

Watchers, and we are here to look after the family budget by checking the growth of waste, fraud and abuse in the Federal budget.

Madam Speaker, I am sure that all of my colleagues are well aware of the size of our Federal budget deficit. It is large, and growing larger every day. To compound the challenge, we are presently faced with an additional \$87 billion supplemental appropriation request to help fight the war on terror.

Now, I believe, after much debate and due diligence, that this body will pass most, if not all, of this request, and I for one, agree that it is far better to fight this war on terror over there than it is over here. So, faced with unparalleled homeland security needs and a growing budget deficit, what are we to do?

Democrats say the only way to cut the deficit is to yet again raise taxes on the American family. Sound familiar? It is the only budget idea that they have.

We do have a large deficit, but it is not because the American people are undertaxed, it is because Washington spends too much.

Since I was born in 1957, the Federal budget has grown seven times faster than the family budget. Seven times faster. This is unconscionable and unsustainable. And over and above the expenses connected with the war on terror, Democrats have voted to spend almost \$1 trillion more than the budget allows, \$1 trillion more in spending, and they claim to be concerned about deficits.

Madam Speaker, much of this spending in Washington is pure waste, fraud and abuse, and by attacking it every day, we can begin to close this deficit.

Once again this week, let us talk about duplication.

The Federal Government administers 50 different programs scattered across eight Federal agencies to assist the homeless. Combined, these duplicative programs cost Americans close to \$30 billion a year. Fifty different programs all engaged in roughly the same mission. Yet Democrats want to raise taxes to pay for more of this?

Six different agencies administer 26 programs offering food and nutrition benefits to the homeless, including the USDA, HHS, Department of Education, FEMA, HUD and the VA. What is it that one of these agencies knows about feeding the homeless that the other agencies do not know? Whatever it is, I hope they figure it out pretty soon, because these duplicative programs cost roughly \$43 billion a year. Just think how much we could save the American taxpayer over 10 years through consolidation of just some of these 26 programs. Yet Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this?

More than 50 different Federal agencies are responsible for waging the war on drugs. Four agencies are responsible for coordinating and developing narcotics detection technologies, more than 70 programs in 13 Federal depart-

ments and agencies are eligible to disperse resources to prevent substance abuse, and 16 different agencies deal with treatment. How many billions could be used to lower the Federal deficit if we simply consolidated a few of these programs? Yet the Democrats wanted to raise our taxes to pay for more of this?

Sixteen Federal agencies operate roughly 75 international education, culture and training programs. Seventeen agencies monitor and enforce trade agreements. Ten of them operate export subsidy programs, and 12 oversee importation of agricultural products. How much more could we save if we simply consolidated a few of these programs. Yet the Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this?

Madam Speaker, these are just a few of the examples of the rampant duplication in waste in our Federal Government that has been here for years. Once you begin to look closely, it is easy to see that many Federal programs routinely lose 10, 20, even 30 percent of their taxpayer-funded budgets in waste, fraud and abuse.

□ 1945

In the real world, when people lose this much money, they are either fired or they go to jail; but in Washington, it is yet another excuse to take even more money away from the American family.

Mr. Speaker, there are many ways that we can save money in Washington without cutting any needed services and without raising taxes on the American family. Because when it comes to Federal programs, it is not how much money Washington spends; it is how Washington spends the money.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF MILDRED A. O'NEILL AND CELEBRATING GREAT AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PORTER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I had the great privilege of coming to Congress in 1981. Some of my colleagues on the floor were here when I came. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and I came in the same class. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the dean of the Massachusetts delegation, was already here. Those who came after 1987 lost an extraordinary experience, and that experience was to serve in this House with one of America's great political leaders, so defined by Bob Dole. His name, of course, was Thomas P. O'Neill. He was a large man physically, but his heart was much larger, and his commitment to people even larger still.

Those of us who came to the Congress at that time obviously met Tip, serving under Speaker O'Neill and with him. But shortly thereafter, we had an extraordinary privilege, and that privi-

lege was to meet his partner. Mildred A. O'Neill, affectionately known to all of us as Millie, became, in many respects, at least for those who were young enough to consider her as such, as sort of the den mother of the Democratic House. She was a wonderful, warm, committed, devoted human being. She was the kind of human being that everybody would want to be born and have as their grandmother or their mother, period, because she was filled with love and caring for humankind. And my, how she loved our Speaker. And my, how our Speaker loved her.

We talk about family values. It is easy to talk about family values, but I suggest that no one has lived family values any more than Tip O'Neill and Millie O'Neill.

Millie O'Neill was born in 1914, the same year that my mother was born. My mother, unfortunately, passed away in 1975 at a too-young age. Millie O'Neill lived until just a day ago. She died at the age of 89, having seen extraordinary history in her State and in her country and, indeed, with her husband, had impacted on that history in a most positive way.

When Tip O'Neill left the Congress, or shortly before, there was a poll taken in the South. And the two most popular figures in the United States, political figures at that time, were Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill in the South.

Now, obviously, they disagreed on many issues. So what was the cause of that support and popularity? It was because they were both viewed as two men of principle and the courage of their convictions. People could disagree with either one, but there was that respect for their character that was reflected. Millie O'Neill was a critical component of the character of her husband. They had been married for over half a century. Tip in his book referenced how loyal, how important Millie was to his life, both at times of triumph and times of trial.

Mr. Speaker, I count myself uniquely privileged to have come to Congress in time to know and become a friend of Mildred A. O'Neill. I believe she loved each and every one of us; and there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that each and every one of us loved her.

Let me say that I was also advantaged because, on the other side of the aisle, there was a leader who shared the compassion and commitment to this institution that Tip had, and that was Bob Michel. Bob has a wonderful wife, Corrine. She is ill today, and I know that she, too, and Bob Michel will grieve for the loss of their friend. It was a time, frankly, I say to my colleagues, when Bob Michel and Tip O'Neill knew that they were friends, knew that they had different views; but both were committed to this institution, and their wives, Millie and Corrine, were fast and true friends as well. America has lost a great American, a great grandmother, a great

mother, and a great supporter of this institution.

WASHINGTON WASTE WATCHERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, while the Democrats continue to want to raise the taxes on the hard-working Americans, or when they keep proposing, as they did this year, over a \$1 trillion increase, or close to \$1 trillion, \$890 billion increase, to be precise, on the already, I think, large deficit, thank God the President, though, has released the President's agenda that we are all familiar with, which outlines a plan to clean up this mess of just waste, fraud, and abuse that exists and is rampant here in Washington and that has always been rampant here in Washington.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) eloquently mentioned some issues that should concern all Americans as to how Washington wastes America's taxpayers' money. I am reminded of all of the cases, case after case, of fraud, waste, and abuse that continue to happen, including money that is just absolutely lost in this huge bureaucracy.

In 1999 the Army, for example, took an inventory of its assets and found that, check this out, 56 airplanes, 32 tanks, I do not know how you lose 32 tanks, and 36 Javelin-command launch units for which it had no record, had no records for them. That same year, GAO identified more than \$3 billion in inventory that the Navy had "lost in transit." How do you lose \$3 billion of inventory in transit? The GAO also found \$400,000 in computer purchases that the Department of Education had not recorded in the property records. By the way, 200,000 of those computers could never be located.

Yet, I repeat, the Democrats insist on raising the taxes on the hard-working Americans, because there is not enough money. There is not enough money if you want to lose more money, if you want to throw away more money, if you want to splurge more money; but there is clearly more than enough money to do what we need to do here, as long as we get a little bit more responsible.

I commend the President for his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the Inspector General at the Department of Veterans Affairs alone has identified more than 5,500 possible cases of individuals who may be defrauding the Veterans Administration by receiving benefits intended for veterans, these are benefits that are intended for benefits, but for people who are dead. Mr. Speaker, 5,500. Fourteen thousand, almost 14,000 incarcerated veterans have been paid about \$100 million, and these are not small sums, \$100 million in benefits that they were

clearly not eligible for. And yet the Democrats insist on coming up with proposal after proposal and budget after budget that raises the taxes of the hard-working Americans in this country. To do more of this?

Over \$100 million, another \$100 million in improper payments of missed Medicare beneficiaries who rely on them. Over the last 4 years, by the way, for example, the Department of Agriculture has spent \$5.13 billion in improper payments, improper payments intended to go to food stamp beneficiaries. Yet, the Democrats say, there is not enough money, and they insist on trying to raise the taxes on the hard-working Americans of this country.

Mr. Speaker, that is why, with a number of my colleagues, we have come up with the Washington Waste Watchers to not only highlight the fact, not that Washington has enough money, but that we have too much money, and that there is not enough accountability. We commend the President for his steps in the right direction, and we are going to continue to let the American people know where their money is being spent and, in many cases, misspent. And, no, we are not going to support raising taxes. We are going to support changing the culture up here from a culture of waste, of fraud, and abuse to a culture of fiscal responsibility.

WASHINGTON WAR WATCHERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, in 2 days the House Committee on Appropriations will take up the \$87 billion that the administration has requested for Iraq and Afghanistan. This is the second down payment on top of the first \$75 billion that has been requested. Secretary Powell and others in the administration recently said this is a down payment, and that they will be back in 6 months from now with an additional request on top of the \$160-some-odd billion we spent on these two operations, for more money for reconstruction of both Afghanistan and Iraq. This funding contains a \$20 billion request, taxpayer financed, for the reconstruction of Iraq.

Back in April I introduced a bill called the American Parity Act, which required that for every dollar we invest in Iraq's health care, education, and transportation and infrastructure we also invest here at home. Today we have 102 cosponsors.

Now, I think everybody that has signed on to this agrees that the same values that we hold for Iraq, we must pledge for all Americans. The same goals we envision for Iraq's future, we must envision for America's future. Unfortunately, to date, we have had two priorities, two sets of values, two sets of books, one for Iraq and one for

America. I did a T-shirt the other day which I brought down to the floor showing all of the investments we had planned for Iraq and all the cuts here at home we had planned in the corresponding areas.

Now, two colleagues before me who are part of my freshman class from the other party talked about waste, fraud, and abuse. I would like to bring to their attention, and I have the same sense that if we were able to cut some of the waste, fraud, and abuse, we could fund other initiatives dealing with the uninsured in this country.

But to point to some waste, fraud, and abuse: in the President's request for Iraq, there is \$3.6 million for 600 radios and telephones at \$6,000 each. I highly recommend that maybe we should hear the word Radio Shack. If you cannot get a telephone for less than \$6,000, you may want to consider Radio Shack.

We have also in the request \$2.5 million for pickup trucks at \$33,000 apiece. Has anybody ever heard of zero percent financing by GM, Ford, or Chrysler? You can get a pickup truck for less than \$33,000. Mr. Speaker, \$100 million to hire 500 people at \$200,000 a person to investigate crimes. Mr. Speaker, \$20 million to finance 200 election experts, election experts for 6 months at \$100,000 per expert. Now, I come from Chicago. I think I can get a ward committeeman to do it just slightly cheaper than that.

So if we are interested in waste, fraud, and abuse, I recommend maybe we take a look at what we are recommending as a first down payment of what will be a total bill to the American taxpayers for \$60 billion in the area of waste, fraud, and abuse.

If I may take some more time, they did not want to mention the \$5.6 billion for the new electric grid in Iraq. Yet here in America, what did we get for that? The blackout. And how much is invested in America's electric future, in our energy future, in a massive investment here? Zero. We could create 100,000 jobs. We do not mention that when it comes to waste, fraud, and abuse.

In the area of health care, we are talking about \$150 million more for a new children's hospital in Basra. Yet, in that same week, we had a report that there are 10 million uninsured Americans. And what is the initiative? We cut the funding for the children's health insurance program. We have 44 million uninsured Americans, and not a single bill on the floor to insure the uninsured Americans.

In the area of police, there is \$4 billion planned for the Iraqi police, and yet what do we do? We cut the 100,000 police program here in the United States practicing community policing at \$1 billion. Mr. Speaker, \$5 billion for water, drinkable water in Iraq and wetlands restoration and irrigation; yet we have frozen the funds for the Corps of Engineers, and we do not fund any cleanup and improvement in the Great