

Capps Hastings (WA)  
 Capuano Hayes  
 Cardin Hayworth  
 Cardoza Hefley  
 Carson (IN) Hensarling  
 Carson (OK) Herger  
 Carter Hill  
 Case Hinchey  
 Castle Hinojosa  
 Chabot Hobson  
 Chandler Hoekstra  
 Chocola Holden  
 Clay Holt  
 Clyburn Honda  
 Coble Hooley (OR)  
 Cole Hostettler  
 Collins Houghton  
 Conyers Hoyer  
 Cooper Hulshof  
 Costello Hunter  
 Cox Hyde  
 Cramer Inslee  
 Crane Isakson  
 Crenshaw Israel  
 Crowley Issa  
 Cubin Istook  
 Culberson Jackson (IL)  
 Cummings Jackson-Lee  
 Cunningham (TX)  
 Davis (AL) Jefferson  
 Davis (CA) Jenkins  
 Davis (FL) John  
 Davis (IL) Johnson (CT)  
 Davis (TN) Johnson (IL)  
 Davis, Jo Ann Johnson, E. B.  
 Davis, Tom Johnson, Sam  
 Deal (GA) Jones (NC)  
 DeFazio Jones (OH)  
 DeGette Kanjorski  
 Delahunt Kaptur  
 DeLauro Keller  
 DeLay Kelly  
 DeMint Kennedy (MN)  
 Deutsch Kennedy (RI)  
 Diaz-Balart, L. Kildee  
 Diaz-Balart, M. Kilpatrick  
 Dicks Kind  
 Doggett King (IA)  
 Doolittle King (NY)  
 Dreier Kingston  
 Duncan Kirk  
 Dunn Kleczka  
 Edwards Kline  
 Ehlers Knollenberg  
 Emanuel Kolbe  
 Emerson Kucinich  
 Engel LaHood  
 English Lampson  
 Eshoo Langevin  
 Etheridge Lantos  
 Everett Larsen (WA)  
 Fattah Larson (CT)  
 Feeney Latham  
 Ferguson LaTourette  
 Filner Leach  
 Foley Lee  
 Forbes Levin  
 Ford Lewis (CA)  
 Fossella Lewis (GA)  
 Frank (MA) Lewis (KY)  
 Franks (AZ) Linder  
 Frelinghuysen Lipinski  
 Frost LoBiondo  
 Gallegly Lofgren  
 Garrett (NJ) Lowey  
 Gephardt Lucas (KY)  
 Gerlach Lucas (OK)  
 Gibbons Lynch  
 Gilchrest Majette  
 Gillmor Maloney  
 Gingrey Manzullo  
 Gonzalez Markey  
 Goode Marshall  
 Goodlatte Matheson  
 Gordon Matsui  
 Goss McCarthy (MO)  
 Granger McCarthy (NY)  
 Graves McCollum  
 Green (TX) McCotter  
 Green (WI) McCrery  
 Greenwood McDermott  
 Grijalva McGovern  
 Gutierrez McHugh  
 Gutknecht McInnis  
 Hall McIntyre  
 Harman McKeon  
 Harris McNulty  
 Hart Meehan  
 Hastings (FL) Meek (FL)

Meeks (NY)  
 Menendez  
 Mica  
 Michaud  
 Millender-McDonald  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Miller, George  
 Mollohan  
 Moore  
 Moran (KS)  
 Moran (VA)  
 Murphy  
 Musgrave  
 Myrick  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal (MA)  
 Nethercutt  
 Neugebauer  
 Ney  
 Northup  
 Norwood  
 Nunes  
 Nussle  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Olver  
 Ortiz  
 Osborne  
 Ose  
 Owens  
 Oxley  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor  
 Payne  
 Pearce  
 Pelosi  
 Pence  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Peterson (PA)  
 Petri  
 Pitts  
 Platts  
 Pombo  
 Pomeroy  
 Porter  
 Portman  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Putnam  
 Quinn  
 Radanovich  
 Rahall  
 Ramstad  
 Rangel  
 Regula  
 Rehberg  
 Renzi  
 Reyes  
 Reynolds  
 Rodriguez  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Ross  
 Rothman  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Ruppersberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Ryun (KS)  
 Sabo  
 Sanchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sanders  
 Sandlin  
 Saxton  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrock  
 Scott (GA)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sessions  
 Shadegg  
 Shaw  
 Shays  
 Sherman

Sherwood  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simmons  
 Simpson  
 Skelton  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (MI)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Solis  
 Souder  
 Spratt  
 Stark  
 Stearns  
 Stenholm  
 Strickland  
 Stupak  
 Sullivan  
 Sweeney  
 Tancredo

Tanner  
 Tauscher  
 Taylor (MS)  
 Taylor (NC)  
 Terry  
 Thomas  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiahrt  
 Tiberi  
 Tierney  
 Toomey  
 Towns  
 Turner (OH)  
 Turner (TX)  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Upton  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Vitter

Walden (OR)  
 Walsh  
 Wamp  
 Waters  
 Watson  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weldon (PA)  
 Weller  
 Wexler  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson (NM)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Wynn  
 Young (AK)

#### NAYS—3

Flake Otter Paul

#### NOT VOTING—10

Dingell Farr  
 Dooley (CA) Hoeffel  
 Doyle Murtha  
 Evans Pickering

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

#### □ 1819

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.

#### □ 1820

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on the following questions will resume tomorrow: H.R. 3786, H.R. 2993, H.R. 254, H.R. 3095.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO VETERANS' DISABILITY BENEFITS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 1501(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2004 (38 U.S.C. 1101 NOTE), and the order of the House of December 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following members on the part of the House to the Veterans' Disability Benefits Commission:

Mr. Nick B. Bacon, Rosebud, Arkansas.

Mr. Donald M. Cassidy, Aurora, Illinois.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tues-

day, March 23, 2004 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. 393.

#### □ 1820

#### 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. 393) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2004 and 2006 through 2009, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the following time remained for general debate confined to the congressional budget: The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) had 53½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) had 57½ minutes remaining.

In addition, 1 hour remains on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, first, I thank the chairman for the time and commend him on the job that he has done on the budget process. It is very difficult to please 435 people and nobody is ever happy in the end. It was not exactly like they thought it would be. So I think the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has done yeoman's work on this.

Mr. Chairman, I rise on the floor today to strongly urge my colleagues to consider the path of fiscal responsibility and debt reduction at this critical juncture for our Nation. I rise to offer my support for the fiscal year 2005 budget resolution to get this Congress and our Nation on the right path.

Mr. Chairman, we are all too painfully aware of the tragic events of September 11, 2001, and our Nation's and the free world's war on terrorism that has ensued. It has been a war that the American people did not ask for. It has been a challenge to the people of this country, the greatest and most free nation on Earth. But the costs, Mr. Chairman, the costs have been great in virtually every single way.

On the fiscal side of the ledger, the cost that this Nation has incurred could never have been foreseen. This body has agreed and enacted, rightfully so in my opinion, to pay that price and fight this war.

But, Mr. Chairman, the time to address the growing debt is also at hand,

and this resolution, the fiscal year 2005 budget resolution, gets us on that path of fiscal responsibility and beginning to pay down our debt without compromising our effort in the war on terrorism or any other of our Nation's critical priorities, without raising the taxes of hardworking Americans.

The numbers tell the story. Under this budget, the deficit falls to \$377 billion in the 2005 fiscal year and it is cut in half in 4 years.

Mr. Chairman, the hardworking folks I represent in northeast Georgia have to make a tough decision around their kitchen tables every day to live within their fiscal means. It is time this Congress followed the lead of Georgians and all Americans, hardworking taxpayers, in getting our financial house in order. But, Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely not time and it never will be time to saddle those same taxpayers in Georgia and all over this great Nation with higher Federal taxes in the name of government-knows-best budgeting.

Mr. Chairman, as the folks in Georgia also know, we can slap some lipstick on a hog and dress it up, but at the end of the day it is still a hog. And any budget proposal that sticks it to the working man through higher taxes, funds government pet projects, and pretends to be something that it is not, well, that certainly smells a little bit like a hog to me.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing, get this Congress and America on the path of fiscal responsibility. Reject the notion that raising taxes is the answer to everything and vote in favor of this budget resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purposes of a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks against the Republican budget because it cuts funding for Violence Against Women programs and in 10 years has cut Family Violence programs 10 percent.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object, but I hope that if speeches are going to be made during the time of a unanimous consent request, that that time be taken out of the opposition's time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to address that issue.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Republican budget because it cuts women's education programs.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Republican budget because it cuts funding for women's business centers, among many other essential and effective programs.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Republican budget because it cuts funds for Violence Against Women by \$22 million, which is a 5.7 percentage cut below the 2004 budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. MCCARTHY).

(Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Republican budget because it cuts women's education acts and programs.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Democratic budget substitute and in opposition to the Republican plan which fails to address the needs and fiscal challenges America faces today. Instead of creating jobs, it creates record deficits. It shortchanges education, healthcare, veterans and does little to aid the sagging economy. Further, it makes drastic cuts to programs that provide educational and business opportunities to women across the country.

This budget eliminates Women's Educational Equity Act Programs, which fund activities promoting educational equity for girls and women. Over 10 percent of young women drop out of high school, yet the President's budget eliminates funding for dropout prevention programs. As a former teacher, I understand the importance of education in providing young men and women with the background they need to lead successful lives. This budget cuts many vital programs such as Head Start and Even Start and freezes funding for Pell Grants.

More than 3.8 million women are looking for work, yet the Administration cuts \$79 million in funding for the Small Business Administration, which helps women and minority owned small businesses grow. There are more than 7 million small businesses owned by women. The need for SBA assistance continues to be vital to my community.

This budget freezes funding for The Child Care and Development Block Grant program, which provides child care assistance for low income families and early education services to disadvantaged children and is essential to working women nationwide.

Further, violence against women prevention programs and SBA Women's Business Centers are underfunded, and no increase is requested by the Administration for the National Women's Business Council, which conducts

invaluable research on issues of importance to women business owners and their organizations.

Mr. Chairman, this budget fails to meet the fiscal challenges America faces today and slashes programs that are the lifeline to working families, especially women heads of households. I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic substitute as a much more realistic budgetary solution that restores funding to vital programs and achieves balance in the budget and assistance to those who seek the American dream.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ).

(Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget because it provides virtually no hope for the 20 million women without health insurance in this country.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON).

(Ms. CARSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Republican budget because it shamelessly undercuts the funding for Violence Against Women programs.

Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Republican budget because it cuts funding for Violence Against Women Programs.

The budget presented before us today provides only \$362 million for the Violence Against Women Act programs—a cut of \$22 million below this year's level.

Historically, domestic violence has been a silent epidemic. According to the Commonwealth Fund, almost 4 million women are physically abused each year in the United States.

Further statistics reveal that, in our country, battering is the single major injury to women exceeding muggings, rapes, and auto accidents combined.

Domestic violence is the leading cause of injury to women in this country, where they are more likely to be assaulted, injured, raped or killed by a male partner than by any other type of assailant.

Each year, in my home-state of Indiana, thousands of women and children flee to emergency shelters to escape violence within their home. Approximately 90 percent of these abusers were a spouse, family member, boyfriend, or separated spouse.

Ensuring that victims of domestic violence receive the necessary services to protect themselves and their children is one of the most important things this legislative body can do.

However, violence against women is not only a national issue. Internationally, at least one in every three women has been beaten, coerced into sex or abused during her lifetime.

Domestic violence encompasses all socioeconomic, racial, ethnic and religious groups

worldwide. We can tackle the undignified treatment of women before it matures into violence, by conducting early prevention programs to teach young people the importance of supporting and respecting one another.

I will continue to support initiatives to obtain gender equality, women's rights and put an end to violence against women here, in our nation, and abroad. In order to do this we must make sure that VAWA is fully funded within the budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Republican budget because it is fiscally irresponsible, bad for the economy, and it underfunds homeland security, education, veterans and women.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Republican budget because it cuts most programs for women, most especially for Violence Against Women programs.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks about the Republican budget because it cuts funding for the Violence Against Women Programs.

The funding for violence against women supports most of the programs created by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. The programs impact the lives of women and children by bolstering prosecution of domestic violence, sexual assault, increasing services for victims by funding shelters and increasing resources for law enforcement personnel. The President's budget proposes to cut funding for these programs to \$362 million, a reduction of \$22 million.

Since the Violence Against Women Act was implemented, there has been a 25 percent decrease in violence against women. This 25 percent decrease demonstrates, the effectiveness of the policing and prosecutions that these programs fund.

Violence against women is a global epidemic. It is not a woman's issue and it is not a "private" issue. We need to restore the \$22 million to the Violence Against Women Programs to show the women, children and families across the country that we are committed to creating a safer and more peaceful world for them.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the President's budget and the Republican budget because of their lack of attention to the need of the uninsured with no health care.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Republican budget because the Republican budget virtually guarantees cuts in women's programs as the President's budget already does.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Republican budget because it jeopardizes Even Start for children and families.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Republican and Presidential budget because it opposes the veterans' budget, civil rights budget, women's support, children's support and homeland security.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Republican budget because it would place my USC girls' number one volleyball team, who were here at the White House yesterday, at risk.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Republican budget because it continues a practice of reverse Robin Hood, robbing from the poor and working people to give tax breaks to the rich.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Republican budget because it does not accelerate the child tax credit for 250,000 men and women who are fighting and dying in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request 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 against the Republican budget because it reduces the number of Section 8 housing vouchers which provides subsidized housing for women, children and families.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise against this budget because while this administration is proposing to spend billions of dollars to build schools in Iraq, there is zero in this budget for school construction for the public schools in America.

□ 1830

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself half a minute just to say I certainly have enormous respect for people's opinions, but I have to say I do not see a volleyball team anywhere in the budget that was mentioned, that we cut a volleyball team; and I am looking through here, and I just do not see it.

I am amazed by the conversation we are hearing here today. My guess is that there is not a volleyball team funded in any of the other alternative budgets either, and if there is, I hope to God that it does not pass.

We need to make sure that we control spending, and I do not think volleyball spending should be part of the Federal budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN), a very distinguished member of the committee.

(Mr. BROWN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate all the effort that the chairman has done to bring this document to the House floor, and I rise in support of this resolution; and I have got a few charts that we wanted to show to support the reason we are supporting this budget resolution.

Since we met here to consider our budget last year at this time, our economy, then struggling to gain traction, has made a tremendous, remarkable comeback. The policies we have put in place to deal with the extraordinary circumstances of the past few years have worked and continue to work.

Today, our economy is showing robust growth. The strong growth is expected to continue. In the third quarter of 2003, we saw the GDP growth at 8.2 percent, the highest surge in 20 years; and that was followed in the fourth quarter with a growth rate of 4.1 percent, still strong by historical standards.

It is interesting to note that last year at this time, private forecasters

were expecting real GDP growth of 3.6 percent for 2004. Now they are expecting 4.7 percent for 2004.

Housing starts are running at their highest levels in 20 years. Mortgage rates continue to run at their lowest levels in over 3 decades, and the bank prime rate is at its lowest level in 45 years. Inflation has been running at its lowest level in nearly 4 decades. U.S. real exports of goods and services rose in the fourth quarter at a 20 percent rate, the fastest pace in 7 years.

We have seen a significant increase in the stock market. The Dow Jones Industrial Average is up 25 percent since March of last year.

Most important, labor markets are improving. The unemployment rate is down 5.6 percent from 6.3 percent just last June.

We must keep this momentum. We cannot afford to cut this recovery off at the knees just as we are getting back on track.

This budget will keep taxes from increasing. If we do not act, Americans will face a tax increase next year. This budget helps to make sure that a family of four earning \$40,000 will not have to face a tax increase of nearly \$1,000 next year. Make no mistake, a tax increase would hurt our economy and destroy jobs.

This budget places economic growth and job creation at the highest priority by supporting those policies that are fueling the economic recovery. We need to keep the economy and jobs growing, and this budget supports those goals.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) so that she can respond.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, what I did say is it would have placed my number one USC volleyball team at risk because this bill eliminates the Women's Educational Equity Act.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WATSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I would even provide the gentlewoman with some time if she can find that in the budget. I have got the budget here. If she can find volleyball or the Women's Athletic Act or anything in this budget, I would be glad to yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman if she can find that for me in my budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

If the gentlewoman can either find it in my budget or someone else's budget, the word "volleyball" does not appear and that act does not appear in this budget or in the gentlewoman's alternative budget.

So I guess I would just suggest that this is where the rhetoric starts getting a little bit, we have got to be a little careful here when we start running to the floor, on the one hand, while concerning ourselves with deficit

spending and, on the other hand, coming to the floor, which I would suggest is somewhat shrill, suggesting that we are cutting volleyball teams in a budget like this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, Federal spending in recent years has been growing, particularly in the wake of our national emergency on September 11, at a record-breaking pace. The Congressional Budget Office projects that current policies could produce a cumulative deficit of nearly \$2 trillion for the 10 years that lie immediately ahead of us.

Federal spending breaks down today to a burden of more than \$20,000 per household, the highest since World War II, and yesterday's report by the Social Security and Medicare board of trustees was disconcerting, to say the least, about the long-term obligations that this government faces.

Many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle know that I have taken some strong stands in recent days to confront my concern for runaway Federal spending, but it is with equal conviction that I rise today to endorse and support the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2005.

The good news today in this budget is that Republicans in Congress are taking an important first step under the leadership of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and under the leadership of our Speaker, our majority leader, and the balance of the majority of this Congress to right the fiscal ship that has been listing in the direction of government spending. We are truly taking an important first step in this budget to put our fiscal house in order; and I, as a conservative Member of this Congress, rise to extol its virtues.

This budget holds the line on spending. It makes permanent the tax cuts of 2001 and 2003, and it funds our vital defense during a time of war.

Mr. Chairman, during World War II, President Roosevelt signed a budget that actually reduced nondefense spending. President Truman did the same thing during the Korean War, and this budget resolution follows the same ethic by freezing nondefense, nonhomeland security spending at current levels for the first time in a generation.

Mr. Chairman, this budget is a tough solution to a tough problem. The easy solution, on the other hand, would be to listen to many who propose that simply some day in the not-too-distant future that we will raise taxes, but one of the undeniable truths of the modern era is that when we raise taxes on the American family, the Congress simply raises the amount of money it spends in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, budgets are all about priorities, and there are those in this body who claim that we are not spend-

ing enough in this budget; but in the very same breath, we will hear on this floor tonight and tomorrow a lament about deficits and about debt. Well, they cannot have it both ways.

This budget sends a clear message to the American people that we are truly committed to cutting the deficit and to winning the war on terrorism and to growing this economy through tax cuts.

Again, I commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for his yeoman's work on this budget, as evidence of the fiscal conservative principles for which this Republican majority is endorsed and celebrated by millions. As a conservative, I support these priorities. As a conservative, I support this budget and urge all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, who lament the deficits and the fiscal, spend-thrift ways of the past and urge their support in passage of this 2005 budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for one more unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO).

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks about this budget because it needlessly underfunds the Violence Against Women's Act and cuts so many programs important to women.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking out of order here, and I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) be yielded 10 minutes of the Joint Economic Committee time for purposes of control.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, as the senior Democrat on the Joint Economic Committee, I am honored to be here today to continue the tradition begun by Senator Humphrey and Congressman Hawkins.

I came here last year and accused President Bush of being a liar. A year later, I feel no reason to apologize or change my opinion. Events have proved that point.

It has been proven that there was no evidence of weapons of mass destruction. In the economic report that the President signed, he tried to spin a recovery on jobs but the fact is—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise the gentleman to refrain from personally offensive references against the President.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I will take that under consideration.

This is the first President since Herbert Hoover to lose jobs during his Presidency. In the same report, the President tried to reinvent history of our current recession and blame it on the Clinton administration; but the National Bureau of Economic Research, the only body that can date a recession, continues to say it began March 2001, under the watch of George W. Bush.

More recently, there was subterfuge to hide an analysis done by the administration experts on the cost of their Medicare prescription drug bill, which narrowly passed the House, with assurance that it would cost no more than \$400 billion. The chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and others assured us that, in fact, it would cost perhaps less than \$400 billion, when the administration knew that the costs would be higher than their own analysis says, \$535 billion.

They could not have passed the bill if their own Members had known about this price tag. So what did they do? The administration suppressed the information and told the actuary who had done the work if he released that data he would be fired so fast his head would spin.

This is not an administration that can be trusted. They lie, they bury facts, they threaten people to make sure that their side of the story is presented, and it is reason enough alone to vote "no" on this budget presented to us today.

The Republicans are playing games with numbers. The Americans deserve to have an honest budget, and I do not think that the Republican budget lives up to that standard. It has got an eternity time frame for Social Security and Medicare; but if they used the same time frame for their own budget, we would see deficits beyond our discovery of life on Mars. Regardless of how we measure it, this budget is one more step to privatize Social Security and Medicare.

For jobs and unemployment, we have got 12.6 million people under- or unemployed and there are no unemployment insurance benefits to fulfill those that expired at the end of last year.

In health care, 1.6 million more Americans, mostly children and pregnant women, will lose their access to health care because of the \$13 billion cut from Medicaid and children's health program; 500,000 children will be dropped from their child care by 2009; and in education \$9.4 billion less for the No Child Left Behind Act than was promised by the Republican administration.

The Republican budget shortcomings shortchange college students by freezing the Pell grant awards, and it reduces other student aid. Any way we look at it, this budget shortchanges American families. It causes more people to join the ranks of those without health insurance. It endangers the education of our children, and it fails to

honestly address the costs of the President's war with Iraq.

Like my friend, Princeton economist Uwe Reinhardt, points out, and I agree, this is a faith-based budget. It is a memo to God. It is our Nation, the Republicans in it, telling God what our highest priorities are, and in this Republican budget, we are telling God that making the rich richer is much more important than educating our children, providing quality health care for all our citizens and helping those between jobs.

It is a sad commentary when we have to rely on distorted facts, made-up figures, I am not allowed to suggest prevarication; but when we do not have the numbers and make them up, the country should not have to rely on falsehoods.

□ 1845

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the Republican budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for the gentleman's hard work on this fiscally sound budget.

I would like to bring to Members' attention a very valuable program which pays for itself, saves the government money and energy, and creates jobs in local communities. It is called the Energy Performance Savings Performance Contracting, or ESPC.

It has been documented over time that many government facilities have energy inefficient equipment and buildings that need to be modernized so that they operate at peak efficiency. However, Federal agencies do not have the funds, nor in some cases the expertise, to perform this kind of work. The ESPC program allows the government to modernize facilities without spending upfront funds. Additionally, the program saves the government and taxpayers money and creates precious jobs across the Nation.

Under ESPC, the private sector installs new energy efficient equipment in Federal facilities at no upfront cost to the government. Federal agencies then pay off this investment over time with the funds saved on utility costs. It is important to note that the private sector contractor guarantees these savings and, by law, the government does not pay more for projects than it pays for in utilities.

Energy analysts estimate that more than 50 federally approved projects worth close to \$300 million are stalled at military bases and Federal agency offices nationwide. Additionally, this lapse has cost over 2,000 jobs nationwide.

The reauthorization of this valuable program has been stymied because the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office disagree on whether or not to score the program. The OMB and the CBO have not scored the ESPC as a cost to the

government since its inception. However, this year while the OMB still does not score the program, the CBO scores it at a significant cost over the next 10 years.

There is no doubt that energy efficiency is essential to meeting our Nation's goals. As the single largest consumer of energy, the Federal Government can do a great deal to help the Nation meet this goal, especially through this program. Thus, it is my hope that the scoring discrepancies between the OMB and the CBO can be resolved when the budget resolution goes to conference.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to start off by thanking the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his incredible work on this budget and for helping the American people understand what is at stake here. And as far as I have heard, it has been scored so it seems to me we are talking about different things here.

Here are the top 10 reasons we Democrats oppose the Republican budget resolution. First, it makes the ballooning deficit even worse.

It fails to protect Social Security. It spends every penny of the Social Security surplus over the next 5 years, \$1 trillion.

It offers more of the same failed economic policies that have already caused the loss of 3 million private sector jobs during this administration.

It underfunds education and, specifically, the No Child Left Behind Act by over \$9 billion less than was promised.

It provides for \$1.3 billion less than the Veterans' Affairs Committee on a bipartisan basis recommended for our country's veterans.

It cuts homeland security at a time of national insecurity below even the President's request by nearly \$857 million.

It fails to protect the Nation's environment.

It cuts funding for the National Institutes of Health, Maternal and Child Health.

It creates long-term deficits that will undermine economic growth and fails to extend unemployment insurance to those who have lost their jobs.

And during the war on terror, it actually cuts benefits to widows of military retirees, limits improvements to military housing, and discontinues last year's TRICARE for Reservists.

And the President's tax cut proposal is a gift that keeps on taking, taking from our children, our families, and our seniors. His tax cut takes from the next generation and replaces with that taking a mountain of debt on the backs of our children. America simply cannot be red, white and broke and meet its challenges at home and abroad; but that is exactly where the Republican budget takes us.

Therefore, it is the duty of Democrats to bring these wrong priorities for America to the light of day, and to offer an alternative that reflects the priorities of America's working families by stimulating the economy, by creating jobs, by expanding educational opportunity, by improving health care, by strengthening homeland security, those first responders we see the President take the pictures with, but then he goes ahead and cuts their funding dramatically. It is outrageous. Tell him to go see the firefighters now that he cut a quarter of a billion dollars, and after he basically zeroed out the Safer Act to help communities hire more firefighters, or the interoperable communications equipment that is necessary. Tell the firefighters how you are their friend and how you are their heroes with this budget.

We do all of our things, however, in a positive way by creating opportunities, and, yes, helping the firefighters and all those who provide emergency management for homeland security while bringing our budget into balance in 8 years.

In fact, over the next 5 years the Democratic budget is going to provide over \$9 billion more for education and training than the Republican budget, \$11 billion more for health care programs than the Republican budget, \$17 billion more for environmental protection than the Republican budget, nearly \$6 billion more for first responders for port security, for aviation security, and for border security than the Republican budget.

And the Democratic budget also targets \$2 billion in fiscal year 2005 to support our troops and includes the full \$2.5 billion increase that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs says is critically needed for our Nation's veterans.

It is time for Republicans to stop lamenting the deficit they recklessly created and join us in balancing the budget just like American families have to do every day of their lives, and give us an opportunity for a future of hope, growth and opportunity, not a future of debt and despair.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this budget that continues the same failed economic policies that have moved our record surpluses to record deficits in record time. Its single-minded focus is on tax policies that benefit the wealthy at the expense of everyone else.

Let me give one example of the misguided tax priorities that guide this budget. More than 25 million families received a \$400-per-child increase in the child tax credit last year. However, during final negotiations of the tax legislation passed by this Congress, the families of approximately 12 million children were excluded from this increased credit. Among the families who

did not receive the acceleration of the tax credit are 250,000 men and women who today continue to fight and die in Iraq and in Afghanistan. The 20 million children who did not receive the full increase, including 12 million who did not receive any increase at all, did not because their families, they were told, do not pay enough in income taxes to receive the credit. But yet these families pay taxes: payroll taxes, State and local taxes, sale taxes, all of which place a far heavier burden on those with the lowest income.

Unlike the Republican budget, the Democratic substitute would right this injustice. In addition to being the right thing to do for families, this cut would stimulate our economy. Only about a quarter of the \$300 rebate from the last tax cut was put back into the economy. Giving tax cuts to families who would spend the money immediately would be the best stimulus we could give our economy right now.

Mr. Chairman, it does come down to priorities. By supporting the Republican budget, we continue down the same path of failed economic policy developed with misguided values and priorities; and by supporting the Spratt substitute and extending the child tax credit to these 6.5 million families, we draw upon our Nation's shared values. We act with a shared sense of purpose and responsibility that helps us to address the most important tasks before this country. That should be the goal in this budget. That is what this institution should aspire to do.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to concentrate on an area of this budget that could have devastating effects on Medicaid coverage and safety net institutions that serve the uninsured.

This budget requires cuts of \$2.2 billion in the Medicaid and S-CHIP programs, stripping away critically needed Federal funds from already beleaguered and underfunded State Medicaid programs that serve the poorest among us.

We know States are in budgetary crisis. We know we would have millions more uninsured if we had not provided a temporary increase in the Federal matching rate for Medicaid. But instead of providing funds to extend this higher matching rate, there are no funds allocated for that; and it will expire. Instead, we are compounding the problem by requiring cuts in Federal funding for Medicaid and S-CHIP. Assuring that these cuts do not occur is not and should not be a partisan issue.

I want to read from a letter Governor Schwarzenegger sent earlier this week to the entire California delegation. He said, "I am writing to urge your opposition to proposed reductions in Medicaid funding that could significantly jeopardize support for services to low-income, underserved Californians.

Given California's budget challenges, the rising number of uninsured and the financially precarious position of many of the State's safety net providers, California can ill-afford reductions in Federal Medicaid spending.

"I am particularly concerned by any proposals that would reduce the critical funding California uses to support its hospital safety net. Clearly, reductions of this magnitude will place tremendous stress on the State's already financially fragile health care safety net, compelling hospitals to cut back on emergency and trauma care throughout California and, quite possibly, put entire hospitals at risk of closure."

Mr. Chairman, surely anyone concerned about the 43 million Americans who are already uninsured in this country must see the folly of adopting cuts in this budget which would add to that number and simultaneously cripple the safety net institutions which are their only source of care. This is reason enough to vote against this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the full text of Governor Schwarzenegger's letter.

MARCH 22, 2004.

DEAR CALIFORNIA DELEGATION MEMBER: I am writing to urge your opposition to proposed reductions in Medicaid funding that could significantly jeopardize support for services to low-income, underserved Californians. Given California's budget challenges, the rising number of uninsured, and the financially precarious position of many of the state's safety net providers, California can ill afford reductions in federal Medicaid spending.

California opposes reductions in Medicaid funding and changes in current policy that would erode federal support of the state's fragile health care delivery system. I am particularly concerned by any proposals that would reduce the critical funding California uses to support its hospital safety net. Cuts in Medicaid funding for intergovernmental transfers, for example, could put \$900 million in federal funds to California per year at risk; Los Angeles County alone would lose \$500 million in funding for its hospitals. Clearly, reductions of this magnitude will place tremendous stress on the state's already financially fragile health care safety net, compelling hospitals to cut back on emergency and trauma care throughout California and, quite possibly, put entire hospitals at risk of closure.

I share Congress' commitment to further controlling Medicaid spending in California and eliminating waste, fraud and abuse in the program. Consistent with that commitment, I have proposed a comprehensive redesign of our state's Medicaid program to preserve health care coverage while managing costs in a more effective manner. Additionally we have a number of proposals to further the state's efforts to crack down on fraud and abuse in the program. These efforts will result in cost savings to both the State and federal governments.

Moreover, California already operates one of the most cost-effective Medicaid programs in the country. The state's low per capita spending coupled with its low federal Medicaid matching rate combine to make the federal per capita contribution the lowest in the nation. As a result, California cannot afford reductions in federal Medicaid funding.

Over 6.5 million Californians rely on the state's Medicaid program to access essential

health care services. As the budget process moves forward, I urge you to oppose proposed cuts to Medicaid spending that will undermine the system of health care low-income Californians rely upon for their medical needs. I ask that you not cut funds for reimbursing states for their Medicaid costs or funds used by California to ensure that critical hospitals in the State are able to provide emergency room and trauma care.

Sincerely,

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) for purposes of control.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes, and thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately what we have before us today by the majority party is a status quo budget. It is a budget that continues the failed economic policies which have not been working for American families. It has been failing our seniors, failing working families, and certainly is failing our veterans. We have heard debate about that today.

But most importantly, I believe, it is going to fail the future of our country, our children, by the underinvestment that is being made in crucial education programs, by not fully funding the No Child Left Behind law, by not reaching that guideway to full funding of special education.

□ 1900

It undercuts vocational and technical education programs, the Perkins loans, it underinvests in community colleges. We will pay a heavy price in the future if this underinvestment continues.

As this chart demonstrates, Mr. Chairman, the history of the Republican Congress when it comes to living up to the promise of fully funding No Child Left Behind, over the last couple of fiscal years, they have fallen way short of the promise to fully fund. This has been the track record. Make no mistake, these are new Federal mandates, requirements on local school districts, requiring them to do certain things with our children; but they are not providing the resources and tools they need to succeed.

Just a couple of weeks ago, we had Chairman Greenspan testify before the Committee on Education and the Workforce. In his opinion, he felt one of the most important priorities of investment we need to make in the Federal budget is in education and job training programs so that our children, our workers, are as competitive as they can be in this new global marketplace. This Republican budget falls short of that investment.

The Democratic substitute that we will be offering tomorrow has substantial increases in investments in No Child Left Behind, special education,

vocational education, Perkins loans and investment in our community colleges.

There is a clear difference in the vision of the future of this Nation, where our priorities as a party lie, where our values are shared throughout the Nation. Unfortunately, this majority budget falls short of that.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I am trying understand here, when we talk about the other side where it is just talking about the fact that we are not living up to our commitments. Just so everybody knows, there are some other charts here that we want you to see.

Total education: Annual growth over the last 5 years in the education accounts averaged 11 percent per year in those 5 years. So when we hear this lament that we are not spending enough on education, here are the facts. Eleven percent. There is no other part of government that has been growing at that kind of rate. In fact, it is growing faster than national defense.

Let me show you another one. Special education, over the last 5 years, the average growth was 19 percent. While they are complaining about special education, we have not seen the final total, but I will bet they do not fully fund special education in their budget. I bet they do not reach that, do they? They just complain about it.

Yes, they say they give a little bit more, but we have been providing 19 percent per year. Spending has more than doubled over the last 5 years for special education.

Last but not least is No Child Left Behind. The No Child Left Behind program funding has grown 40 percent under this President. Annual growth over the last 4 years, my colleagues can see before them right here. In fact, it has happened so fast, there are States, Iowa is one of them, where Iowa actually had to turn back money that we are looking to investigate, we want to find out exactly why it is that money that went to Iowa and to other States under No Child Left Behind has now been sent back. That is unconscionable at a time when our classrooms and our teachers are talking to us, telling us that they need more money.

We are increasing. We are meeting the totals. If the States had grown at the level we have been growing at the Federal level, we would not be in the predicament we are in. We are meeting our obligations. The States are not. We are growing our budget. We will continue that commitment.

So as the lament continues, just remember, the increases are in here and the increases are coming.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I am obviously referring to the broken promise the President made in fully funding No Child Left Behind when he signed it into law.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, in the 2000 campaign, President Bush declared that he opposed nation-building. Who knew it was America he was talking about? When we look at this higher education agenda, the President can run for reelection saying he kept his promise against nation-building.

Everybody understands the importance of higher education, opening doors of economic opportunity in a time of changing economic conditions. Pell Grants, the single largest educational opportunity we provide at the Federal level, is frozen. In fact, as tuition has been going up by 14 percent a year for the last 3 years, we have kept constant the Pell Grant and have not allowed it to increase with the cost of college education.

Today, at the University of Illinois, the average graduate from the University of Illinois graduates on graduation day, gets a diploma plus \$18,000 in debt. They get their first Visa bill when they graduate from college. We have frozen higher education assistance to middle-class families.

During the campaign, President Bush promised to increase the Pell Grant to \$5,100. Despite an average tuition increase of 14 percent, the Pell Grant today sits at \$4,050. To me, that is a fascinating way to invest in America's future. We make available all these types of assistance to corporations. That child is as important to America's future as a corporation, yet we have frozen and closed the doors of economic opportunity.

And all while we were freezing our assistance to college education, in Iraq we have opened up 2,300 schools and distributed 1.5 million secondary and 800,000 primary school kits to the children of Iraq.

We need to have a budget that reflects our values here at home with the same type of commitment we have held for the people of Iraq and for their children. Here in America we are limiting the educational options available to students and limiting the ability of Americans to compete in the world marketplace.

I am glad to see the President kept his commitment, that is, to be opposed to nation-building. Unfortunately, he has chosen America as his model. This budget returns us and, in fact, you could label this budget as a back-to-the-future budget. What has it resulted in in the last 3 years? Two-and-a-half million Americans have lost their jobs, 43 million Americans are without health care, 2 million American children went from the middle class to poverty, and the most important fact is, we have had a wage recession in America, a 3 percent decline in wage income in America under this administration.

This budget consistently follows the path of the last 3 years, the last three budgets of the President, and takes us back to the future to an economic time



in which we have seen the job decline and the health care decline in this country. Unfortunately, in the area of higher education, they have frozen and kept the doors closed to middle-class families at a time when it is essential for them to go forward.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds again just to point out that the Democratic alternative, while they come to the floor and lament that we do not fully fund No Child Left Behind, guess what? The alternative budget presented by the Democrats does not fully fund No Child Left Behind. Is that not interesting? In fact, the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce has called it somewhat hypocritical that you would complain on one side and not propose a budget that funds it on the other.

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, in response to that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, Americans have always known that education is about more than education. They have always understood that education was about their dreams, about their families, that education was about their children and their communities, that it was about the health of our economy and the future of our country. That is why we are so terribly disappointed when we see the broken promises by the President of these United States in this budget and the Republican Budget Committee, when we see that special education is not fully funded.

And the gentleman is quite correct, it is not fully funded in our budget because you gave away all the money. You made a conscious decision 2 years ago in the Committee on the Budget not to fully fund education. It is a dead letter, except for the parents and the children who suffer from those disabilities and their families and looking for that educational opportunity. That was a campaign promise of this President, but it is broken in this budget, it was broken in last year's budget, and it was broken in the budget before.

We argued about it in the committee, we had votes on the Senate floor, we had votes on it here; and the Republicans killed it each and every time we brought it up. Of course, then there was a promise of this President that he was going to raise the Pell Grant. But again he gave away all of the money, so he had to break his promise. He kept his promise to the wealthy, but he could not keep his promise to kids who were struggling to pay for their education. So the Pell Grant is worth less now than it was in 1976, but the cost of a college education is not what it was in 1976.

And then, of course, there is the granddaddy of all broken promises, and that is, if we gave him real reforms in elementary and secondary education, real reforms, he promised us in the Oval Office of the White House that he would provide the real money to go along with that.

He got the most significant reforms in Federal education policy in 40 years. Those are his words. I agree with him. These are real. These are important. They are starting to make a difference. But we did not get the real resources to go with those real reforms. The President owes us about \$9 billion in various parts of this program; \$7.2 billion alone in Title I.

Yes, we can come up with a budget, but the fact of the matter is, the President had other priorities. He simply chose to give tax cuts, and then after he gave the tax cuts we had a war, we had 9/11, we had another war, we had a recession.

It did not bother the President. It did not faze him. He kept his promise to those wealthy people, those people making more than \$4- or \$500,000 a year, but he could not keep his promise to the school children. He just could not keep that promise. So he chose not to fully fund No Child Left Behind.

I do not know what a Presidential promise is worth anymore. Apparently not much to school children, not much to the disabled community, it is not much to young people trying to finance their education. They cannot take that Presidential promise to the bank. They cannot take that Presidential promise to get service for their disabled children. They cannot take that Presidential promise to get supplementary services for their children in school who are having trouble. As No Child Left Behind provides, they will not have that qualified teacher in their classroom as the bill mandates the States to do. No. And they will not have that restructuring of the local education system as the bill mandates because the President did not keep his promise.

The tragedy of this is Americans and their families understand the value and importance of education, but this Republican budget does not. It devalues education. Why does it do that? They are forced to do that, because they made a decision about the tax cuts and to loot the country. They looted the Treasury on behalf of the wealthy the first day that they came to office, and there is nothing left in that Treasury for the children of America, for their schools, for their higher education, for their disabilities.

What a sad, sad portrait of the country. This portrait was intentionally painted by this Republican administration, this President and their friends at the Republican Budget Committee. It is a tragedy for this Nation.

The Republican Budget Resolution provides for only a \$2.8 billion increase over a frozen FY 2004 education funding level. This provides for meager increases in Title I, the Indi-

viduals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and Pell grant funding—leaving these programs billions of dollars short of levels promised by the Bush Administration and House Republicans:

The Republican Resolution would leave the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) \$9.4 billion short of promised levels. This leaves our schools with a nearly \$27 billion deficit in NCLB funding compared to what was promised when the law was enacted.

The House Republican Budget resolution shortchanges education and job training programs at the time when American children, students and workers need the assistance the most.

This year's House Republican Budget Resolution comes after yet another paltry budget submission by President Bush. The Bush budget represents the smallest increase in education spending in 9 years, cutting \$1.4 billion in critical education programs, including those that improve family literacy, and provide school counselors to elementary school children. The budget resolution also continues the Administration's unprecedented level of proposed cuts to job training and related programs—totaling \$1.8 billion since he took office.

The House Republican Budget Resolution shortchanges Title I funding by \$7.2 billion. This Budget will deny nearly 5 million disadvantaged children critical education services, such as extra help to become proficient in reading and math.

The Republican Budget Resolution freezes the maximum Pell grant for the third year in a row at \$4,050 just as college tuition continues to rise faster than family income.

The maximum Pell grant is worth \$500 less (in real terms) than the maximum grant in 1975–76. Not only do the Republicans fail to stop tuition hikes, but they actually make college even more expensive by freezing or cutting student aid and increasing taxes on students.

The Republican budget breaks President Bush's campaign promise to provide a \$5,100 Pell grant.

The House Republican Budget Resolution also calls for a freeze on teacher quality, after school, and technology programs. This means fewer professional development opportunities for teachers, fewer safe learning environments before and after school and less technologically advanced classrooms.

The Republican Resolution would leave us over \$11 billion short of fully funding special education. This budget calls for yet another \$1 billion increase for special education. At this rate of increase America's children with disabilities will never benefit from full funding of IDEA.

The House Republican Budget Resolution would leave no room for any increase in Head Start funding. This means zero dollars to expand the program to serve more children and no added resources to improve program quality.

During the Bush Administration, 2.2 million jobs have been lost—the worst job creation record in 70 years. To keep pace with the number of jobs available for working adults when President Bush took office, we would need to create 7.1 million new jobs today. In addition, there are over 2.8 million workers who would be engaged in the labor force, but they have either dropped out entirely or failed



to enter the labor market because of the lack of jobs.

Over 760,000 people have exhausted their unemployment benefits between the end of December and the end of February, and two million are projected to lose their benefits by June without an extension of these benefits. To make matters worse, President Bush has proposed to cut nearly \$1.8 billion in job training and vocational education funding since he took office, eliminating training opportunities for thousands of workers. Now House Republicans answer these dire economic conditions by proposing a Budget Resolution without any meaningful help for American workers:

The Republican Budget Resolution would freeze job training and vocational education funding. The Budget resolution utilizes its paltry increase for programs other than job training, leaving no room for an increase for these critical initiatives.

The Republican Budget Resolution contains no funding for an extension of unemployment benefits. The Bush Administration and Congressional Republicans have failed to extend unemployment benefits despite continued high unemployment and lack of job growth, and despite the fact that \$20 billion will be sitting, untapped, in the Unemployment Insurance Trust funds at the end of March.

President Bush's budget severely cuts available child care assistance and the Republican budget resolution does nothing to rectify this situation. Despite the importance of quality child care on later academic achievement and despite research demonstrating how child care is the most important work support keeping low income workers employed, the Republican budgets significantly decrease the number of children served by the federal child care assistance program.

According to the President's own budget documents, his decision to freeze child care funding will lead to more than a 10 percent decrease in child care assistance for low income workers. Despite serving only 15 percent of eligible children to begin with, the Administration chose to cut the number of children served by child care assistance, from 2.5 million in 2003 to 2.2 million by 2009.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds just to say, yes, but you did not, either. You had the choice to put an alternative budget on the floor to fully fund the promises that you are complaining about here today and you chose not to. So be careful what you promise on the campaign trail.

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. GILCHREST) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, 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. 393) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2004 and 2006 through 2009, had come to no resolution thereon.

# REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 393, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-446) on the resolution (H. Res. 574) providing for further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 393) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2004 and 2006 through 2009, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 5, 108th Congress, and the order of the House of December 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Select Committee on Homeland Security to fill the existing vacancy thereon:

Mr. CHANDLER, Kentucky.

□ 1915

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST). Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, March 23, 2004, 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. 393.

□ 1915

### 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. 393) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2004 and 2006 through 2009, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the following time remained for general debate confined to the congressional budget:

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 37½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 37 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) has 5¾ minutes remaining.

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

Just a quick response to my good friend from Iowa. Just to be clear, the Democratic substitute is offering close to 10 billion more in additional funds over the next 5 years to fund No Child Left Behind and special education; over the next 10 years, \$50 billion more than the President's baseline budget that he submitted in regards to education programs. Yet we still achieve balance, a balanced budget within 8 years, given the limitations that we face with these historically large budget deficits that we have the majority party to thank for.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), from the Committee on the Budget.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time, and I applaud his leadership on this issue.

I do not know about anybody else, but I grew up in a family where if we gave our word, we kept our word. We did not break our promise. And this budget is full of broken promises.

I want to talk about just one of those today. There are many, including for veterans, No Child Left Behind, IDEA; but one of the things we do is we fill niches in education, and education is the one piece that gives everybody equal opportunity in this country. Education is incredibly important. Twenty-nine years ago, this Congress pledged it would fully fund IDEA, which is Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. We would fully fund it at 40 percent of the excess cost. And for 29 years Congress has failed to keep that promise, leaving States to shoulder the brunt of this unfunded mandate. Many of us have voted here. We said we will not have any unfunded mandates; yet this has been going on for 29 years.

This budget continues to fail our students, our schools. It costs on average twice as much to educate children with disabilities than a nondisabled child. With the Federal Government failing to live up to its end of the bargain, the State and local school districts are forced to divert already-meager resources from other students in order to ensure that special needs students also receive instruction.

This year, the appropriations for IDEA was \$10.1 billion, or at 18.65 percent of excess cost, leaving States and local districts with an unfunded Federal mandate of \$12 billion. That is 12 billion that our States and our school districts could be spending to alleviate the school crisis, reduce class size, modernize our schools. The failure to adequately fund IDEA is affecting every student in every classroom across America.

Last year I was very pleased. The Republicans and Democrats got together and said we are going to get to fully funding by the year 2010. I said hooray, at least we know where we are going. But this budget in front of us in the year 2005 increases special education by