.

Such information includes trafficking of assets seized by the Nazis and post-war communications between U.S. Government and former Nazi officials, unless declassification would unduly violate personal privacy or harm national security or foreign policy interests. The law also allowed for expedited processing of Freedom of Information, requests made by survivors of the Holocaust.

On December 6, 2000, as part of the Intelligence Authorization Act for 2001, Congress changed the group's name to the Nazi War Crimes and Japanese Imperial Government Records Interagency Working Group. This action expanded the mission of the group to include the declassification of U.S. Government records related to World War II-era war crimes committed by the Japanese Imperial government.

Mr. Speaker, the Nazi War Crimes and Japanese Imperial Government Records Interagency Working Group is a valuable effort that informs the American people of the actions of their government while balancing the protection of legitimate national secrets.

I support this noble effort so that we can continue to confront this dark chapter in American History.

The vicious and barbaric war crimes committed by the Nazis, and the atrocities committed by the Japanese Imperial Government during World War II, were some of the worse criminal acts of the 20th century. Both of these historical crimes against humanity must be studied and chronicled in their entirety. The acts of barbarism and genocide committed by the German Nazi and Japanese Imperial governments should never be forgotten. Therefore, it is up to the elected representatives of the American people to ensure that the United States Government complies completely with the Nazi War Crimes and Japanese Imperial Government Records Interagency Working Group and makes accessible all information that is allowable by law.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

INTRODUCTION OF THE "END GRIDLOCK ACT"

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and TOM DAVIS in introducing the "End Gridlock Act." This bill is a refinement of a proposal, the "Washington Regional Transportation Act" (H.R. 2882) that I introduced last session.

Unfortunately, this region is not yet prepared to embrace last year's proposal and establish a regional transportation authority. Last year's bill called for the creation of a regional transportation authority, one that could receive a dedicated revenue source, issue bonds and be in an ideal position to coordinate land use and transportation funding decisions. I regret that the time is not ripe for this a proposal.

The defeat of the Northern Virginia transportation referendum in 2002, in my view, moved us away from real progress in solving our transportation problems. Unfortunately, poor management of the state's transportation programs and false promises by past state officials left the public distrustful that any meaningful solutions were possible.

I'd trade the price of a daily cup of coffee for real investments in transit and road improvements, something that would shave 10 minutes off my commute. I think a majority of the public share this view, but they have been skeptical and fear that the money raised would not be spent wisely or spent on projects that have their own built-in opposition and controversy.

The legislation I am introducing today does not to create a regional authority, it won't build new roadways. Instead, it focuses on making improvements to what already exists. It is a small but important first step that I hope builds the foundation for greater regional coordination and cooperation and builds public confidence for longer term solutions.

Believe me, we need better coordination and cooperation. We need to rebuild confidence. The legislation I am introducing today borrows from some of the best, simplest and most cost-effective proposals. Some of the ideas were drawn from local transportation and planning experts. They are small ticket items, but if they prove successful, maybe the consensus will be there to support a more ambitious agenda. The Washington Post highlighted some of these potential projects in a series featured last year.

These investments included building sidewalks and pedestrian and bike paths to connect communities to schools, transit centers, Metrorail stations and commercial centers. This legislation will provide grants to help localities synchronize traffic lights signals on major transportation corridors which will reduce travel time and improve capacity. The bill provides money to encourage more businesses to offer greater telework and telecommuting options. It will provide grants to give transit riders real-time information on bus and rail schedules so they can time their departures from home and work to arrive at a transit stop just when the bus pulls up. It will also fund advance technologies to allow buses to slip through interchanges before the traffic

lights change and on and offload passengers without blocking traffic.

These simple measures can be done for a few million dollars as opposed to the tens or hundreds of millions other projects require but for lack the funds are not being built and would take years to complete. It is said that if you can encourage just 3 percent to today's drivers to carpool or take the bus, you can reduce congestion by 10 percent.

In addition to these type of investments, the bill also allows the regional governments to fund a transportation incident management operations center. The center would be modeled after the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut program, known as TRANSCOM, where a full-time staff is focused on helping the public get around congestion problems when they occur. How many people remember the "Tractor Man" episode? There were hundreds of law enforcement and emergency response people on the scene, but it was hours before anyone there began to try to figure out how to move traffic around when all the adjacent streets were closed.

Similarly, how many times do commuters find road or utility construction closing traffic lanes in a haphazard manner. Jurisdictions should be working together to coordinate their construction schedule to minimize the time a lane along a transportation corridor remains closed. A New York-New Jersey TRANSCOM-type program for the National Capital Region would be on point for coordinating critical transportation information 24/7.

These are simple solutions, but ones that are not in the interest of any one jurisdiction to fund. But, if a federal grant was offered as an incentive, the local governments might all be willing to contribute, or better yet, compete to pull down the extra federal money. Mr. Chairman, this bill is the first step to end this region's gridlock. It gets us started and could bring measurable quality of life improvements to this region's citizens at a relatively small cost.

I will be working with my colleagues from this region to try to incorporate this proposal into this year's surface transportation reauthorization bill.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS
OF BEXAR COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY SUSAN REED

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Susan Reed for her distinguished career in law, and her many contributions to the justice system in the state of Texas.

Susan Reed was raised in San Antonio, Texas, and graduated from Alamo Heights High School. She attended the University of Texas at Austin, where she received an undergraduate degree in Economics, and completed her JD at the University of Texas Law School in 1974.

Ms. Reed began her legal career as an Assistant District Attorney for Bexar County in 1974. She served in that position for eight years, and was chief prosecutor in the 144th and 187th District Courts.

Following a successful career in civil practice, Ms. Reed served as Judge of the 144th

District Court for 12 years. She was Administrative Judge for the District Courts of Bexar County in 1996 and 1997, and spearheaded the development of the gang unit within the Adult Probation Department, which she counts as one of her proudest accomplishments. Her work on this project resulted in her being awarded the Judge of the Year Award by the Texas Gang Investigators Association.

Since 1998, Susan Reed has served the people of Bexar County as District Attorney. She is a member of the National Advisory Council on Violence Against Women, and a member of the Regional Anti-Terrorism Task Force. She has been a tireless advocate for victims of crime, and a powerful force for making our communities and our State safer.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Bexar County have benefited greatly from Susan Reed, and I am proud to have the opportunity to thank her today.

IN MEMORY OF DR. JAMES O.
MCBRIDE

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give tribute to Dr. James O. McBride, from Fort Worth in the 26th Congressional District of Texas, for his lifelong contributions to his community and to medicine. Dr. McBride started the first open-heart surgery program in Fort Worth. Dr. Brooks died on March 11th at the age of 86.

I would like to recognize and celebrate Dr. McBride's life today. Dr. McBride was a third generation Fort Worth resident. Dr. McBride graduated from Central High School before going on to college at Texas Christian University. He then went to the University of Texas Medical Branch in Galveston and received his PhD in 1942. When Dr. McBride finished his internship in Fort Worth, he went on active duty with the Navy as a surgeon in the Pacific Theater. There, he earned a Navy Unit Citation and nine battle stars.

Upon completion of his active duty in 1946, Dr. McBride completed medical residencies at Bellevue Hospital and Columbia Presbyterian Hospital in New York. In 1951, Dr. McBride moved back to Fort Worth where he set up a thoracic surgery practice. He was known for visiting with patients' families after performing an operation, which was virtually unheard of then. While at Saint Joseph Hospital, Dr. McBride began the first open-heart surgery program in Fort Worth. He was later promoted to chief of surgery at Saint Joseph Hospital. Dr. McBride was also the chief of thoracic surgery at John Peter Smith Hospital.

Dr. McBride was very active in several philanthropic organizations and served on the board or as a chairman for the Fort Worth Chapter of the American Lung Association, YMCA's Camp Carter, Joseph White Foundation, Carter Blood Center, and Country Day School and Union Bank. Dr. McBride's community realized his great services in 1989 when he was presented with the Gold-Headed Cane Award by Tarrant County Medical Society. Only a doctor who has been a society member for 20 or more years can receive the award.

I respected him as a fellow doctor and was honored to represent him here in Congress. I extend my sympathies to his family and friends. Dr. McBride was described by one of his sons as a "source of guidance for whoever sought his counsel." Such a man can never be replaced and will be dearly missed.

RECOGNIZING DR. R. DUNCAN
LUCE ON THE OCCASION OF HIS
RECEIVING THE 2003 NATIONAL
MEDAL OF SCIENCE

HON. CHRISTOPHER COX

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to recognize Dr. R. Duncan Luce of the University of California-Irvine for his outstanding contributions to the scientific community. Professor Luce is one of eight U.S. scientists and engineers—and one of four Californians—to receive the 2003 National Medal of Science, the Nation's highest scientific honor.

Professor Luce is no stranger to high honors. Over his 50-year career, Professor Luce has been awarded the Society of Experimental Psychologists' Norman Anderson Award, the Decision Analysis Society's Frank P. Ramsey Medal, and the American Psychological Foundation's Gold Medal for Life Achievement in the Science of Psychology. Among his many influential publications are the seminal texts *Games and Decisions* (1957) and *Individual Choice Behavior* (1959), both of which remain in widespread academic use. His pioneering work in game and choice theory has resulted in dramatic advances in the fields of economics and psychology, and is applied to a variety of disciplines, including the analysis and prediction of stock market fluctuations.

Professor Luce has made vital contributions to Orange County in the course of his 20 years of service at the University of California-Irvine. He first came to UCI in 1972 before leaving in 1975 to serve in a variety of positions at the forefront of mathematical research at some of the Nation's finest universities, including the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Columbia University, Harvard University, and the University of Pennsylvania. In 1988, he returned to Irvine, where he created UCI's Institute for Mathematical Behavioral Sciences, thereby reinforcing the campus's reputation as a leader in that field. He has served on search committees for three UCI chancellors.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all of our colleagues join me in paying tribute to Dr. R. Duncan Luce. In behalf of all of us in the United States Congress, I am pleased to recognize Professor Luce's remarkable achievements, and to thank him and his family for all that they have given to the improvement of learning and the betterment of our society.

HONORING COLONEL BILL GUINN

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Colonel Bill Guinn, Commander of

Letterkenny Army Depot in Chambersburg, Pennsylvania. Colonel Guinn, a native of San Bernardino, California, will have served as Commander of Letterkenny for an unprecedented 3 years on July 18, 2005.

While most Commanders assume posts for only 2 years, Letterkenny has been fortunate to have Colonel Guinn as Commander for 3. On July 29th, 2005, Colonel Guinn will complete his command duty and pursue another endeavor to add to an already impressive career of service to his country. He has commanded the 123rd Main Support Battalion, 1st Armored Division in Bosnia, Croatia, and Germany. Highlights of his honors include the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Legion of Merit Medal, the NATO Medal, and the Army Achievement Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster.

Devoted to Letterkenny's mission of supporting the Global War on Terror, Colonel Guinn ensures the best equipment is available to field units throughout the world but especially in Afghanistan and Iraq. Colonel Guinn's concern and care for his soldiers enhances the effectiveness of their missions and has established a new level of commitment among the troops.

However, what makes Colonel Guinn remarkable is not only his outstanding military credentials and devotion to country, but also to his immediate community. He has taken personal interest in the economic growth of Chambersburg and the surrounding area of Franklin County Pennsylvania. As Letterkenny transitions into the 21st century it has ceded some of its unused land to Franklin County to be used for private enterprise. Colonel Guinn has been there every step of the way with a spirit of cooperation and mutual support for the developing Cumberland Valley Business Park.

Colonel Guinn takes his leadership beyond the gates of Letterkenny by personally participating in community events and pro-actively informing and educating the surrounding community as to the efforts of the Army Depot. A good neighbor in the truest sense of the word, Colonel Guinn ensures the community is welcomed onto the installation by way of annual picnics, Armed Forces Day activities, and provides recreational land for the Cub Scout Program.

I know Chambersburg and all of Franklin County join me in grateful thanks for the spirit of service, patriotism, and dedication Colonel Guinn, his wife Karen, and their two daughters have inspired and provided to so many. My best wishes to him on the completion of his tremendous service at Letterkenny Army Depot.

HONORING KEITH WOOD MEURLIN

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to draw the attention of the House to the retirement of Keith Wood Meurlin from the position of vice president and airport manager of Washington Dulles International Airport. He will leave his position at the end of March.

Keith has helped Washington Dulles grow from an airport that was used by few to an airport that is well respected world-wide. I re-

member attending an event on the runway of Dulles Airport when I was first elected to Congress. Last year alone 22.9 million passengers traveled through Dulles Airport.

As airport manager, Mr. Meurlin directed operations, maintenance, and commercial activities at Dulles, which employs nearly 17,000 people and is one of the busiest in the country in terms of aircraft operations. During Keith's tenure as airport manager, the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (MWAA) has invested nearly \$1.5 billion in expanding the airport facilities in the late 1990's and is currently undertaking an additional \$3 billion construction program to keep pace with current and future growth.

Mr. Meurlin came to the Washington airports in 1977 following his active duty in the United States Air Force. He began his service as an airport operations officer and successively advanced through the organization in engineering and maintenance and operations management positions before becoming the airport manager in 1989.

Mr. Meurlin helped guide Dulles after the September 11 terrorist attacks and has helped lead the way as the airport and the aviation industry have grown since that time. Last year at Dulles saw a passenger increase of almost 35 percent compared to 2003.

Keith has been extensively involved in the community. He has served on the Board of Directors of the Greater Reston and the Loudoun Chambers of Commerce; Board of Directors of the Loudoun County Convention and Visitors Association; member of Leadership Fairfax; the Board of the United Way for both Loudoun County and the National Capital Area; and is the past chairman of the Heart Association of Northern Virginia.

He was also the recipient of the 2000 Citizen of the Year award from the Loudoun Rotary and the 2002 Tower of Dulles Award from the Committee for Dulles.

In addition to his service with MWAA, Mr. Meurlin has continued his military service in the Air Force Reserve where he has attained the rank of major general, the highest rank a traditional reservist can achieve.

I wish Keith and his family the best as he retires from MWAA and again thank him for his efforts to make Dulles Airport the thriving aviation center it is today.

INTRODUCTION OF NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT AND ECONOMIC CONVERSION ACT OF 2005

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I am again introducing the Nuclear Disarmament and Economic Conversion Act, NDECA, as I have done since 1994. I have introduced this bill every year based on a ballot initiative passed by D.C. residents in 1993. NDECA will require the United States to disable and dismantle its nuclear weapons when all other nations possessing nuclear weapons enact laws to do the same. NDECA further provides that when U.S. nuclear weapons are dismantled, the resources used to support nuclear weapon programs would be diverted to our growing human and infrastructure needs, such as

housing, health care, Social Security and the environment.

This year's introduction of this bill has special meaning because this is the sixtieth anniversary of the U.S. bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Only the United States has used an atom bomb, but today the number of nations with this capability has grown dangerously and continues without effective intervention by the Bush administration.

In addition to the economic cost of nuclear weapons, the weapons have increased as a destabilizing force in world affairs. North Korea, at least in part in response to stepped up aggressive talk and U.S. policies, has responded in a dangerously paranoid fashion by announcing that it is expanding its nuclear capabilities and even that it now has a nuclear weapon, although these claims have not been entirely verified. Iran also appears to be pursuing greater nuclear capability and is resisting inspections. India and Pakistan have moved back from the precipice of several years ago but each remains poised with nuclear weapons.

This country must lead the world community in redoubling efforts to push back the new surge of nuclear proliferation. Our country would be better able to dissuade other nations who aspire to become or remain nuclear powers if we ourselves took greater initiative in dismantling our own nuclear weapons program. We moved in the right direction when the Senate ratified the Moscow Treaty in 2003, which provides that by 2012 both the U.S. and Russia will reduce their long-range warheads two thirds from approximately 6,000 warheads each to 2,200. However, the administration has failed to build on this effort. According to a recent study, "Securing The Bomb: An Agenda for Action" May 2004; prepared by the Belfer Center, Harvard University Kennedy School of Government: "Total nuclear-threat reduction spending remains less than one quarter of one percent of the U.S. military budget. Indeed, on average, the Bush administration requests for nuclear-threat reduction spending over FY 2002-2005 have been less, in real terms, than the last Clinton administration request, made long before the 9/11 attacks ever occurred."

However, the problem today is far more complicated than nuclear disarmament by nation states. The greatest threat today is from inadequately defended and guarded sites in many countries where there is enough material to make nuclear weapons and many opportunities for terrorists to secure nuclear materials. Astonishingly, because of the absence of Presidential leadership, less nuclear material was seized in the 2 years following the 9/11 attacks than in the 2 years immediately preceding the attacks ("Securing The Bomb: An Agenda for Action", May 2004).

I serve on the Prevention of Nuclear and Biological Attack Subcommittee of the Homeland Security Committee. I know that threats from nuclear proliferation and available nuclear material are more dangerous in the post 9/11 era than at any time since I first introduced this bill in 1994. The way to begin is closing down nuclear capability here and around the world.

With 45 million people still without health insurance, Social Security without the benefits for the huge baby boomer generation, an economy burdened with a dangerous deficit, and millions of Americans pushed back into poverty during the last 4 years, the time has

come to begin the transfer of nuclear weapons funds to urgent domestic needs.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS
OF WILSON COUNTY JUDGE
MARVIN QUINNEY

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Wilson County Judge Marvin Quinney for a lifetime of dedicated public service.

A native Texan, Marvin Quinney grew up in Wilson County. In 1968 he worked with the Texas Department of Safety. Mr. Quinney served his community as a DPS state trooper in Wilson County for 27 years. He also served his country as a Military Police Officer in Vietnam and in the United States.

Providing a valuable service to our courts, Marvin Quinney has spent years as a Court Security Officer at the John Wood Federal Courthouse in San Antonio. He also belongs to numerous trooper organizations and participates in multiple safety projects for the citizens residing in his county.

Marvin Quinney currently serves as the County Judge of Wilson County, and currently serves as the presiding officer of the Wilson County Commissioners Court. He has been instrumental in the growth and infrastructure development of Wilson County, and serves the office with honor and distinction.

Mr. Speaker, Wilson County Judge Marvin Quinney is a credit to his community and a tremendous resource to his country. His concern for the people and his willingness to work hard has enabled him to accomplish great things and help serve the people of his community.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES TO ESTAB-
LISH "NATIONAL TARTAN DAY"
RECOGNIZING ACHIEVEMENTS
AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF SCOT-
TISH-AMERICANS

SPEECH OF

HON. RAHM EMANUEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 2005

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, on behalf of nearly six thousand Scottish-Americans who live in my district, I rise today as a proud cosponsor and in strong support of H. Res. 41. This bipartisan resolution supports the establishment of a 'National Tartan Day' to recognize the outstanding achievements and contributions made by Scottish-Americans throughout our nation's history.

In America's early history, many colonists pursued higher education at universities founded by Scottish settlers. Many of the non-Anglican students who were prohibited from enrolling at other institutions attended these universities where the Scottish-American ideals of universal education, religious freedom and law flourished and became significant influences on the development of our Nation.

In fact, our nation's Declaration of Independence was modeled largely on Scotland's Declaration of Independence, the Declaration of Arbroath, which was signed four and a half centuries earlier. An often overlooked fact is that nearly half the signers of our Declaration of Independence were of Scottish descent.

Throughout our Nation's history Scottish-Americans contributed to diverse areas of American life such as science, technology, medicine, government, politics, economics, architecture, literature, media, and visual and performing arts. President Woodrow Wilson and Andrew Carnegie are two examples of notable Scottish-Americans who excelled in these fields.

These contributions and achievements are celebrated by more than 200 cultural organizations throughout the United States. One of these organizations, the Illinois Saint Andrew Society serves the city and suburbs of Chicago, Illinois by honoring the culture and traditions of Scotland and Scottish-Americans. These organizations provide a valuable service by educating all Americans about the time-honored values and ideals of the Scottish culture.

Madam Speaker, I thank the Scottish cultural organizations for documenting and promoting these contributions, and I am proud to be a cosponsor and support this important resolution.

IN RECOGNITION OF HEATHER
RAY

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding young woman in my district, Heather Ray. Heather is a sophomore at Northglenn High School. She was recently honored with the Human Rights Campaign 1st Annual Colorado Youth Award. Heather was selected for her exceptional commitment to diversity.

Specifically, she was instrumental in forming a diversity group at Northglenn High School called "Students Teaching Not Discrimination" or STAND. This organization is designed to give students a safe environment to talk about issues involving sexual orientation, discrimination and the peer pressure that can often lead young people to contemplate dropping out of school, or even worse, suicide.

Heather and her fellow students in STAND have spoken out against the violence and hatred that so many young people are subjected to, and no matter what your position or religious views may be on controversial issues like gay marriage or sexual orientation, I believe we can all applaud this young woman for having the courage of her convictions, and for pursuing a constructive vehicle to explore these issues.

Heather's teacher and mentor, Victoria Bull, describes Heather as an exceptional young person who not only cares passionately about equal right and human dignity but is also tenacious in her desire to affect change. Heather understands the importance of language and insists that those around her take care to make sure their words reflect the values of respect due all human beings. She plans to be-

come a lawyer or a teacher so that she can continue to educate about and defend human rights.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Heather for her commitment to diversity. I join her family and friends in acknowledging her courage and idealism.

SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION
OF THE YEAR OF THE LANGUAGES

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 2005

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Education and Workforce and the International Relations committees, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 122, Mr. HOLT's resolution to support and encourage the study of languages in the United States.

The promotion and expansion of language studies will ensure our nation's ability to compete in a global marketplace of the 21st Century. The United States needs a skilled workforce in government, national security, the scientific community and business who possess the language and cross-cultural skills to successfully engage our global community.

While colleges and universities across the U.S. provide for the study of languages and employ teachers and scholars in specialized languages, they have not had the resources or the incentives to recruit, retain, and graduate students in specialized languages at a rate equal to the demand. We need more students to study languages for the strength of our economy and for the security of U.S. interests here at home and abroad.

The federal government provides incentives for the study of math, science, and engineering because we have recognized the value of encouraging strong graduation rates in those areas. We should have the same recognition for the value that foreign language proficiency adds to other professional degrees.

At the University of Minnesota, between July 1, 2003 and June 30, 2004, while fourteen bachelor's degrees in East Asian languages were conferred, zero Masters and PhDs in East Asian languages were conferred. During the same time, zero degrees in Arabic languages were conferred at any level. And, zero degrees were conferred in South Asian languages at either the bachelor's or advanced degree levels.

In contrast, Chinese students as well as men and women from countries in the Middle East, India, and across the globe come, to the United States to study math, engineering, biology, and medicine—in English—their second or even third language. How many Americans have the ability or incentive to live in China and obtain an advanced understanding of the Chinese language? In Japan? In South Korea? The learning gap between the U.S. and countries in Europe and Asia is widening in math and science. Language acquisition is an essential component of our nation retaining our competitive edge.

I commend Mr. HOLT for his leadership on this important issue and, again, offer my strong support.

HONORING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF ANDREA LEEDS

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the accomplishments of Andrea Leeds. Andrea's steadfast involvement in the community has truly enriched the lives of children and families in our Long Island communities.

Upon graduating from Boston University with a BA in Psychology, Andrea began her career in Human Resources at Kenyon and Eckhardt Advertising. She continued in the Wall Street offices of Chemical Bank as a Corporate Training Specialist. Finally, as Assistant Director of Human Resources at Ziff Davis Publishing, she met her favorite applicant and most notable "hire"—Michael Leeds. Following their engagement, Andrea left Ziff Davis to become Director of Human Resources at Lebharr Friedman Publishing.

While Michael was expanding CMP Media, Andrea became a full-time mom—raising three daughters. With her focus on the family, she became very involved in numerous school activities—most notably the PTA and girls' athletics.

Andrea's involvement in the community extends far beyond her own family. As a founding member and President of the Woodbury Jewish Center Sisterhood, Andrea was honored by the community as "Woman of Achievement." She is currently a Trustee of the Woodbury Jewish Center and is the Board liaison to the Senior Citizens Group.

Andrea also co-chairs the United Jewish Agencies Long Island Legislative Committee and is Executive Vice President and a member of the Board of Directors of the North Shore Child and Family Guidance Center. Throughout her service to center, which is the largest non-profit mental health center on Long Island, Andrea has led numerous initiatives including the establishment of the Trauma and Bereavement Center. Along with her husband, Michael, Andrea was recognized with the prestigious "Family Life Award" in 2002.

Together, this dynamic spouse-team runs the Andrea and Michael Leeds Family Foundation, which focuses on community health care, education and support for Israel. The Center upholds one of Andrea's core beliefs that the "key to success and understanding each other begins with education." This statement is one that Andrea maintains throughout her abundant work in our community, and I applaud her many achievements and contributions.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GINNY BROWN-WAITE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was out on Monday, March 14, and as a result, missed three votes. Had I been present:

For Roll Call No. 66—H.Res. 135, I would have voted "yea."

For Roll Call No. 67—H. Res. 101, I would have voted "yea."

For Roll Call No. 68—H. Res. 151, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING EARL V. JONES SR.

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great American and Pittsburgher, Mr. Earl V. Jones, Sr. Mr. Jones is a constituent of mine and the founder of the worldwide Peace on Earth Campaign.

The Peace on Earth Campaign is centered on community leaders and the many volunteers in the community who do their part day in and day out. Local firefighters, police and paramedics have co-sponsored Mr. Jones' project which is showcased by a flag designed by Mr. Jones himself. The flag and symbol for the world peace campaign is a dove and globe in red, black, brown, yellow, and white to acknowledge the ongoing struggle for world peace.

In a post-9/11 world where terrorism and war surround us, Mr. Jones' Peace on Earth Campaign is a symbol for all nations to strive towards. The Peace on Earth campaign has been recognized and endorsed by President George W. Bush, former President Bill Clinton and Former Russian President Boris Yeltsin.

Mr. Jones organizes numerous events to promote community involvement in the Peace on Earth Campaign. One of the many events Mr. Jones' organization promotes is a highly successful student essay program in our public schools. Each essay is designed to bring awareness of the theme of peace on Earth to the youth of the world.

With his efforts to promote the noble goal of peace on Earth, Mr. Jones truly epitomizes the American values of peace, community, and brotherhood. I commend Mr. Jones on his countless hours of volunteer work spent as the ambassador and organizer for the Peace on Earth Campaign.

RECOGNIZING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend U.S. Ambassador to Armenia John Evans for properly labeling the atrocities committed by the Ottoman Empire against the Armenians as genocide and to urge the President to follow his example and accurately characterize this crime against humanity in his commemorative statement next month.

Ambassador Evans recently completed his first U.S. visit to major Armenian-American communities to share his initial impressions of Armenia and our programs there. During his public exchanges with Armenian-American communities throughout the United States late last month, Ambassador Evans declared that "the Armenian Genocide was the first genocide of the twentieth century."

By employing this term, the Ambassador is building on previous statements by Presidents Reagan and Bush, as well as the repeated declarations of numerous world-renowned scholars. In effect, Evans has done nothing more than succinctly name the conclusions enunciated by those before him.

In 1981, President Reagan issued a presidential proclamation that said in part: "like the genocide of the Armenians before it, and the genocide of the Cambodians which followed it—and like too many other persecutions of too many other people—the lessons of the Holocaust must never be forgotten . . ." President Bush, himself, has invoked the textbook definition of genocide in his preceding April 24th statements by using the expressions "annihilation" and "forced exile and murder" to characterize this example of man's inhumanity to man.

Furthermore, Evans' remarks correspond with the signed statement in 2000 by 126 Genocide and Holocaust scholars affirming that the World War I Armenian Genocide is an incontestable historical fact and accordingly urging the governments of Western democracies to likewise recognize it as such. The petitioners, among whom is Nobel Laureate for Peace Elie Wiesel, also asked the Western Democracies to urge the Government and Parliament of Turkey to finally come to terms with a dark chapter of Ottoman-Turkish history and to recognize the Armenian Genocide.

The Ambassador's declarations also conform to the summary conclusions of the International Center for Transitional Justice (ICTJ) when it facilitated an independent legal study on the applicability of the 1948 Genocide Convention to events that occurred during the early twentieth century. The ICTJ report stated that "the Events, viewed collectively, can thus be said to include all of the elements of the crime of genocide as defined in the Convention, and legal scholars as well as historians, politicians, journalists and other people would be justified in continuing to so describe them."

The Armenian people's ability to survive in the face of the repression carried out against them stands as a monument to their endurance and will to live. Therefore, it is critically important that the United States speak with one voice in condemning the horrors committed against the Armenians. Only by working to preserve the truth about the Armenian Genocide can we hope to spare future generations from the horrors of the past.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I join the Armenian Caucus Co-Chairs, Representatives Frank Pallone and Joe Knollenberg, in applauding the statements of Ambassador Evans and others, and in urging the President to reaffirm the U.S. record on the Armenian Genocide.

IN HONOR OF ROBERT MANCUSO

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Robert J. Mancuso, C.E.C., Executive Chef for the world-renowned Sardine Factory Restaurant on Cannery Row, who has been named Chef of the Year by the Monterey Bay Chapter of the American Culinary Federation.

Mancuso won high honors at the Culinary Institute of America in Hyde Park, New York, graduating in 1990. He also earned an associate's degree in culinary arts, and in April of 2003, he received the prestigious Certified Executive Chef certification from The American Culinary Federation.

His career has taken him to prominent restaurants throughout the United States, giving him a strong background in the diversity of dining styles in this country. According to Mancuso, "California is a culinary mecca and as the Executive Chef at The Sardine Factory, I will have the opportunity to strengthen American cuisine by working with individual agriculture growers. The resources are here—coastal seafood, fresh vegetables, and prime poultry."

His outstanding talents have won him numerous national and international culinary awards, including 13 gold medals in national and international competitions. He is a member of Les Toques Blanches, an honor society of chefs in the United States. In 1996 he was on the Culinary Olympic Team USA, representing 25,000 chefs from the American Culinary Federation.

In addition, Mancuso is a regular participant in fundraising for charity events in the local community and has mentored many students in the culinary field. Mr. Speaker, I wish to honor Chef Robert Mancuso for his many accomplishments, for his dedication to his art, and to express my sincere gratitude for his service to the community.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS
OF THE 341ST DISTRICT COURT
JUDGE ELMA T. SALINAS ENDER

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the important achievements of Judge Elma T. Salinas Ender in Laredo, Texas of my Congressional District.

Appointed as Judge of the 341st District Court by Governor Mark White, Judge Elma T. Salinas Ender became the first Mexican-American woman appointed and elected to a district court bench in state and U.S. history. Her knowledge and commitment that she has brought to the bench has made her an inspiration too many.

Professional activities include: member of the Governor's Juvenile Standards Task Force; the Funding/Judiciary branch of Government in Texas; State Bar of Texas; and has served on the Texas Bar Association council for "Women in Law." Judge Salinas Ender is involved in numerous civic and community activities, i.e. Laredo 1010 Youth Task Force; Communities in Schools; and Leadership Laredo.

She holds a Juris Doctor degree from St. Mary's University School of Law in San Antonio, Texas. Judge Salinas Ender is a fine example to women in our community, demonstrating what hard work and dedication can accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have this opportunity to recognize the contributions of Judge Elma T. Salinas Ender.

INTRODUCING THE REGIONAL ECONOMIC AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT ACT

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, today Congresswoman NORTON and I have introduced the "Regional Economic and Infrastructure Development Act". A detailed summary of the bill's provisions is attached.

The bill organizes four regional commissions under a common framework, thereby providing a more uniform method for distributing economic development funds throughout the regions most in need of such assistance. It reauthorizes the Delta Regional Authority and the Northern Great Plains Regional Authority and creates two new regional commissions: the Southeast Crescent Regional Commission and the Southwest Border Regional Commission. Both of these latter commissions have been proposed in legislation introduced in the previous Congress and are designed to address problems of systemic poverty and chronic underdevelopment in those regions. Every county or parish that is currently included in a commission through enacted or proposed legislation is similarly included in that same commission under this bill. While the bill follows the successful organizational model of the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC), it does not include the ARC or the Denali Commission (a wholly intrastate commission) in its framework.

Regional commissions provide vital assistance to the development of the Nation's most chronically poor and distressed regions. They are true federal-state partnerships, bringing together federal, state, and local governments to expand the economic and development opportunities of a chronically distressed region. These regions typically experience rates of poverty and unemployment that are more than 150 percent of the national average. Further, some of these areas lack the transportation and basic public infrastructure necessary to support business development, and importantly, create jobs in the region.

The regional commissions are designed to assist areas in overcoming chronic economic distress by focusing on the distressed region as a whole. By recognizing that systemic economic distress follows geographic and natural resource realities, rather than arbitrary state or political subdivision borders, the commissions are able to concentrate their efforts over the entire region—regardless of state lines. One way that federally designated regional commissions work within the region to overcome the effects of chronic underdevelopment is through investment in infrastructure, including transportation, telecommunications, and other basic public infrastructure. The commissions also assist the region in obtaining job skills training, entrepreneurship, technology, and business development. Through these efforts, commissions work to improve the economic development of these systemically distressed regions.

Regional commissions also supplement the state share of other federal programs to ensure that areas that do not even have the economic means of meeting a required state or local funding share are not denied the oppor-

tunity to participate in these programs. Regional commissions assist in local development planning by helping provide local development districts with the resources and expertise necessary to formulate and follow a comprehensive, strategic regional development plan. Often it is the local development planning that is the key for the successful implementation of economic and infrastructure development programs.

The Regional and Economic Infrastructure Development Act is modeled after the statute authorizing the ARC. The ARC has demonstrated that regional commissions are successful in fighting chronic underdevelopment and poverty. Since the ARC's creation in 1965, employment in the thirteen-state region has grown by nearly 66 percent. In contrast, in the decade preceding its creation, employment in the region had declined by 1.5 percent. Further, the poverty rate of the region has been cut by more than one half—from 31.1 percent in 1960 to 13.6 percent in 2000.

As the Nation continues to suffer through a weakened economy, the need for these commissions becomes even more important. In February 2005, the national unemployment rate reached 5.4 percent. Further, since January 2001, the number of people unemployed increased from 6 million to 8 million—an increase of 2 million people, or 33 percent. Moreover, workers who have lost their jobs are having more trouble finding new jobs. The average length of unemployment is now almost 20 weeks, and more than one in five unemployed workers have been out of work for more than six months.

As the economy continues to struggle, it is these historically depressed regions—the regions that have already been struggling—that suffer a disproportionate share of the burden. Now, perhaps more than ever, there is a greater need for these regional commissions. This bill recognizes the importance of the regional commissions to these chronically distressed areas. The bill strengthens the commissions by establishing a uniform organizational structure, under which an affirmative vote of a commission requires a majority of state members plus the affirmative vote of the federal cochairperson. With this voting structure, the bill ensures that the federal and state roles in a commission are equal and interdependent, thereby promoting a true federal-state partnership.

In addition, the bill establishes a coordinating council for the regional commissions consisting of representatives from all the commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission and the Denali Commission. The coordinating council is directed to meet biannually to discuss issues facing regions that suffer chronic distress and successful strategies for promoting regional development. While the council will assist the commissions in promoting regional development, it has no decision-making authority over any of the commissions.

Finally, the bill authorizes sufficient funds for each commission so that a commission will have the means available to fulfill its mission of promoting economic and infrastructure development. The bill authorizes \$30 million for each commission in fiscal year 2006 (the amount currently authorized for the Delta and Northern Great Plains Regional Authorities) and increases that authorization by \$5 million for each successive year through fiscal year 2010.

Frankly, I am concerned about this Administration's lack of funding for existing regional commissions and lack of interest in promoting economic development programs that create jobs and improve communities. In its fiscal year 2006 budget proposal, the Administration proposes \$6 million for the Delta Regional Authority and only \$1 million for the Northern Great Plains Regional Authority. Further, the Administration's budget proposes to dismantle 18 different economic development programs and instead "consolidate" these programs into a formula-based program housed in the Department of Commerce. Presently these 18 programs include funding for grants and other economic development activities that total \$5.5 billion. The new program will be funded at \$3.7 billion—a reduction of nearly \$2 billion in economic development program funds!

It is time that we affirm our commitment to regional economic development by authorizing these commissions and providing the funding necessary from them to break the cycle of chronic distress in these regions. I believe this bill will help us do that.

SUMMARY OF THE REGIONAL ECONOMIC AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT ACT

The Regional Economic and Infrastructure Development Act organizes four regional commissions under a common framework, thereby providing a more uniform method for distributing economic assistance throughout the regions most in need of such assistance. It reauthorizes the Delta Regional Authority and the Northern Great Plains Regional Authority and creates two new regional commissions: the Southeast Crescent and the Southwest Border Regional Commission. Both of these latter commissions have been proposed in legislation introduced in the previous Congress and are designed to address problems of systemic poverty and chronic underdevelopment in those regions. Every county or parish that is currently included in a commission through enacted or proposed legislation is similarly included in that same commission under this bill. While the bill follows the successful organizational model of the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC), it does not include the ARC or the Denali Commission (a wholly intrastate commission) in its framework.

PURPOSE

To organize the regional commissions in the lower 48 states (with the exception of the Appalachian Regional Commission) under a common framework, providing a more uniform organization structure among the commissions and a more uniform method for distributing economic assistance throughout the country.

COMMISSIONS

The bill reauthorizes the Delta Regional Commission and the Northern Great Plains Regional Commission, and creates the Southeast Crescent Regional Commission and the Southwest Border Regional Commission. The Delta Regional Commission and the Northern Great Plains Regional Commission are composed of the same states, counties, and parishes included in the existing Delta Regional Authority and Northern Great Plains Regional Authority. The Southeast Crescent Regional Commission and the Southwest Border Regional Commission are composed of the same states and counties proposed in legislation introduced in the 108th Congress to create a Southeast Crescent Regional Authority and a Southwest Border Regional Commission.

Each commission is authorized to receive appropriations of \$30 million for fiscal year

2006; \$35 million for fiscal year 2007; \$40 million for fiscal year 2008; \$45 million for fiscal year 2009; and \$50 million for fiscal year 2010.

Currently, some counties qualify for membership in more than one regional commission. The bill does not change that. However, the bill provides that an individual county may only receive economic assistance from one regional commission. Therefore, if a county is eligible for membership in more than one commission, it must select one commission in which it would like to participate and be eligible to receive funds. A county or parish can change its selection 90 days before the start of the fiscal year.

The Denali Commission and the Appalachian Regional Commission are not included in this statute.

COMPOSITION

Each commission includes a Federal co-chairperson and a state cochairperson, who is selected from among the state members. Like current law, the Northern Great Plains Commission also includes a tribal cochairperson.

An affirmative vote of a commission requires an affirmative vote of the federal co-chairperson plus a majority of state members.

Like the current laws authorizing regional commissions, the bill sets forth provisions for the salaries of commission members, the appointment of alternatives, and the hiring of additional staff, including an Executive Director.

The bill establishes a coordinating council for the regional commissions consisting of representatives from all the commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission and the Denali Commission. The coordinating council is directed to meet biannually to discuss issues facing regions that suffer chronic distress and successful strategies for promoting regional development. The council has no decision-making authority.

Also like current law, each state must develop a comprehensive economic development plan and each commission must develop an economic and infrastructure development plan.

Commissions are required to designate distressed, transitional and attainment counties, and isolated areas of distress within attainment counties, within their region and must allocate at least 50 percent of the appropriations made available to the commission to projects in distressed counties and isolated areas of distress.

ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

Commissions have the authority to make grants to State and local governments, and public and nonprofit organizations, for economic development projects, with an emphasis on infrastructure projects, including transportation, basic public, and telecommunications infrastructure projects.

The bill provides for a commission share of 50 percent of the costs of projects; that percentage increases to up to 80 percent for distressed counties. These shares are increased by 10 percent (to 60 percent and 90 percent, respectively) for those projects that have a significant regional impact, including projects that involve 3 or more counties or more than one State.

Commissions have the authority to make grants to local development districts to assist in the payment of the administration of the district. The commission of these grants is limited to 80 percent of the administrative expenses of the local development district receiving the grant.

Commissions have the authority to supplement part of the basic Federal contribution to projects authorized under other Federal grant programs and to increase the Federal

contribution above the fixed maximum part of the cost. The Federal share is the same for projects (50 percent and 80 percent for distressed counties, with a 10 percent bonus for regional projects), with the stipulation that the total Federal contribution cannot exceed 80 percent.

IN MEMORY OF THE KURDISH VICTIMS OF MARCH 16, 1988

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in remembering the horrible events that took place in Halabja, Iraq, on March 16, 1988. Today is the 17th anniversary of Saddam Hussein's chemical weapons attack on his own people during a battle waged between a Kurdish force resisting Saddam's oppression and Saddam's Iraqi army. This attack was part of Saddam's systematic genocidal attack on the Kurds known as the Anfal campaign.

In seeking to subdue Kurdish resistance, Saddam Hussein used chemical weapons indiscriminately against Kurdish fighters and civilians alike. The attack on Halabja was one of some forty chemical assaults staged by Hussein against the Kurdish people. In fact, the Kurds of Halabja and neighboring towns constitute the largest civilian population ever exposed to chemical weapons, including sarin, VX, tabun, and mustard gas. As a result of the extensive and devastatingly cruel Anfal campaign, hundreds of Kurdish villages were totally destroyed and as many as 200,000 Kurds were killed.

The tragedy of Halabja should yield lessons for those concerned about responding to future chemical and biological emergencies. The world stood by as innocent men, women, and children suffered and died at the hands of a barbarous regime, and, for 14 long years, the Saddam Hussein dictatorship went unpunished for the murder of hundreds of thousands of innocent Iraqis, the use of banned chemical weapons against Iraqi Kurds, and innumerable other human rights violations. During those 14 years, the number of his victims, Kurdish and non-Kurdish, increased dramatically, as the discovery of mass graves testifies.

Mr. Speaker, now history has avenged Saddam's victims, however belatedly and inadequately, and soon Saddam Hussein will face the consequences of his war crimes. I ask that my colleagues join me in speaking out against oppression and against the use of chemical and biological weapons. That is now the best way to commemorate the suffering of the people of Halabja and all the victims of Saddam's inhuman Anfal campaign and of his subsequent depredations.

TRIBUTE TO SOUTH PARK HIGH SCHOOL

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call your attention to the great South Park

High School in Buffalo, New York which this year is celebrating ninety years of excellence in educating Western New York's young people.

Ninety-one years ago this week, on St. Patrick's Day, the people of South Buffalo broke ground at 150 Southside Parkway for the construction of what would become City of Buffalo Public School Number 206.

That same year, on June 1st, the cornerstone was placed at PS 206, also known as South Park High School, marking the institution as the fifth public high school built in the City of Buffalo.

On September 7, 1915 the doors of South Park opened, welcoming 680 students and 32 faculty members.

Home of the Sparks, the South Park faithful proudly display their school spirit through the black and red tradition.

Over the last nine decades the teachers and administrators at South Park have motivated, nurtured and educated thousands of Buffalo's youth, preparing each for the road ahead and providing all with the tools necessary to pursue a limitless future.

I am proud to call myself an alumnus of South Park and grateful for the wealth of knowledge and values I have obtained through my experiences at the school.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to commemorate the 90th Anniversary of Buffalo's South Park High School and wish the institution continued success in instilling pride and excellence in Western New York young people for decades to come.

ON THE INTRODUCTION OF A RESOLUTION URGING TURKEY TO RESPECT THE RIGHTS AND RELIGIOUS FREEDOMS OF THE ECUMENICAL PATRIARCH

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to introduce a resolution urging Turkey to respect the human rights and religious freedoms of the Ecumenical Patriarch, which are being violated by the Turkish government.

The Ecumenical Patriarch is the spiritual leader of 300 million Orthodox Christians around the world, including millions of Americans. The Turkish government continuously violates the Ecumenical Patriarch's religious rights and freedoms by refusing to recognize its international status. Training for the clergy has also been effectively banned because the Turkish government refuses to reopen the Greek Orthodox Halki seminary. Furthermore, the Turkish government requires all candidates for the Patriarchate be Turkish nationals, thus severely limiting the field. Additionally, the Turkish government has confiscated 75 percent of Ecumenical Patriarchal properties since 2002 and has levied a 42 percent

retroactive tax on the Balukli Hospital, a philanthropic institution run by the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Meanwhile, Turkey is scheduled to begin accession negotiations with the European Union in October 2005.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am introducing today is very simple. This resolution calls on Turkey to meet the criteria on eliminating all forms of discrimination set forth by the European Union, particularly those based on race or religion. This bill urges the Turkish government to grant the Ecumenical Patriarch appropriate international recognition and ecclesiastical succession, the right to train clergy of all nationalities, and demands that Turkey respect the property rights and human rights of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. These are simple demands, Mr. Speaker. The path of democracy must be laid with the bricks of freedom and tolerance—without them, democracy becomes a hollow word devoid of promise and hope. We must take a stand for religious rights and freedoms. We must call on Turkey to fulfill its obligations to the European Union and stop violating the human and religious rights of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

STATEMENT BY THE FRIENDS OF IRELAND ST. PATRICK'S DAY 2005

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the Friends of Ireland in the Congress join 38 million Irish Americans in celebrating the unique ties between America and the island of Ireland. We welcome the Taoiseach Bertie Ahern to the United States, and we send our warmest greetings to all the people of Ireland and Northern Ireland.

Irish Americans care deeply about Northern Ireland, and we commend President Bush for his efforts to keep the American government involved in the pursuit of peace. We also praise Mitchell Reiss, the President's special envoy to Ireland, for his unwavering commitment and his bi-partisan American approach to the process.

We do regret that none of the political parties from Northern Ireland will be represented at the Shamrock Ceremony or the Speaker's Luncheon this year, but this should be taken as a clear signal reflecting the severity of the situation, and the immediate need for all parties to return to the negotiating table.

In 1998, the parties to the Good Friday Agreement committed to partnership, equality and mutual respect as the basis for moving forward. We continue to believe that inclusive power sharing—based on those three defining qualities—is essential to the viability and advancement of the democratic process in Northern Ireland. A political system based on inclusive power sharing requires trust and confidence. The parties to the Good Friday Agreement also affirmed their total and absolute

commitment to exclusively democratic and peaceful means.

The recent events in Northern Ireland involving alleged and admitted criminality by IRA members have put tremendous pressure on all the governments and have seriously undermined the trust and confidence that are essential to advance the process. We deplore this tragic setback. Circumstances on both the Nationalist and Unionist sides have created great chasms of mistrust. Neither side is blameless in this tragic breakdown, and the British, Irish and United States Governments must devote themselves to instill the trust and continue the forward movement.

Clearly, there is essential work to be done in ending all paramilitary activity, permanently restoring the democratic institutions, progressing with demilitarization, and advancing an equality agenda. It is also imperative, in all democratic societies, for all parties to be willing to work with the criminal justice system or in this case the Police Service.

We regret that the dramatic effort to reach an agreement over the Christmas Holiday fell short. The world watched as the framework was set, and all parties were steps away from a victorious moment in history. We must remind all the parties that this framework is still in place and there was a reason why an agreement was almost settled only a few months ago. It is from this point that negotiations must resume.

We commend the Irish and British Governments for their ongoing efforts to work with the political leaders in Northern Ireland to restore the trust and confidence that are essential to advance the peace. On this St. Patrick's Day, we look forward to the day when the Good Friday Agreement will be finally and fully implemented, and to the day when stable democratic institutions, peace, and justice will be achieved in Northern Ireland.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRIAN BAIRD

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 2005

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, due to circumstances stemming from the recent birth of my two sons, William and Walter, I was not able to be present for legislative business on the morning of March 16, 2005, during which time the House considered and passed H.R. 1268. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On House Amendment #60 I would have voted "aye."

On the motion to recommit H.R. 1268 to the Committee on Appropriations with instruction to provide an additional \$100 million for veterans healthcare, and \$50 million for veterans job training and transitional assistance, I would have voted "aye."

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 18, Concurrent Budget Resolution.

The House passed H. Con. Res. 95, Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2006.

The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 103, Adjournment Resolution.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2875–S2897

Measures Introduced: Forty bills and eleven resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 646–685, S. Res. 84–91, and S. Con. Res. 20–22. (See next issue.)

Measures Reported:

S. 48, to reauthorize appropriations for the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail Route, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 109–41)

S. 182, to provide for the establishment of the Uintah Research and Curatorial Center for Dinosaur National Monument in the States of Colorado and Utah, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 109–42)

S. 188, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2005 through 2011 to carry out the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program.

S. 589, to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays.

S. 667, to reauthorize and improve the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, improve access to quality child care. (See next issue.)

Measures Passed:

Condemning Violence and Criminality by the Irish Republican Army: Senate agreed to S. Res. 84, condemning violence and criminality by the Irish Republican Army in Northern Ireland. (See next issue.)

Private Relief: Senate passed S. 653, for the relief of the parents of Theresa Marie Schiavo. (See next issue.)

Concurrent Budget Resolution: By 51 yeas to 49 yeas (Vote No. 81), Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the

United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S2875–97 (continued next issue)**

Adopted:

By 52 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 58), Bingaman (for Smith) Amendment No. 204, to create a reserve fund for the establishment of a Bipartisan Medicaid Commission to consider and recommend appropriate reforms to the Medicaid program, and to strike Medicaid cuts to protect states and vulnerable populations. **Pages S2875–86 (continued next issue)**

Hutchison Amendment No. 218, to fully fund the level of Border Patrol Agents authorized by the National Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 and as recommended by the 9/11 Commission. **Pages S2875 (continued next issue)**

Salazar/Conrad Amendment No. 215, to provide additional funding for rural education, rural health access, and rural health outreach programs. **Pages S2875 (continued next issue)**

By a unanimous vote of 100 yeas (Vote No. 62), Landrieu Amendment No. 219, to establish a reserve fund in the event that legislation is passed to provide a 50 percent tax credit to employers that continue to pay the salaries of Guard and Reserve employees who have been called to active duty. **Pages S2875 (continued next issue)**

Vitter Amendment No. 223, to express the sense of the Senate that Congress should provide dedicated funding for port security enhancements. **Pages S2875 (continued next issue)**

Subsequently, the amendment was modified. (See next issue.)

By 63 yeas to 37 nays (Vote No. 64), Collins (for Lieberman/Collins) Amendment No. 220, to protect

the American people from terrorist attacks by restoring \$565 million in cuts to vital first-responder programs in the Department of Homeland Security, including the State Homeland Security Grant program, by providing \$150 million for port security grants and by providing \$140 million for 1,000 new border patrol agents. **Pages S2875 (continued next issue)**

Vitter Amendment No. 224, to restore funding for Corps of Engineers environmental programs to fiscal year 2005 levels.

Pages S2875 (continued next issue)

By 68 yeas to 31 nays (Vote No. 66), Coleman Amendment No. 230, to fully fund the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program.

Pages S2894-97 (continued next issue)

By 73 yeas to 26 nays (Vote No. 67), Cochran Amendment No. 208, to modify the designation authority for an emergency requirement.

(See next issue.)

By 51 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 68), Kennedy Modified Amendment No. 177, relative to education funding.

(See next issue.)

Feinstein Amendment No. 188, to express the sense of the Senate that Congress should enact a long-term reauthorization of the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program and appropriate \$750,000,000 for the program in fiscal year 2006.

(See next issue.)

Obama Amendment No. 159, to prevent and, if necessary, respond to an international outbreak of the avian flu.

(See next issue.)

Leahy Amendment No. 160, to increase funding for the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and other international organizations.

(See next issue.)

Grassley/Kennedy Amendment No. 164, to provide a reserve fund for the Family Opportunity Act.

(See next issue.)

Hatch Amendment No. 194, to provide a deficit-neutral reserve fund for the restoration of SCHIP funds.

(See next issue.)

Cochran/Byrd Amendment No. 209, to modify a provision defining advance appropriations subject to limit.

(See next issue.)

Thomas/Conrad Amendment No. 226, to restore discretionary funding levels for crucial rural health programs, such as the rural health outreach grant program, the rural hospital flexibility grant program, the small hospital improvement program, telehealth, trauma programs, and rural AED programs to fiscal year 2005 levels.

(See next issue.)

Mikulski Modified Amendment No. 180, to provide a deficit neutral reserve fund for the Hope credit.

(See next issue.)

Allen Amendment No. 198, to express the sense of the Senate regarding funding for the National

Aeronautics and Space Administration for subsonic and hypersonic aeronautics research.

(See next issue.)

Lott Amendment No. 182, to express the sense of the Senate on the acquisition of the next generation destroyer (DDX).

(See next issue.)

DeWine/Dodd Modified Amendment No. 153, to express the sense of the Senate concerning the care and treatment of children with HIV/AIDS.

(See next issue.)

By 81 yeas to 19 nays (Vote No. 72), Talent Amendment No. 225, to provide the flexibility to consider all available transportation funding options.

(See next issue.)

By 94 yeas to 6 nays (Vote No. 73), Conrad Amendment No. 243, to express the sense of the Senate that the tax cuts assumed in the budget resolution should include the repeal of the 1993 increase in the income tax on Social Security benefits.

(See next issue.)

By 55 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 74), Bunning Amendment No. 241, to repeal the 1993 tax increase on Social Security benefits.

(See next issue.)

Boxer Amendment No. 259, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the need for a comprehensive, coordinated, and integrated national ocean policy.

(See next issue.)

Leahy Amendment No. 203, to express the sense of the Senate in support of full funding and availability of the Crime Victims Fund.

(See next issue.)

Santorum Amendment No. 169, to reaffirm that the United States maintain a one-to-two ration for contributions to the Global Fund, that the United States not exceed contributing more than 33 percent of the Global Fund's revenue.

(See next issue.)

Lincoln Modified Amendment No. 192, to restore funding the COPS Methamphetamine Enforcement and Clean Up Program to 2005 levels.

(See next issue.)

Baucus Amendment No. 253, to support full funding for High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area.

(See next issue.)

Clinton Amendment No. 155, to establish a deficit neutral reserve fund for influenza vaccine shortage prevention.

(See next issue.)

Snowe/Kerry Modified Amendment No. 216, to increase funding for Small Business Administration's programs.

(See next issue.)

Bayh Modified Amendment No. 157, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the amount of United States debt that is foreign-owned.

(See next issue.)

Santorum Amendment No. 163, to express the sense of the Senate regarding tax relief to encourage charitable giving incentives.

(See next issue.)

Chafee Amendment No. 261, to express the sense of the Senate that the total amount of payments to

States from the Water Pollution Control State Revolving Fund should be increased to \$1,350,000,000. (See next issue.)

Baucus Amendment No. 167, to express the sense of the Senate that the full amount of the President's request for the administrative costs of the Social Security Administration for fiscal year 2006 should be funded. (See next issue.)

Clinton Modified Amendment No. 154, to express the sense of the Senate concerning comparative effectiveness studies. (See next issue.)

Kohl Modified Amendment No. 217, to restore \$1 billion to juvenile justice and local law enforcement programs funded by the Department of Justice. (See next issue.)

Salazar Modified Amendment No. 254, to restore funding for the payment in lieu of taxes program (PILT), in order to compensate rural counties for decreased tax revenues as a result of non-taxed federally owned county lands. (See next issue.)

Pryor Modified Amendment No. 252, to create a reserve fund for extension of the treatment of combat pay as earned income for purposes of the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit. (See next issue.)

By 53 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 80), Levin Modified Amendment No. 238, to promote innovation and U.S. competitiveness by expressing the sense of the Senate urging the Senate Committee on Appropriations to make efforts to fund the Advanced Technology Program, which supports industry-led research and development of cutting-edge technologies with broad commercial potential and societal benefits. (See next issue.)

Leahy Modified Amendment No. 237, to increase funding for Boys and Girls Clubs. (See next issue.)

Gregg (for Grassley) Amendment No. 262, to express the sense of the Senate with respect to pension reform. (See next issue.)

DeWine/Leahy Modified Amendment No. 161, to increase funding for Child Survival and Maternal Health Programs. (See next issue.)

Rejected:

By 49 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 57), Gregg (for Frist) Amendment No. 229, to express the sense of the Senate regarding Medicaid reconciliation legislation consistent with recommendations from the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Pages S2886 (continued next issue)

By 49 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 59), Carper Amendment No. 207, to provide for full consideration of tax cuts in the Senate under regular order.

Pages S2875 (continued next issue)

By 49 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 60), Snowe Amendment No. 214, to ensure that any savings associated with legislation that provides the Secretary

of Health and Human Services with the authority to participate in the negotiation of contracts with manufacturers of covered part D drugs to achieve the best possible prices for such drugs under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, that requires the Secretary to negotiate contracts with manufacturers of such drugs for each fallback prescription drug plan, and that requires the Secretary to participate in the negotiation for a contract for any such drug upon request of a prescription drug plan or an MA-PD plan, is reserved for reducing expenditures under such part. Pages S2875 (continued next issue)

By 44 yeas to 56 nays (Vote No. 61), Harkin Amendment No. 172, to restore the Perkins Vocational Education program and provide for deficit reduction paid for through the elimination of the phase out of the personal exemption limitation and itemized deduction limitation for high-income taxpayers now scheduled to start in 2006.

Pages S2875 (continued next issue)

By 40 yeas to 59 nays (Vote No. 63), Conrad (for Dorgan) Amendment No. 210, to repeal the tax subsidy for certain domestic companies which move manufacturing operations and American jobs offshore. Pages S2875 (continued next issue)

By 49 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 65), Sarbanes Amendment No. 156, to restore funding for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program. Pages S2286-94 (continued next issue)

By 46 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 69), Baucus/Conrad Amendment No. 234, to ensure that legislation to make cuts in agriculture programs receives full consideration and debate in the Senate under regular order, rather than being fast-tracked under reconciliation procedures. (See next issue.)

By 45 yeas to 55 nays (Vote No. 70), Biden Amendment No. 239, relative to funding to the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. (See next issue.)

By 45 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 71), Byrd/Baucus Amendment No. 240, relative to transportation funding. (See next issue.)

By 47 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 75), Reid (for Clinton) Modified Amendment No. 244, to expand access to preventive health care services that reduce unintended pregnancy (including teen pregnancy), reduce the number of abortions, and improve access to women's health care. (See next issue.)

By 45 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 76), Lautenberg Amendment No. 187, to strike the debt ceiling reconciliation instruction. (See next issue.)

By 44 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 77), Boxer Amendment No. 257, to establish a point of order. (See next issue.)

By 45 yeas to 55 nays (Vote No. 78), Dorgan Amendment No. 211, to restore funding for tribal

programs and provide necessary additional funding based on recommendations from Indian country.

(See next issue.)

Feingold Amendment No. 258, to ensure that savings associated with legislation that reduces overpayments to Medicare Advantage plans is reserved for deficit reduction and to strengthen the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

(See next issue.)

By 37 yeas to 63 nays (Vote No. 79), **Dayton Amendment No. 202**, to provide full funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) part B grants over five years.

(See next issue.)

Pryor Amendment No. 213, to increase funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

(See next issue.)

Withdrawn:

Allen Modified Amendment No. 197, to increase by \$1,582,700,000 over fiscal years 2006 through 2010 funding for Transportation (budget function 400) with the amount of the increase intended to be allocated to the Vehicle Systems account of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for subsonic and hypersonic aeronautics research.

Pages S2875 (continued next issue)

National Asbestos Awareness Day: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 43, designating the first day of April 2005 as “National Asbestos Awareness Day”, and the resolution was then agreed to, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto:

(See next issue.)

Frist Amendment No. 264, to amend the preamble.

(See next issue.)

Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund: Senate passed H.R. 1270, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund financing rate, clearing the measure for the President.

(See next issue.)

Financial Literary Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 88, designating April 2005 as “Financial Literacy Month”.

(See next issue.)

Montana Future Farmers of America: Senate agreed to S. Res. 89, congratulating the Montana FFA on its 75th Anniversary and celebrating the achievements of Montana FFA members.

(See next issue.)

Holocaust Commemoration Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 90, to designating the Week of May 1, 2005, as “Holocaust Commemoration Week”.

(See next issue.)

Arms Export Embargo on China: Senate agreed to S. Res. 91, urging the European Union to main-

tain its arms export embargo on the People’s Republic of China.

(See next issue.)

Concurrent Budget Resolution: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that when the Senate receives H. Con. Res. 95 from the House, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010, the Senate begin its consideration; that all after the resolving clause be stricken and the text of S. Con. Res. 18, Concurrent Budget Resolution, as agreed to be inserted in lieu thereof; that the resolution then be agreed to as amended, the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

(See next issue.)

Authorizing Leadership to Make Appointments—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President Pro Tempore, and the Majority and Minority Leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences, or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

(See next issue.)

Authority for Committees: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate, all committees were authorized to file legislative and executive matters on Wednesday, March 30, 2005, between the hours of 10 a.m. and 12 noon.

(See next issue.)

Signing Authority—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that during this adjournment of the Senate, the Majority Leader, Assistant Majority Leader and Senator Warner, to be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

(See next issue.)

Appointments:

United States Holocaust Memorial Council: The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 96–388, as amended by Public Law 97–84 and Public Law 106–292, appointed the following Senators to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council: Senators Feingold and Lautenberg.

(See next issue.)

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

George M. Dennison, of Montana, to be a Member of the National Security Education Board for a term of four years.

James William Carr, of Arkansas, to be a Member of the National Security Education Board for a term of four years.

Harold Damelin, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of the Treasury.

David B. Balton, of the District of Columbia, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and Fisheries.

Joseph R. DeTrani, of Virginia, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Special Envoy for the Six Party Talks.

John Thomas Schieffer, of Texas, to be Ambassador to Japan.

Kiron Kanina Skinner, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the National Security Education Board for a term of four years.

R. Nicholas Burns, of Massachusetts, to be an Under Secretary of State (Political Affairs).

C. David Welch, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Near Eastern Affairs).

Jeffrey Clay Sell, of Texas, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

Christopher R. Hill, of Rhode Island, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (East Asian and Pacific Affairs).

Rudolph E. Boschwitz, of Minnesota, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

35 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

37 Army nominations in the rank of general.

2 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, Navy. (See next issue.)

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Joseph H. Boardman, of New York, to be Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration.

John Robert Bolton, of Maryland, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

John Robert Bolton, of Maryland, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

Stephen L. Johnson, of Maryland, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

John D. Negroponte, of New York, to be Director of National Intelligence.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps. (See next issue.)

Messages From the House: (See next issue.)

Measures Referred: (See next issue.)

Measures Read First Time: (See next issue.)

Executive Communications: (See next issue.)

Executive Reports of Committees: (See next issue.)

Additional Cosponsors: (See next issue.)

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: (See next issue.)

Additional Statements: (See next issue.)

Amendments Submitted: (See next issue.)

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: (See next issue.)

Authority for Committees to Meet: (See next issue.)

Privilege of the Floor: (See next issue.)

Record Votes: Twenty-five record votes were taken today. (Total—81) (See next issue.)

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9 a.m., and adjourned at 11:48 p.m., until 4 p.m., on Monday, March 21, 2005. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in the next issue of the Record.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NATIONAL SECURITY THREATS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded open and closed hearings to examine current and future worldwide threats to the national security of the United States, after receiving testimony from Porter J. Goss, Director of Central Intelligence; and Vice Admiral Lowell E. Jacoby, USN, Director, Defense Intelligence Agency, Department of Defense.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of John Paul Woodley, Jr., of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, James William Carr, of Arkansas, George M. Dennison, of Montana, and Kiron Kanina Skinner, of Pennsylvania, each to be a Member of the National Security Education Board, Anthony Joseph Principi, of California, to be a Member of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, and 5,664 nominations in the Air Force, Army, Navy and Marine Corps.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported an original

bill entitled “The Federal Public Transportation Act of 2005”.

COAST GUARD BUDGET

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Oceans, Fisheries and Coast Guard concluded a hearing to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2006 for the Coast Guard Operational Readiness/Mission Balance, after receiving testimony from Admiral Thomas H. Collins, Commandant, and Master Chief Petty Officer Franklin A. Welch, both of the United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security; and Margaret T. Wrightson, Director, Homeland Security and Justice Issues, Government Accountability Office.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Daniel R. Levinson, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services.

NOMINATION

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Lester M. Crawford, of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 188, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2005 through 2011 to carry out the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program;

S. 589, to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays; and

The nominations of William Gerry Myers III, of Idaho, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Paul A. Crotty, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and J. Michael Seabright, to be United States District Judge for the District of Hawaii.

Also, committee announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts: Senators Sessions (Chairman), Specter, Grassley, Kyl, Schumer, Feinstein, and Feingold.

Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights: Senators DeWine (Chairman), Specter, Hatch, Grassley, Graham, Brownback, Kohl, Leahy, Biden, Feingold, and Schumer.

Subcommittee on Constitution, Civil Rights and Property Rights: Senators Brownback (Chair), Specter, Graham, Cornyn, Coburn, Feingold, Kennedy, Feinstein, and Durbin.

Subcommittee on Corrections and Rehabilitations: Senators Coburn (Chairman), Specter, Sessions, Cornyn, Brownback, Durbin, Leahy, Biden, and Feingold.

Subcommittee on Crime and Drugs: Senators Graham (Chairman), Grassley, Kyl, DeWine, Sessions, Coburn, Biden, Kohl, Feinstein, Feingold, and Schumer.

Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security and Citizenship: Senators Cornyn (Chairman), Grassley, Kyl, DeWine, Sessions, Brownback, Coburn, Kennedy, Biden, Feinstein, Feingold, Schumer, and Durbin.

Subcommittee on Intellectual Property: Senators Hatch (Chairman), Kyl, DeWine, Graham, Cornyn, Brownback, Coburn, Leahy, Kennedy, Biden, Feinstein, Kohl, and Durbin.

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Homeland Security: Senators Kyl (Chairman), Hatch, Grassley, Cornyn, DeWine, Sessions, Graham, Feinstein, Kennedy, Biden, Kohl, Feingold and Durbin.

VETERANS

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the report entitled, “Back from the Battlefield: Are we providing the proper care for America’s Wounded Warriors?”, after receiving testimony from Jonathan B. Perlin, Acting Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Health; Major General Kenneth L. Farmer, Jr., Commanding General, North Atlantic Regional Medical Command and Walter Reed Army Medical Center, United States Army; Cynthia A. Bascetta, Director, Health Care—Veterans’, Health and Benefits Issues, Government Accountability Office; Major Tammy Duckworth, United States Army National Guard; Joseph J. Costello, Vista Vet Center, Vista, California; and David J. Hosking, Vet Center, Madison, Wisconsin.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Measures Introduced: 96 public bills, H.R. 1356–1451; and 34 resolutions, H.J. Res. 38–39; H. Con. Res. 103–120, and H. Res. 167–180, were introduced. **Pages H1690–96**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1696–97**

Reports Filed: Report were filed today as follows:

H. Con. Res. 53, expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the issuance of the 500,000th design patent by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (H. Rept. 109–22);

H.R. 683, to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 with respect to dilution by blurring or tarnishment, amended (H. Rept. 109–23);

H.R. 1038, 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 (H. Rept. 109–24);

H.R. 366, to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 to strengthen and improve programs under that Act, amended (H. Rept. 109–25); and

H.R. 185, to require the review of Government programs at least once every 5 years for purposes of evaluating their performance (H. Rept. 109–26)

Page H1690

Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2006: The House passed 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, by a yea-and-nay vote of 218 yeas to 214 nays, Roll No. 88. The bill was also considered yesterday, March 16. **Pages H1627–40, H1641–74**

Agreed by unanimous consent that a final period of general debate be in order at the conclusion of consideration of amendments. **Pages H1640–41**

Yesterday it was agreed that during further consideration of the bill, the Hensarling amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 109–19) may be considered out of the specified order.

Rejected:

Obey amendment, No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 109–19, that increases \$15.8 billion in FY06 new BA and outlays for veterans, education, health care needs, homeland security, the environment and infrastructure; and reduces the FY06 tax benefit for those earning more than \$1 million; (by a recorded vote of 180 yeas to 242 noes, Roll No. 82);

Pages H1627–33

Debated Wednesday, March 16: Hensarling amendment in the nature of a substitute (Republican Study Committee), No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 109–19, that replaces the current 19 functional categories with four functions: Defense, Homeland Security, Non-Defense Discretionary and Mandatory Spending, and Interest; and accepts the Iraq Operations Reserve Fund and creates a new “rainy day” fund for non-military emergencies (by a recorded vote of 102 yeas to 320 noes, Roll No. 83).

Pages H1633–40

Watt amendment in the nature of a substitute (Congressional Black Caucus), No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 109–19, that calls for an additional \$36.3 billion in spending and a \$4 billion deficit reduction for FY 2006 (by a recorded vote of 134 yeas to 292 noes and 3 voting “present”, Roll No. 85);

Pages H1641–53

Spratt amendment in the nature of a substitute, No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 109–19, that projects spending and revenue levels that would eliminate deficits and result in a balanced budget by FY 2012 (by a recorded vote of 165 yeas to 264 noes with 1 voting “present”, Roll No. 87); **Pages H1654–65**

Motion to rise: Rejected the Blumenauer motion that the Committee rise by a recorded vote of 101 yeas, to 313 noes and 1 voting “present”, Roll No. 86. **Pages H1653–54**

H. Res. 154, the rule providing for consideration of the measure was agreed to yesterday, March 16.

Suspensions—Proceedings Postponed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures which were debated yesterday, March 16:

Expressing concern regarding the occupation of the Republic of Lebanon by the Syrian Arab Republic: H. Con. Res. 32, amended, expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the occupation of the Republic of Lebanon by the Syrian Arab Republic, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 419 yeas to 1 nay and 4 voting “present”, Roll No. 84; and

Page H1640

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: concurrent resolution expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the occupation of the Lebanese Republic by the Syrian Arab Republic. **Page H1640**

Expressing concern regarding the continued violations of human rights and civil liberties of the Syrian and Lebanese people by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic: H. Con. Res. 18, amended, expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the continuing gross violations of human rights and civil liberties of the Syrian and Lebanese

people by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ ye-a-and-nay vote of 402 yeas to 3 nays, Roll No. 89. **Pages H1674–75**

Spring District Work Period: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 103, providing for a conditional adjournment of the House and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate. **Page H1675**

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, April 6. **Page H1675**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourn today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, March 21, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in H. Con. Res. 103, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution. **Page H1675**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Wolf, or if not able to perform this duty, Representative Tom Davis (VA) to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through April 5. **Page H1675**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three ye-a-and-nay votes and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1632, H1639–40, H1640, H1653, H1654, H1664–65, H1674, and H1674–75. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and at 6:15 p.m., pursuant to the provisions of H. Con. Res. 103, it stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, March 21, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of the concurrent resolution, in which case the House shall stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, April 5, 2005.

Committee Meetings

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FDA AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Under Secretary for Rural Development. Testimony was heard from Gilbert Gonzalez, Acting Under Secretary, Rural Development, USDA.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on Air Force Posture. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department

of the Air Force: Peter B. Teets, Acting Secretary; and GEN John P. Jumper, Chief of Staff.

The Subcommittee also met in executive session to hold a hearing on Air Force Acquisition. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Air Force: Peter B. Teets, Acting Secretary; and LTG John D. W. Corley, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Acquisitions.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Department of Homeland Security held a hearing on Citizenship and Immigration Services. Testimony was heard from Eduardo Aguirro, Jr., Director, Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, HHS, EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a hearing on the Secretary of Labor. Testimony was heard from Elaine L. Chao, Secretary of Labor.

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, AND HUD, JUDICIARY, D.C., AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies held a hearing on the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Testimony was heard from Alphonso R. Jackson, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Bureau of Indian Affairs. Testimony was heard from James Casen, Assistant Deputy Secretary, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.

SCIENCE, THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Science, the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies held a hearing on the SBA. Testimony was heard from Hector V. Barreto, Administrator, SBA.

The Subcommittee also held a hearing on the Federal Prison System. Testimony was heard from Harley G. Lappin, Director, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

IRAQ—CURRENT OPERATIONS AND POLITICAL TRANSITION

Committee on Armed Services: Held a hearing on current operations and the political transition in Iraq. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BUDGET REQUEST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2006 National Defense Authorization budget request—United States Special Operations Command policy and programs. Testimony was heard from officials of the Department of Defense: Thomas W. O'Connell, Assistant Secretary, Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict; and GEN Bryan D. Brown, USA, Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command.

HIGHER EDUCATION—TRACKING INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness and the Subcommittee on Select Education held a joint hearing entitled "Tracking International Students in Higher Education: A Progress Report." Testimony was heard from Victor X. Cerda, Counsel to the Assistant Secretary, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security; Stephen A. Edson, Managing Director, Visa Services Directorate, Bureau of Consular Affairs, Department of State; Randolph C. Hite, Director, Information Technology Architecture and Systems Issues, GAO; and public witnesses.

NIH PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled "Setting the Path for Reauthorization: Improving Portfolio Management at the NIH." Testimony was heard from Elias Zerhouni, M.D., Director, NIH, Department of Health and Human Services.

SECURITIES ARBITRATION SYSTEM

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance, and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled "A Review of the Securities Arbitration System." Testimony was heard from William Francis Galvin, Secretary, MA; and public witnesses.

DEPOSIT INSURANCE REFORM ACT

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing on H.R. 1185, Deposit Insurance Reform Act of 2005. Testimony was heard from Donald E. Powell, Chairman, FDIC.

STEROID USE IN BASEBALL

Committee on Government Reform: Held a hearing entitled "Restoring Faith in America's Pastime: Evaluating Major League Baseball's Efforts to Eradicate Steroid Use." Testimony was heard from Senator Bunning; Nora D. Volkow, M.D., Director, National Institute on Drug Abuse, NIH, Department of Health and Human Services; the following officials of Major League Baseball: Allan H. Selig, Commissioner; and Elliott J. Pellman, M.D., Medical Advisor for Major League Baseball, Office of the Commissioner; Sandy Alderson, Executive Vice President of Baseball Operations, Major League Baseball; the following Major League Baseball baseball players: Curt Schilling, Frank Thomas, Sammy Sosa, and Rafael Palmeiro; and the following former Major League baseball players: Jose Canseco and Mark McGuire.

AFGHANISTAN—U.S. COUNTERNARCOTICS POLICY

Committee on International Relations: Held an oversight hearing on U.S. Counternarcotics Policy in Afghanistan: Time for Leadership. Testimony was heard from Maureen E. Quinn, Coordinator on Afghanistan, Department of State; Mary Beth Long, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Counternarcotics, Department of Defense, and Michael A. Braun, Special Agent, Chief of Operations, DEA, Department of Justice.

HUMAN RIGHTS—GLOBAL VIEW

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Human Rights and International Operations held an oversight hearing on A Global Review of Human Rights: Examining the State Department's 2004 Annual Report. Testimony was heard from Michael G. Kozak, Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, Department of State; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—U.N. AND THE FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on International Terrorism and Nonproliferation held an oversight hearing on the United Nations and the Fight Against Terrorism. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

The Subcommittee also held a briefing on this subject. Testimony was heard from Stephen J. Stedman, Special Advisor to Secretary-General United Nations.

OVERSIGHT—U.N. OIL-FOR-FOOD PROGRAM

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held an oversight hearing on The United Nations Oil-for-Food Program: The Cotecna and Saybolt Inspection Firms. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CHILD INTERSTATE ABORTION NOTIFICATION ACT; OVERSIGHT—U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 748, Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act.

The Subcommittee also held an oversight hearing on the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the U.S. Commission Civil Rights: Russell Redenbaugh, and Michael Yaki, both Commissioners; Kenneth Marcus, Staff Director; and George Harbison, Director, Human Resources and Active Chief of Budget and Finance.

OVERSIGHT—PATENT APPEALS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property held an oversight hearing on Holmes Group, the Federal Circuit, and the State of Patent Appeals. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

STOP COUNTERFEITING IN MANUFACTURED GOODS ACT; ORGANIZED CRIME

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security approved for full Committee action H.R. 32, Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act.

The Subcommittee also held an oversight hearing on Responding to Organized Crimes Against Manufacturers and Retailers. Testimony was heard from Chris Swecker, Assistant Director, Criminal Investigative Division, FBI, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—OFF RESERVATION GAMING RESTRICTIONS

Committee on Resources: Held an oversight hearing on a measure to amend the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to restrict off-reservation gaming. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—NATIONAL PARK SERVICE BUDGET

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks held an oversight hearing on the Fiscal Year 2006 National Park Service Budget. Testimony was heard from Fran Mainella, Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science: Ordered reported the following measures: H.R. 1023, Charles 'Pete' Conrad Astronomy Awards Act; H.R. 1158, To reauthorize the Steel and Aluminum Energy Conservation and Technology Competitiveness Act of 1988; H.R. 28, amended, High-Performance Computing Revitalization Act of 2005; H. Con. Res. 96, amended, Recognizing the significance of African American

women in the United States scientific community; and H.R. 798, amended, Methamphetamine Remediation Research Act of 2005.

NATURAL GAS PRICES

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Rural Enterprise, Agriculture and Technology held a hearing entitled "The High Price of Natural Gas and its Impact on Small Businesses: Issues and Short Term Solutions," Testimony was heard from Representative Terry; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management held an oversight hearing on The Administration's "Strengthening America's Communities" Initiative and its impact on economic development. Testimony was heard from David A. Sampson, Assistant Secretary, Economic Development, Department of Commerce; and public witnesses.

MEDICAL IMAGING SERVICES

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on Managing the Use of Imaging Services. Testimony was heard from Mark Miller, Executive Director, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission; and public witnesses.

GLOBAL UPDATES; BUDGET HEARING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to hold a hearing on Global Updates. Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

The Committee also met in executive session to hold a hearing on the Budget. Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 2005

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, hearing on Quality Teachers, Principals and High Schools, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia and Independent Agencies, on Secretary of Transportation, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "A Review of Security Initiatives at DOE Nuclear Facilities," 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

4 p.m., Monday, March 21

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 p.m., Monday, March 21

Senate Chamber

House Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will be in a period of morning business.

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue.

HOUSE

Ackerman, Gary L., N.Y., E463
 Baird, Brian, Wash., E477
 Brady, Robert A., Pa., E466
 Brown-Waite, Ginny, Fla., E474
 Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E464, E467, E471
 Castle, Michael N., Del., E461, E462, E463, E466, E468
 Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E464
 Cox, Christopher, Calif., E471
 Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E461, E462, E463, E465, E466,
 E468, E469, E471, E473, E475
 Doyle, Michael F., Pa., E474

Emanuel, Rahm, Ill., E473
 Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E465, E467
 Farr, Sam, Calif., E474
 Frank, Barney, Mass., E469
 Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E464, E465, E470
 Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E476
 Israel, Steve, N.Y., E474
 Jenkins, William L., Tenn., E465
 Kanjorski, Paul E., Pa., E461, E463, E466, E469
 Langevin, James R., R.I., E474
 Lantos, Tom, Calif., E476
 McCollum, Betty, Minn., E473
 Menendez, Robert, N.J., E477

Moran, James P., Va., E470
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E472
 Oberstar, James L., Minn., E475
 Portman, Rob, Ohio, E469
 Sessions, Pete, Tex., E467
 Shuster, Bill, Pa., E471
 Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E462
 Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E462
 Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E461, E463, E466, E468
 Udall, Mark, Colo., E473
 Walsh, James T., N.Y., E477
 Wolf, Frank R., Va., E472



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202-512-1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1-888-293-6498 (toll-free), 202-512-1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202-512-1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$252.00 for six months, \$503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, \$10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, \$21.00; greater than 400 pages, \$31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$146.00 per year, or purchased for \$3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.