

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 202, noes 221, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 197]

AYES—202

Abercrombie Gilchrest Neal (MA)
Ackerman Gonzalez Obey
Allen Gordon Oliver
Andrews Green (TX) Ose
Baca Greenwood Owens
Baird Grijalva Pallone
Baldwin Gutierrez Pascarell
Ballance Harman Pastor
Bass Hastings (FL) Payne
Becerra Hill Pelosi
Bell Hinchey Pomeroy
Berkley Hinojosa Price (NC)
Berman Hoeffel Pryce (OH)
Biggart Holt Ramstad
Bishop (GA) Honda Rangel
Bishop (NY) Hooley (OR) Reyes
Blumenauer Houghton Rodriguez
Boehlert Hoyer Rothman
Bono Inslee Roybal-Allard
Boswell Isakson Rumpersberger
Boucher Israel Rush
Boyd Jackson (IL) Ryan (OH)
Bradley (NH) Jackson-Lee Sabo
Brady (PA) (TX) Sanchez, Linda
Brown (OH) Jefferson T.
Brown, Corrine Johnson (CT) Sanchez, Loretta
Capito Johnson, E. B. Sanders
Capps Jones (OH) Sandlin
Capuano Kaptur Schakowsky
Cardin Kelly Schiff
Cardoza Kennedy (RI) Scott (GA)
Carson (IN) Kilpatrick Scott (VA)
Carson (OK) Kind Serrano
Case Kirk Shaw
Castle Kleczka Shays
Chandler Kolbe Sherman
Clay Kucinich Simmons
Clyburn Lampson Slaughter
Conyers Lantos Smith (WA)
Cooper Larsen (WA) Snyder
Cramer Larson (CT) Solis
Crowley Lee Spratt
Cummings Levin Lewis (GA)
Davis (AL) Davis (CA) Lofgren
Davis (FL) Lowey Strickland
Davis (IL) Majette Tanner
DeFazio Maloney Tauscher
DeGette Markey Thomas
DeLauro Matheson Thompson (CA)
Deutsch Matsui Thompson (MS)
Dicks McCarthy (MO) Tierney
Dingell McCarthy (NY) Towns
Doggett McCollum Turner (TX)
Dooley (CA) McDermott Udall (CO)
Dunn McGovern Udall (NM)
Edwards McHugh Van Hollen
Emanuel Meehan Velázquez
Engel Meek (FL) Visclosky
Eshoo Meeks (NY) Walden (OR)
Etheridge Menendez Waters
Evans Millender- Watson
Farr McDonald Watt
Filner Miller (NC) Waxman
Foley Miller, George Weiner
Frank (MA) Moore Wexler
Frelinghuysen Moran (VA) Woolsey
Frost Nadler Wu
Gephardt Napolitano Wynn

NOES—221

Aderholt Bonilla Chabot
Akin Bonner Chocola
Alexander Boozman Coble
Bachus Brady (TX) Cole
Baker Brown (SC) Collins
Ballenger Brown-Waite, Costello
Barrett (SC) Ginny Cox
Bartlett (MD) Burgess Crane
Barton (TX) Burns Crenshaw
Beauprez Burr Cubin
Bereuter Burton (IN) Culberson
Berry Buyer Cunningham
Bilirakis Calvert Davis (TN)
Bishop (UT) Camp Davis, Jo Ann
Blackburn Cannon Davis, Tom
Blunt Cantor Deal (GA)
Boehner Carter DeLay

DeMint Kline
Diaz-Balart, L. Knollenberg
Diaz-Balart, M. LaHood
Doolittle Langevin
Doyle Latham
Dreier LaTourette
Duncan Lewis (CA)
Ehlers Lewis (KY)
Emerson Linder
English Lipinski
Everett LoBiondo
Feeney Lucas (KY)
Ferguson Lucas (OK)
Flake Lynch
Forbes Manzullo
Fossella Marshall
Franks (AZ) McCotter
Gallegly McCrery
Garrett (NJ) McInnis
Gerlach McIntyre
Gibbons McKeon
Gillmor McNulty
Gingrey Mica
Goode Michaud
Goodlatte Miller (FL)
Goss Miller (MI)
Granger Miller, Gary
Graves Molohan
Green (WI) Moran (KS)
Gutknecht Murphy
Hall Murtha
Harris Musgrave
Hart Myrick
Hastings (WA) Nethercutt
Hayes Neugebauer
Hefley Ney
Hensarling Northup
Herger Nunes
Hobson Nussle
Hoekstra Oberstar
Holden Ortiz
Hostettler Osborne
Hulshof Otter
Hunter Oxley
Hyde Paul
Issa Pearce
Istook Pence
Jenkins Peterson (MN)
John Peterson (PA)
Johnson (IL) Petri
Jones (NC) Pickering
Kanjorski Pitts
Keller Platts
Kennedy (MN) Pombo
Kildee Porter
King (IA) Putnam
King (NY) Quinn

NOT VOTING—10

Delahunt Johnson, Sam Portman
Fattah Kingston Tauzin
Ford Leach
Hayworth Norwood

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1853

Mr. ORTIZ changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. BASS changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 648, I hereby request that the following amendment be considered out of the order printed in House Report 108-499: amendment No. 14.

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. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. SWEENEY, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on

the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4200) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2005, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLU- TION ON THE BUDGET FOR FIS- CAL YEAR 2005

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 649, I call up the conference report on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 95) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2006 through 2009.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 649, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Tuesday, May 18, 2004.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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 on S. Con. Res. 95.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank members of the Committee on the Budget on both sides of the aisle that have worked throughout the process this year. I wish to thank my ranking member and friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

We will embark today on a vigorous debate. I have a feeling that we will differ quite a lot on the policy and the issues before us faced in the budget, but we do so in a cheerful manner, one that is with full respect; and I have enormous respect for my very able friend and colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

I also want to thank our staff. Rich Meade and the entire Committee on the Budget staff, they have worked very, very diligently on the majority side; and Tom Kahn and the minority staff have also done that. They prepare Members, not only on the committee but throughout our conferences and caucuses, so we are prepared for this debate today and throughout the year, and they deserve our support as we move forward and our appreciation.

As we started crafting the budget this year, there was certainly really no lack of naysayers who said that getting a budget passed this year would probably be next to impossible. There were way too many challenges, people said, facing our country, too many conflicting interests, too much pressure because of the upcoming elections.

All of those things are certainly true. It is true we are dealing with a number of other challenging issues, such as the ongoing conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the war against terrorism in general on a global basis.

But we will prevail as a Nation. Regardless of the debate that we have today on budgets and taxes and pay-as-you-go and the national debt, we will prevail as a Nation, because it is not about budgets in the end. It is not about taxes in the end. It is about an American spirit that will not die, because we believe in freedom, and that is freedom that is given to us as a little seed planted in our hearts when we are born and something that blossoms throughout our lives. We want to share that with the world, and we believe that by sharing it with the world, we will have a safer place in which to live.

I am also happy to report that we have prevailed, despite a myriad of critics who said it could not be done, that we would not even get a conference report agreement between the House and the Senate. We were able to do that. So today in the House we will complete the first step of what are some of our most fundamental duties.

I am extremely proud of this budget and what it stands for. I would like to particularly thank our leadership, our Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT); our majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY); our deputy whip, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR); and our whip, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT); as well as the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE). All of the leadership team worked hard, standing our ground for the budget principles that we knew must be done.

And what was that must-do list for this year's budget? Clearly, this budget had to provide for the defense and homeland security of our Nation. That is job one. There is no excuse not to complete the most important job that this country requires of a Nation in order for it to be free, and that is the defense of our country.

Second, this budget had to continue to support a program of economic growth for our country, as well as continue our commitment to a host of critical domestic programs, such as veterans benefits, education, health care, and prescription drugs for seniors. And we had to do all of this while reining in our spending and working to reduce the deficits we incurred while responding to extraordinary circumstances over the past few years.

Getting a consensus on what was exactly right or correct was not easy. It has been very difficult. Every single

person has their own idea of what a perfect budget would look like. This is not a perfect budget, and I dare say my friends on the other side will remind me of that time and time again today; but it is what is doable at a time of extreme circumstances in our Nation's history.

I have heard people say at time of war we ought to do this; at time of economic challenge we ought to do that; we ought to fund priorities. All of those are true. But we have never faced all of them at the exact same time: to have a downturn in the economy, be faced with two wars, a global response to terrorism, the most unbelievable tragic event of terrorism facing our Nation. All of this happening at the exact same time is something that has never happened to our Nation.

□ 1900

So these are extraordinary circumstances and we will respond. Let me tell you the guiding principles of this budget of how we are going to respond.

First is strength. We are free as a Nation as long as we are able to defend our freedom at home and abroad. And so the first principle is strength.

Second is growth. We must continue to grow. Our policies are helping to boost the economy. We do not want to grow government. We want to grow the earning capacity of people. We want to grow the ability to create jobs. We want to grow the entrepreneurial spirit in our country. That is what we want to grow. And we have already seen, the last 6 months have been the fastest growth in 20 years as a result of the policies put forward by our President and by this Congress. And we believe that must continue.

Business investment is up. Unemployment is falling, and it is lower now than it was on average for the 1970s, the 1980s or the 1990s. And most important, we are seeing jobs being created.

More Americans are working today than at any time in American history; 1.1 million jobs have been created over the last 8 months alone. So to remain the most prosperous superpower, our economy must be able to continue to grow.

Finally, opportunity. Strength, growth and, finally, opportunity. America's continued greatness comes from the unlimited opportunities that our American freedom provides. We are all for that. And we must continue to encourage those opportunities for a better life for every American citizen. Government certainly has a role in that.

Those were the guiding principles of our budget that we passed here in the House, and they remain the guiding principles as we work through this conference agreement.

I also want to talk to you about a few principles with regard to this budget that were included in the final conference agreement. First, there will be no tax increase. And let me be clear: If

you vote "yes" on this budget, you are saying we do not need a tax increase. We do not want an automatic tax increase to happen, and we do not believe that this is a time for Americans to dig deeper in their pockets in order to deal with challenges we should be facing here in Washington.

Tax increases should not be the solution. And so if you vote "no" on this budget, be aware you are voting to automatically allow tax increases to occur this year.

That is what this budget will do. It will prevent an automatic tax increase. So by voting against it, an automatic tax increase will occur.

Second, on spending, our constituents have told us time and time again that we have got to rein in spending. We have got to control the waste, fraud and abuse in Washington. And certainly that is often in the eye of the beholder; but we believe that it is time to go through our departments, through our categories and look at ways to rein in spending. We cannot begin to address reducing the budget deficit without holding the current rate of spending growth.

This is what our spending growth has looked like in the past few years, a lot of growth. Most of that from necessary demands, but we cannot sustain that spending growth. So we have looked for ways to control spending throughout the budget. This budget calls for holding the line on nondefense, nonhomeland security discretionary spending. For the first time, this Congress, certainly in my tenure here and I daresay in the tenure of all Members of this body, this will be the first opportunity for you to vote to freeze or hold the line on nonsecurity spending in Congress.

Let us talk about the war. The President did not, when he submitted his budget back in February, contemplate the true cost of war because they were unknown at that time. Our budget has taken that into account.

We know, without question, that there will be costs for the ongoing war and that this budget will have an effect as a result. Do we know the exact amount? No. That is not known right now to the Congress, to the Defense Department, to the President.

We can speculate, and we have put into this budget a placeholder that says \$50 billion, based on the estimate that we have for this year, is an appropriate figure to begin planning for the 2005 costs of the war.

And thank goodness we did that, because right after we passed our budget, we found out that at least \$25 billion will be necessary to fund the ongoing conflict during 2005. So it is not with precision that we know this amount, but it is something we need to plan for in this, and this budget accomplishes that.

This budget does all of this, if we follow it, to get us back to balanced budgets and fiscal responsibility. We have to start somewhere.

There will be people who come to the floor today who say, you know, this is only a 1-year budget. Well, yeah, that is what we always pass. Last year we passed a budget; it had a lot of years on it, but we only followed it for a year. Then we renegotiated it this year. We will to the same next year and the year after. In fact, every year I have been here we have gone year to year to year with regard to taxes, spending, rules, appropriations, all of the different issues that face us today.

And so we are coming forward to present to you today a 1-year budget. It complies with the Budget Act. You will see 5 years' worth of projections for the amounts of money, but this is a 1-year budget. And we believe if we can get this right and if we can hold the House and the other body and the President to this plan, it puts us on a path to not only controlling the deficit, but getting us back to a balanced budget.

This budget is the first step in accomplishing that but it only works if we stick to it. This is our next major challenge, I daresay, to begin to get past all of the excuses of the last few years, although they are appropriate, certainly important rationale for how we have gotten here.

But we need to move forward. This allows us to do that today. So we need to vote "yes" in order to move this plan forward. But let me be clear: If you vote no, as I said before, you vote for an automatic tax increase, you vote to cut veterans' spending because we increased veterans' spending here over the President's amount by \$1.2 billion; you are not supporting the troops to the tune of \$50 billion contemplating the war costs.

Sure, you can say we will vote for the appropriations bill, but this plans for it in a budget. And I also suggest, you are not doing what you need to do to plan for defense and homeland security of our Nation.

This puts us on a track to fiscal responsibility. It meet our needs and the strengths of our country and growth for the economy and opportunity for the future. And I ask my colleagues to support the conference report.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker I yield myself 4½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and I work together well, and I have the greatest regard for him, but let me put it the way it is. He is trying to put the best face on a bad situation.

What we have got here is a new high for the budget deficit and a new low for the budget process. For the first time in 20 years, for the first time since the 1980s we have a budget that only goes out 1 year. Ever since the Budget Act was adopted, the principle has been that you will run out your numbers 5 years so that we can see the implications of tax cuts and tax increases, spending cuts and spending increases, spread over a reasonable period of

time. Not in this budget: 1 year for the first time in 20 years.

Now, what does that allow you to do? It allows you to dodge the deficit. It keeps you from having to show on a multiyear basis how you will get from a \$300–\$400 billion deficit to something that is half that size to a respectable, sustainable number.

If you only take it out 1 year, there is no way in the world that we will ever get our arms around the deficit in that period of time. So it exonerates you from presenting any kind of process or plan to get where we all know where we have got to go, and that is to a much lower deficit.

Another thing: When you do not put real numbers in the outyears, in 2006, 2007, 2008, it allows you to reduce the President's request and not acknowledge what you are actually doing. By our calculations, when we look at the numbers that are on the chart contained in this budget resolution, this budget resolution provides \$122 billion less for defense than the President requests or projects for himself over that same period of time.

This much is clear: Vote for this and you are voting for a huge deficit by the acknowledgment of the drastic \$367 billion. And while they have included \$50 billion for supplemental spending in Iraq and Afghanistan next year, I think that is at least \$25 billion short of where we will really be. Add that 25 to the 367; you get to 392. Take out the Social Security surplus because it should not be included, and the deficit in the basic budget is \$552 billion.

That is what you are voting for if you vote for this budget resolution, a deficit of \$552 billion.

Now, when you run a deficit like that, you stack up debt, and once again we will have to raise the debt ceiling; and one of the key provisions of this bill buried beneath all of the line items is a provision which would automatically spin off an increase in the debt ceiling of \$690 million—\$690 billion. It will take the debt of the United States up to \$8.1 trillion.

It is hard to get my tongue around those numbers.

When Mr. Bush came to office, the statutory debt ceiling of the United States was \$5.9 trillion. Adopt this budget resolution and we will raise that ceiling by \$2.2 trillion to \$8.1 trillion. That is how much we have had to increase the debt ceiling, \$2 trillion in order to accommodate the fiscal policies of the Bush administration.

Now, we have got record deficits. We have record debt. That is bad enough, but even worse, even worse in this budget resolution, there is no plan, no process and no prospect, not even a PAYGO rule for balancing the budget or anyone issuing the deficit over a period of time. All we have here, after a lot of huffing and puffing, is a puny version of the PAYGO rule that House Democrats and House Republican on two occasions in the 1990s adopted to apply to both tax cuts and spending in-

creases on the entitlement side. All we have got here is a 1-year extension that applies only in the Senate, no application whatsoever in the House. That is all we have got.

The gentleman says if you do not vote for this, it could impair the recovery. Well, let me say, Mr. Greenspan warned us only a week or two ago that this recovery we are beginning to enjoy may be short lived unless we come to grips with this critical problem, and that is mounting, never-ending deficits that these budgets are producing.

So the thing that is incumbent upon us now is not to kick the can down the road, is not just to pass something for the sake of saying we passed the budget resolution, we fixed the 302(a) number. We can go ahead with our appropriation bills. We need a plan; we need a process. We need to deal with this deficit now, and this budget resolution does not do it. That is why we should defeat it, send it back to conference and do it right.

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

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

Let me just respond quickly and say, and I forgot this part, we are reducing the budget deficit by \$100 billion. So I understand there is concern out there. We are taking \$100 billion off the top as a result of this budget because we are planning our work and we are sticking to our plan, and it is a good plan.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I ask this question for myself and my colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

I note on Wednesday, March 31, with 299 votes, the House passed House Resolution 581 regarding pay comparability for Federal employees. That language is not included in the resolution.

Is it the gentleman's understanding that the language of that resolution is the position of the House?

Mr. NUSSLE. It is my understanding. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), a very valued member of the committees.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and commend him on his patience and persistence that was required to have this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. In my view, the first job of the Federal government is to defend the country, and there is certainly no greater priority in this budget than protecting America.

When it comes to helping make the country strong, we in Congress have an

important role to play. Part of our role involves the other major bill we are working on this week, the defense authorization bill. But I believe that passing this budget today also puts in place an essential building block that helps make sure we do our job in keeping and improving on a strong America.

This budget fully funds the President's request for military and homeland security. It allocates \$420 billion for the national security function. Included in that is \$402 billion for the military, and on top of that is \$50 billion that the chairman just talked about for the ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Once that allocation is translated into the various programs, we will have increased basic pay for soldiers in the military, 21 percent over the past 3 years.

□ 1915

We will have increased personnel funding 59 percent since 2001. Operation and maintenance will have increased 55 percent; procurement up 43 percent; R&D funding up 76 percent over the past 3 years.

In short, Mr. Speaker, we will have provided everything the Pentagon has asked for the troops in Iraq and Afghanistan and then some.

On homeland security, this budget allocates \$33.4 billion, including \$31 billion for the Department of Homeland Security. This is nearly double what those agencies were receiving in 2001, nearly double. The budget carves out \$2.5 billion in advance funding for BioShield, the effort to deal with that threat which many people view as the most dangerous to us, biological warfare.

But as I said when the House first considered this budget, we could slap a homeland security label on the whole Federal budget and still not be perfectly safe; but passing this budget today allows the other committees to do their work on the detailed programs and make sure that in Congress we stand up and do our job on homeland security and defense, supporting the men and women who are on the front lines every day protecting our lives and our freedom. It deserves our support.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

This is not a serious attempt to deal with a serious problem. This is a chart that shows the mess we have gotten ourselves into. It is the deficit since the Vietnam War, Reagan, and Bush. The Clinton administration cleaned up the mess, and here we are now with a huge deficit.

If you run up deficits, you have got to pay out interest on the national debt. This is the interest on the national debt we were projected to pay when this administration came in. This

is the interest on the national debt we are going to have to pay for messing up the deficit, \$300 billion additional interest on the national debt. \$300 billion at \$30,000 each, that is enough to hire every unemployed person in the country, over 10 million people.

The bill presented today is \$367 billion more in debt. The chairman is right, we are not digging into our pockets. We are digging into our grandchildren's pockets.

This bill ignores the PAYGO rules of fiscal responsibility. It is a 1-year budget rather than the traditional 5- or 10-year budget. So a lot of the problems are hidden. It is not a serious attempt to deal with a serious problem.

We should reject the conference report.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 13½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, we will reserve our time and let the other side catch up a little bit.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report.

In the 2000 campaign, President Bush declared that he was opposed to nation-building. Well, he has succeeded in keeping his commitment. When you leave \$3 trillion of debt, a budget with \$500 billion in deficit, 3 million Americans who have lost their jobs, 44 million Americans without health care, two more million Americans in poverty, George Bush can say he has kept his commitment against nation-building. Who knew it was America he was talking about.

This budget shows that you cannot finance three wars with three tax cuts and get a different result and continue the same policies by putting your foot on the accelerator on the same policy. You will get the same result: 3 million Americans without jobs, \$3 trillion added to the Nation's debt, \$500 billion in additional debt on top of that, and no ability to deal with the health care crisis and the college tuition crisis that middle-class families are facing.

We need new direction, a new set of policies to put middle-class families and their economic interests and the interests of their families at the heart of our economic policy. We need to break with the policies that continue to literally reward wealth at the expense of work.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for the purposes of a unanimous consent request.

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the budget.

Mr. Speaker, over the past three years, fiscal recklessness has reigned over this House. Record surpluses have been molded into record deficits. Sensible spending has been overtaken by a bloated budget. Discipline and prosperity have been shoved aside for irresponsibility and mismanagement. Now comes today's budget conference report—an opportunity to acknowledge Federal misspending by establishing budget enforcement rules for, at the very least, the next 5 years. Instead, "pay-as-you-go" has been adopted for 1 year only, but there is no way to untangle this fiscal mess in 1 year. Perhaps our friends on the other side of the aisle realized that the voting public, in fact, embraces fiscal discipline. Perhaps they want to give the appearance of a balanced budget to score points in November. Unfortunately for our country, mere appearances won't fix this mess, and they won't create jobs. This thinly-veiled attempt at election-year discipline is far too little and far too late. Is our government's budget better off today than it was 4 years ago? Not by a long shot, and this conference reports is not going to do anything to change that any time soon. And that's why I am voting "no."

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, this budget conference report is another step backward in the action in reverse the Republican leadership and the White House have been conducting on transportation funding over the last 6 months.

Last fall, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure introduced a bipartisan bill at \$375 billion over 6 years, but to appease the Bush administration, the House leadership jawboned that number down to \$350 billion, then 325, then 300, finally \$284 billion, the number which the House passed by an overwhelming vote; but that was not low enough for the White House.

Now the conference report cuts \$11 billion from the will of the House to \$273 billion. The White House still insists on its \$256 billion figure. That means not one dollar more for highway and transit, not one new job compared to the current TEA-21 law. That is a formula for gridlock, congestion, and economic stagnation. We should reject this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to S. Con. Res. 95, the Budget Resolution Conference Report for FY2005. Mr. Speaker, let me briefly focus on the highway and transit funding assumed in the Republican Budget.

Last November, 73 Members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure introduced a bipartisan bill to authorize \$375 billion for the highway, transit, and transportation safety programs for the next 6 years. We developed these program funding levels based upon the Department of Transportation's report assessing the highway and transit needs of our Nation. In March, the Committee unanimously approved that bill. That bill would have

stemmed the tide of crippling congestion that is overcoming our metropolitan areas.

However, the Bush Administration adamantly opposes additional infrastructure investment, and the House Republican Leadership made clear that the bill would never see the light of day. We have seen a Republican "auction in reverse" ever since.

In February, the Senate, by a vote of 76–21, passed its bill authorizing \$318 billion for surface transportation infrastructure. The White House threatened a veto.

To further appease the Bush Administration, the House Republican Leadership forced the Transportation Committee to cut this infrastructure investment even more—to \$284 billion. In April, the House considered that downsized bill and it passed overwhelmingly, by a vote of 357–65. It still wasn't good enough for the White House and it again threatened a veto.

Now, the Republican Leadership, pursuant to the Budget Resolution Conference Report, cuts this critical infrastructure investment even further—to \$273 billion. The Republican Budget assumes \$273 billion for TEA-21 reauthorization, which is \$11 billion less than the \$284 billion provided by H.R. 3550 (TEA LU) as passed by the House just last month. The Republican Budget is \$45 billion less than the Senate-passed funding level.

The reverse auction continues and I fear it will not end until infrastructure investment is cut to President Bush's proposal. The Administration is adamantly insisting that total investment be no more than \$256 billion over 6 years. And let me be clear on what the Bush Administration bill provides: not one more dollar for highway and transit infrastructure, not one new job. Compared to where we are today, the Administration's bill provides no increase for highway funding and no increase for transit funding for the next five years—not a single additional dollar. As a result, not one additional job will be created by this zero-growth investment.

The result of the White House's absolute intransigence on its entirely unacceptable proposal is traffic gridlock in our communities and legislative deadlock in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, our country has worked too hard to put the current transportation system in place to allow this administration to squander previous investments made over generations and allow that system to deteriorate.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on S. Con. Res. 95.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget from South Carolina for the time.

Mr. Chairman, every minute, the Bush administration spends \$991,000 more than it takes in, basically \$1 million in deficit every single minute. We have lost control of the budget; and this is not going to give us control, even though this purportedly is what it is supposed to do.

One of the things that it does, and the American people need to know this, is that it increases the debt limit by \$690 billion to over \$8 trillion. We were told that the last time we increased the debt limit to \$6.9 trillion that we

would not have to do it again until 2008 because of the President's tax cuts, and here we are right back again increasing the debt limit to the \$8.1 trillion. This is a bad budget resolution.

It used to be that we had a 10-year window. We could look out to see what this budget was going to do over 10 years; and then to hide the real deficit creative aspect of this budget, we reduced that to 5 years. Now none of us could have imagined that we would actually bring a budget resolution to the floor limited to one single year.

This is a bad budget resolution. There is no provision for the future. It digs the deficit even deeper, and then we do not even have PAYGO rules that apply. This budget is out of control and deserves to be defeated, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds, and then I will let them continue.

But I want people to listen. Listen. We have got half the speakers on that side saying, worry about the deficit and debt, and the other half coming like the gentleman from Minnesota saying we are not spending enough, we are not spending enough, we are not spending enough. So is it the deficit or is it spending? My goodness, my colleagues need to get their message straight.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, what we have before us today is not a serious document. Putting together a budget should be a reflection of the Nation's priorities. It should be a long-term road map for where we want this country to go and how we expect to get there.

This budget shows that we are not taking this process seriously. This is a 1-year budget providing no commitments or details after the first year. A failure to detail future plans masks the consequences of these policy decisions in future years.

This budget shows that the majority is not taking the deficit seriously, and the results of this budget will seriously tax our children and grandchildren.

Deficits do matter. We cannot just continue to run up massive deficits and add billions to the national debt.

This budget shows that we have no commitment to our future generations. In addition to passing on massive deficits, this budget underfunds education programs and cuts investments in our future, like scientific and medical research.

I urge my colleagues to take their jobs seriously. We have to have a road map for the future. Please vote "no" on this budget resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, these are budgets with pay-as-you-go rules. These are budgets that do not have pay-as-you-go rules, from 4 years of budget surpluses to record setting budget deficit. What is hard to understand here?

Mr. Speaker, this Congress and the legacy of this administration cannot be historically large budget deficits and rising anti-Americanism throughout the globe. Yet that is exactly what is taking place here this evening.

We have an obligation to do better. As the father of two little boys, I did not come to this Congress to leave a legacy of debt for our children and grandchildren to inherit. This will not make us more prosperous, nor will it make us more secure at the end of the day.

We can do better, and by applying pay-as-you-go rules just to the United States Senate and not to the House of Representatives is the height of deceit and double-speak that we have before us this evening.

I encourage my colleagues to reject this budget resolution. We can and must do better.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire of the Chair how much time is left on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 17 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 13¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, this Republican budget reminds me of Saint Augustine's famous prayer, "Lord, make me chaste but not just yet."

The budget resolution covers only 1 year, not the 5 years normally covered, in order to hide the true scope of the deficits their tax cuts have created.

Its pay-as-you-go provisions do not apply to all of the Republican tax cuts.

Oh, Lord, our Republican friends pray, make us fiscally chaste, but not just yet, and only for a year when it comes to the tax cuts we have given to our wealthy friends.

Since taking office, President Bush's reckless tax cutting policy has drilled a massive fiscal hole in our economy. Today, the Republican budget resolution drills even deeper.

Republicans are giving us Energizer Bunny deficits. They keep growing and growing and growing.

But the Republican paradox is that they hate the government, but they have to run for office in order to make sure that the government does not work, and the perfect form of that is when they control the House, the Senate, the White House, the Supreme Court because then they can take the notion of benign neglect which does not harm, it does not hurt, and turn it

into designed neglect where the tax cuts are so massive that cuts in Medicare and Social Security and Medicaid and education and the environment and every other program that has been put on the books over the last 60 years, as each year goes by, has a meat cleaver that has to be applied to it in order to make sure that tax cuts for the wealthiest 2 percentile is preserved.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican budget reminds me of Saint Augustine's famous prayer, "Lord make me chaste, but not just yet."

The budget resolution covers only one year, not the five years normally covered—in order to hide the true scope of the deficits their tax cuts have created.

And its pay-as-you-go provisions don't apply to all of the Republican tax cuts!

Oh Lord, our Republican friends pray, make us fiscally chaste, not just yet, and only for a year when it comes to the tax cuts we've given to our wealthy friends.

Since taking office, President Bush's reckless tax cutting policy has drilled a massive fiscal hole in our economy. Today, the Republican budget resolution drills even deeper.

Republicans are giving us Energizer Bunny deficits—they keep growing, and growing, and growing . . .

Just 3½ years ago, CBO projected a \$5.6 billion surplus over the next 10 years. Today, we're looking at a whopping \$4.4 trillion deficit through 2014.

The Republican budget on the Floor today reinforces this astonishing reversal of fortune. It is a stunning, self-inflicted fiscal wound that will fester for generations yet to come. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the budget deficit in 2004 will top last year's all-time high deficit and reach \$600 billion when current borrowing from the Medicare and Social Security Trust Funds are included.

This resolution before us today will essentially freeze non-defense, non-homeland discretionary programs. Its budget proposes \$13 billion in mandatory cuts over 5 years under the guise of reducing waste, fraud and abuse. But in reality these cuts could slash veterans' health care, Medicaid, unemployment assistance and other domestic programs that Americans depend on.

The Republican budget scheme calls not for benign neglect of Social Security, Medicare, health care, education and other domestic programs, but designed neglect, in order to siphon away the money the federal government needs to meet its obligations under critical programs that benefit seniors, veterans, the environment and our children.

Former Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill reported that during cabinet meetings early in the Bush Administration, Vice President CHENEY brushed off concerns about tax cuts causing huge deficits by saying "Reagan proved that deficits don't matter."

The Republican paradox is that Conservatives hate government, but they have to run for office to make sure it doesn't work.

With this budget resolution, they will have succeeded—but their success spells disaster for all of those Americans who depend on the Federal government to help them, and for the future generations who will be stuck with the tab for the tax cuts the Republicans have given to the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, Vice President CHENEY is wrong. Deficits do matter. Defeat this wrong-

headed budget resolution, so that we can stop digging the deficit hole deeper.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

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

Mr. Speaker, what has happened to the heart and soul of the Republican Party? I used to have a lot of respect for my friends on the other side of the aisle when they called themselves fiscal conservatives. The Republicans can never again call themselves fiscal conservatives.

The American people are not foolish. Each person, each household in America understands that in a budget you only spend as much as you have. If you keep overspending year after year, if you spend more money than you take in time and time again, bad things happen; and that is what is happening here.

We are having an orgy of tax cuts, and we have an unbalanced budget, and we are passing on a legacy of debt to our children and our grandchildren.

□ 1930

Shame on us.

We fought long and hard in this Chamber to balance the budget during the Clinton Presidency. We succeeded by making hard choices. Yet today we are presented with an easy choice, borrow and spend. The borrow-and-spend Republicans have hit once again. Shame on the majority for this sham budget.

When the House debated the budget resolution earlier this year, I rose in opposition to it because it is a big fat IOU to our children and grandchildren. It is unfair. Shame on the majority for abandoning PAYGO for spending and tax cuts.

We should vote down this quick and easy fix. Let us make the hard choices that we were elected to make. Let us pass a budget that balances soon, not one that never balances, and not a phony one that is only 1 year because we want to masquerade the sham that we are causing.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me this time.

One of the statistics that I think is beyond dispute here is the Federal debt now totals \$7 trillion. And if you break that down by every person living in the United States, it is \$24,000 a person.

A few brave, moderate Republicans in the House stood for a central proposition that the American people expect us to live by, that is, Democrats, Republicans and Independents, and it is pay as you go. Do not cut taxes, do not spend, do not drive this massive Federal debt up further unless you can find a way to offset the tax cut or spending.

Tonight, the Republican majority in this House entirely repudiates that

proposition over the objections of independent-minded Republicans in the House and Senate. There will be no pay-as-you-go. Instead, we will be adopting an historic debt ceiling in excess of \$7 trillion. How abysmal. What reckless fiscal responsibility.

It is the Democrats standing on the floor of the House tonight fighting for fiscal responsibility. This is what taxpayers and citizens throughout the country expect. And I would urge the moderate Republicans in the U.S. House to reject this budget resolution. Join your comrades in the Senate and let us restore fiscal responsibility.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, could the Chair tell me how much time is left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 12½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 13¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad night for this House. The budget of the United States of America should be a blueprint for our Nation, but this budget only extends 1 year. We used to make 10-year budgets, and then our friends on the other side of the aisle got more modest in their expectations. It was reduced to 5 years because they were afraid for the American people to see what lay in the 5 years beyond. Now, they are apparently afraid for the American people to see what lies beyond 1 year.

We should be preparing for the future. We should be living within our means. And for all the good things that have been said about this budget, it hides the largest budget deficit in American history.

Now, if that were temporary, that would be one thing. But what we are looking at are permanent structural deficits that will burden this economy and burden our children and grandchildren for generations. They are doing irreparable harm to our Nation.

There were some good reasons for a temporary deficit, but not for a permanent structural deficit. My Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle are good people, but they have been misled by ideology into abandoning principles like pay-as-you-go, which helped rescue our Nation before from a sea of debt. They have abandoned the principle of fiscal responsibility that used to be the lodestar for the Republican Party.

It is so important that we pull together and live within our means, spend responsibly, and tax responsibly so that we can have a stronger Nation.

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

respond to the gentleman that that is why our budget reduces the deficit next year, \$100 billion alone, and that is without raising taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), a very valued member of the committee.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I find it interesting to come to the floor tonight and hear from my friends on the other side of the aisle that we need to have less spending and more fiscal discipline.

Having been on the Committee on the Budget and gone through the process of a markup where we heard again and again how we were not spending enough on education, we were not spending enough on the environment, we were not spending enough on health care, we were not spending enough on labor issues, we were not spending enough. And amendments were offered and amendments were voted down that would spend more and more and more.

And, yes, the Democrats offered an alternative, and I applaud them for that, on the floor of the House, although we did not have one in committee. And it offered more spending, and that is fine, that is fine. But then to come to the floor and say somehow this budget has too much spending in it just does not make too much sense.

The Democrat alternative also offered higher taxes and increasing taxes, and we disagree with that. We think this economy has finally turned. We now see not only the best growth we have had in 20 years, but jobs coming back. We think it is the wrong time to raise taxes.

So I just hope for those listening, my colleagues and others out there, that they realize the budget that is before us, that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget has put together, is a fair budget that provides for spending restraint. It does provide for increases in spending on homeland security and on defense, which are necessary right now, but for the rest of the budget it is pretty much flat.

And, unfortunately, given our budget deficit situation, we cannot make additional investments right now in some high-priority areas and other areas. We have to make, as someone said earlier, some tough choices, and we are making them in this budget.

I want to be clear why we believe that it is important to continue to allow the tax relief to work and not to increase taxes. We believe that because we have seen the impact of tax relief. We did not do it because we just like tax relief for tax relief itself. We did it because we thought it would grow the economy. And it has worked.

This chart shows that the growth of our economy is the greatest growth we have had in 20 years in this country. In the third quarter of last year, we actually had 8.2 percent growth. We had 4.2 percent growth in the last quarter. When you combine the last three quarters together, it is the best growth we

have had since the 1980s, and we want to continue that.

The forecast for the future, in fact, is for much higher growth than we even thought was possible only a year ago. Why? Because the economy is really turning.

Along with that growing economy, we are seeing housing starts and permits at record highs. Home ownership in the country is at record highs right now. Minority home ownership is at record highs. This is what is happening out there in the real world, but it is good news about our economy that we want to continue.

We are also seeing here again that it is not just a growing economy and the fastest growth in 20 years, but the jobs are coming back. Unemployment in this country right now is 5.6 percent. That is lower unemployment, my colleagues, than we had in the 1970s, in the 1980s, or in the 1990s. The average unemployment in those three decades was higher than 5.6 percent. We are seeing unemployment at low levels, and we are seeing jobs coming back. There were 1.1 million jobs created in this country in the last 8 months. That is a million, 1.1 million, jobs in the last 8 months.

But let us talk about those jobs. Perhaps the gentleman would like to tell me what is wrong with 288,000 new jobs being added last month, 300,000 jobs in the month of March. We are seeing the jobs coming back big time, and this is not the time to change our direction and raise taxes on the American people and on small businesses and on our families. It is a time to continue to see this economy grow and prosper. That is what this budget provides.

It is a fair budget. It makes tough choices, but it also ensures that we continue to have the kind of economic growth that all of us hope to see.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to the gentleman.

The gentleman said jobs are coming back, and the recent job growth is a welcome development, but, Mr. Speaker, we are still 2.2 million jobs below the level of jobs existing in the economy in March of 2001 when the last recession began. We have never seen such a jobless recovery as we have seen now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this budget does not just deepen the fiscal deficit, it deepens the moral deficit of cynicism that Americans feel increasingly towards this government, because this budget is built upon a misrepresentation. It is built upon the misrepresentation that we can have it all and never make a tough choice. It says you can keep raising what you spend, you can continue

to reduce taxes, you can continue to borrow massive sums of money, and nothing bad will ever happen.

Something very bad is going to happen if this budget should become law. We are going to borrow more money, drive up interest rates, dry up capital for the private sector, and kill jobs in this country for many, many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I think the majority has a point when they put forward a 1-year budget resolution. Maybe there is intuitive wisdom in that, because if they follow this policy next year, they will not be writing the budget resolution, a new President and a new majority will.

We welcome and look forward to that day.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about the economy on that side of the aisle. I do not blame them. I would not talk about this budget either. I, frankly, would not talk much about the economy either. A net loss of jobs to this date. Does anybody want to dispute that? Apparently not.

Let none of us be mistaken about what we are witnessing here on the floor today. Mr. Speaker, as important as the budget debate is at a time of record deficits, at a time of exploding debt, at a time of war, this debate is about far more than the budget. This debate marks the death, in time and place, of the so-called Republican revolution.

Ten years ago, the Republican Party recaptured the majority on a pledge of reform and a wave of hot rhetoric. Today, with this, and I use this word advisedly, dishonest, phony, political Band-Aid that the majority wants to call a budget, they, for all intents and purposes, are raising the white flag of surrender and announcing to all of America: We Republicans simply cannot govern. We Republicans simply cannot fulfill one of our most basic responsibilities, to pass a real, honest budget. We Republicans have been so blinded by our tax cut ideology, that we do not recognize the irresponsibility and, yes, the immorality of policies that force our children and grandchildren to pay our bills.

Mr. Speaker, this 1-year Republican budget is simply not credible. It brazenly attempts to conceal the record deficits that Republican policies have created and the fact that they have no plan to rein in those deficits. In fact, for the 1 year it does cover, it projects a deficit of \$367 billion.

It conceals the fact that Republicans are robbing the Social Security trust fund to pay for Republican tax cuts skewed toward the highest-income taxpayers.

It conceals the fact they would freeze domestic priorities, such as health care and the environment, and cut them drastically in the future.

And it conceals the fact that this conference report would increase the statutory debt limit by \$690 billion.

And not one of my colleagues on that side of the aisle has the courage to stand up and vote for that increase. Not one.

I have been here long enough to hear my colleagues railing about increasing the debt. Last year, my colleagues increased it even more, without a vote. It was increased to almost as much as the entire debt from 1789 to 1981 at the time I came to Congress. It was \$981 billion then, and my Republican colleagues increased it \$940-plus billion last year and another \$670 in this budget.

So, Republicans, my friends, when you vote on this budget, know that you are voting to increase the debt by \$670 billion.

This budget also conceals the fact that this conference report would lead us into further debt of \$8 trillion.

□ 1945

Yet under the Hastert rule, there will be no debate and no vote on that action.

Mr. Speaker, with this conference report, the majority demonstrates its inability to govern and refuses to address the problems that its own policies have created. This is the last gasp of the revolution. I do not think that they will accept it on the other side, certainly they should not; and I do not think they will. I urge my colleagues to vote against this conference report.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here this evening to discuss how well we treated the veterans in this budget.

Since Republicans took control of Congress in 1995, we have made great strides in improving the benefits for our Nation's veterans. During that period, total spending on veterans has increased from \$38 billion to \$60 billion. That is a 58 percent increase compared with only a 36 percent increase during the previous 10 years when the Democrats were in control.

And since 1995, payments per veteran have actually risen by 79 percent. Let us take a moment to review some of the most important improvements. For example, in veterans medical care, the Republican Congress has expanded eligibility for medical care in 1996 and 1999. As a result, the number of veterans using the VA medical care has increased from 2.5 million in 1995 to almost 4.7 million today.

Since 1995, the total spending on veterans medical care has increased from \$16.2 billion to \$28.3 billion this year alone. That is a 75 percent increase. In veterans educational benefits, since 1995 monthly education benefit levels under the Montgomery-GI bill increased from \$405 to \$985, a 143 percent increase. This compares with only a 35 percent increase during the time that the Democrats had control.

And under the 40 years of Democrat control prior to us taking control,

there was no progress made whatsoever on concurrent receipt. We are very fortunate now that military retirees who are injured in combat or while training for combat or who are 50 percent or greater service disabled are eligible for the first time to receive retirement benefits concurrent with their veterans disability compensation. There is no doubt that the Republicans have helped the veterans in this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, let me make a couple of points clear because they have been brought up repeatedly throughout this debate.

First of all, how much have we reaped in the way of jobs as a result of these enormous tax cuts mainly benefiting wealthy Americans? What has been the pay-off in jobs?

This economy went into a recession in March 2001. If we take the level of jobs in the private sector at that point in time and compare it to today, we are short. There are 2.2 million fewer jobs today, notwithstanding the enormous stimulus of all these tax cuts, 2.2 million fewer jobs. For the first time since President Hoover, we have a recovery where we have not recovered the jobs even though we are 15 months, 18 months out from the trough of the recession. Actually, it is longer than that.

It has also been said that revenues have been rising, and they have taken an up-tick recently; but this chart shows when President Bush proposed his tax cuts, and we said, Mr. Bush, you are betting the budget on a blue-sky forecast; you are betting it for everything it may be able to sustain, this was the course of revenues that he projected, OMB projected with the tax cuts. With the \$3.5 trillion worth of tax cuts that was enacted in 2001, the Bush administration nevertheless projected that revenues would rise and stabilize at that level.

Here is the actual level. The broken blue line is the projected level, the red line which descends precipitously is the actual level of revenues, and the difference between these revenues here, which is about \$1.1 trillion and this level here, which is below \$750 billion, is at least \$250 billion. Revenues have not risen; taxes have not rebounded. We have not had the supply-side phenomenon now, as we did not have in 1981. This is the actual record.

Let me show Members the situation we find ourselves in which makes it absolutely essential for us to use the budget resolution, the one tool that we have which deals in the aggregate with everything we have spent and everything we take in by way of taxes.

This is the curve on which we were proceeding in 2001 when Mr. Bush came to office. He inherited an advantage that no President in modern times has had, a budget in surplus. He was in sur-

plus by \$236 billion in fiscal year 2000, and this was the course that was projected by his economists at the Office of Management and Budget. This is the course that we have determined we are on today. If you are just for what Iraq is likely to cost and what Afghanistan is likely to cost, if you assume that all of the tax cuts are going to be renewed, which is a politically likely assumption, this is where we are. We get a little up-tick from the economy, but the bottom line shows that having risen a bit from a projected deficit of \$521 billion this year, we go up a little bit over \$324 billion, but 10 years from now we are right where we started: \$502 billion. We tread water. We do nothing. We accumulate debt, and that is why we are having in this resolution to raise the debt ceiling by \$690 billion, because year after year we are stacking debt on top of debt. That is the result of this budget, and this resolution does nothing on the revenue side or the spending side.

We have heard a lot of talk about how we have this runaway spending, but let me show where the spending is occurring. If we look at all of the spending in the Federal budget and you take these spikes in the budget where spending in certain accounts is faster than current services, guess what those accounts are: defense, homeland security, the response to 9/11, accounts for 4 fiscal years accounts for 90 to 95 percent of all of the increase in spending over and above current services.

There are two points Members can draw from this. First of all, the President has requested this. We provided it. We had to spend it.

Secondly, the likelihood this is going to be reined in significantly, defense, it goes up to \$422 billion. That is without including the supplementals. This is not going to be reined in significantly. So to talk about accounts where spending is growing, we cannot expect in the near term any significant cuts in that area.

What we continually hear talk about is the sector of the budget called domestic nonhomeland security, domestic discretionary spending. That is it right there. That is one-sixth of the budget. It is about \$384 billion. The budget deficit is bigger than that. Clearly, this has the FBI, the National Park Service, the court service, the whole operation of the government in it. Clearly, we cannot squeeze enough blood out of that turnip to begin to get rid of this enormous deficit.

Let me show Members one final chart just to show it can be done. This budget resolution does not do it, but it can be done. When President Clinton came to office in January 1992, we had just recorded our biggest deficit in history, \$290 billion at the end of fiscal year 1992. He came into office in 1993. Spending was at 22.5 percent of GDP. We did it by lowering spending and raising revenues. It can be done again, but this budget resolution does not do it. Let us vote it down and send them back to conference and start over again.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) for the purpose of a colloquy between myself and the gentleman from Texas, and ask the gentleman to summarize.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, in the Senate Budget Committee, they adopted a provision which would have reduced the maximum payments farmers can receive under the 2002 farm bill, and I asked the gentleman to address that during the conference. Is that provision still in the budget?

Earlier this year, the Senate Budget Committee adopted a provision in its budget resolution which assumes enactment of legislation reducing the maximum payments farmers can receive from commodity support programs. As the Chairman knows, the 2002 Farm Bill addressed this issue through a delicate compromise acceptable to rural members across different regions of the country. Any erosion of this compromise would penalize producers in my West Texas district who would be punished for the efficiencies they have achieved. To clarify for my constituents who strongly oppose the Senate provision, I would like to ask the distinguished Chairman of the Budget Committee if the Senate payment limit provision was dropped in conference?

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, that provision is still in the budget. We worked to preserve that. I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on that. The provision in the Senate-passed budget resolution concerning the farm payment limitation is not included in the conference version. I thank the gentleman for his leadership and his continued efforts in this regard.

The gentleman is correct and I appreciate his leadership on this issue and work to ensure that we keep the promises of the Farm Bill. The provision in the Senate passed budget resolution concerning farm payment limitations is not included in this conference version. Any major changes to farm payment limits or any other agricultural policies should be addressed by the Agriculture Committee which has jurisdiction over these issues.

While the House passed budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 393, included \$371 million over five years in reconciliation instructions for the Agriculture Committee, these instructions, which were never intended to reduce critical farm commodity support programs, are not included in the conference agreement.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his efforts on behalf of my constituents in West Texas.

My constituents will be most pleased and relieved by the decision to remove the Senate's farm payment limit proposal in the conference version of the budget resolution and the Chairman's continued affirmation that neither this budget, nor the House version, will reduce any Farm Bill program payments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, each Member will be allowed to revise and extend their remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), a very valued Member and the vice chairman of the committee.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, as we have developed this fiscal year 2005 budget resolution, I have listened carefully to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. The one common theme for the many budget alternatives offered by the Congressional Black Caucus, the Blue Dogs, and the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget on behalf of the Democratic Caucus has been higher taxes and more spending.

I have also heard too frequently that my side of the aisle is cutting spending for important programs, like education, veterans, and health care. The fact is when you look at Federal spending for the last few years, you will see few programs that have not received significant increases, in most cases very significant increases. Only in Washington do we call a spending increase a cut.

I think our budget can be summed up in one word: responsible.

We think it is responsible to control spending at a time of mounting budget deficits. By freezing nondefense, non-homeland security spending for 1 year, we are taking a painful, but necessary, step towards fiscal responsibility. I strongly support many of these programs, but I also know being fiscally responsible requires tough choices, like we made in the late 1990s, including Members saying no to increases to many popular programs.

We think it is responsible to not raise taxes during a period of economic recovery. The tax relief we passed in 2001 and 2003 fueled the economy to 8.2 percent growth in the third quarter of 2003, the highest growth rate in 20 years; 4.1 percent growth in the fourth quarter of last year; and 4.2 percent growth in the first quarter of 2004. Additionally, the unemployment rate declined from 6.3 percent in June 2003 to 5.6 percent in April 2004. While this substantial growth in the economy is welcome news, we know there is still work to do, particularly with employment. We think it is important to continue the policies that have led to the current economic recovery. The fact is there are more jobs today than ever before, but there are more people looking for work.

We also think it is responsible to plan for ongoing military operations around the world. All of us, on both sides of the aisles, want to make sure we provide whatever resources are necessary for the men and women of our Armed Forces who are risking their lives as we speak. I look at the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) as a good example. For this reason, we have provided \$50 billion for fiscal year 2005 for the additional cost associated with our operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I would just add it is absolutely critical we give this budget the force of law. The Committee on the Budget has marked up legislation that would reinstate discretionary spending caps and pay-as-you-go on mandatory spending. I appreciate the leadership's willingness to consider this legislation soon after we return in June.

Mr. Speaker, from 1997 until 2001, the books of the Federal budget showed that we were running a surplus. For the 40 years prior to that, the country was running deficits. I was grateful that we played a significant role in crafting the budget in the 1990s that not only got us to balance, but got us there ahead of time. We did it by cutting taxes, controlling the growth of spending, and growing the economy.

□ 2000

This budget begins to use that model to address the deficit and get our country's financial house in order.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It is often asked at a time, is America better off than it was 4 years ago? Is it better off at all?

Well, it is.

Homeland security. Since 2000, we have greatly strengthened our homeland security, in part because of the budgets that we have passed to make sure that our homeland is protected through strength. We have created the Department of Homeland Security and more than doubled the funding for homeland security since September 11. With the improved resources, we have increased presence in key ports, the Bio Watch program now on many large U.S. cities, and over 500,000 first responders have been trained. America's homeland security is better off.

Defense. Over the past 3 years, we have made great strides in correcting the defense deficit done in the early 1990s, including increasing the Department of Defense's annual budget by over \$110 billion to prosecute the global war on terrorism, greatly improving the military quality of life. Our defense is better off than it was 4 years ago, and it is better off under this budget.

Our economy. The economy is growing now in 2004, the best in 20 years, not on the verge of a recession the way it was when President Clinton left office. Real gross domestic product growth is at its highest pace in 20 years. Payroll employment is growing strongly now. We have had 1.1 million jobs added to this economy just since last August. Manufacturing jobs are increasing, the unemployment rate is falling, and housing markets are the strongest in 20 years. The economy is much better off than it was 4 years ago and it will be better if we continue the policies of this budget.

Our budget is the blueprint that allows these policies to continue, and we will all be better off if we adopt that budget here today. We need to adopt it to provide the strength of this country, the growth for our economy, and the

opportunity for our future. And we can do it without a tax increase and reduce the deficit by over \$100 billion next year alone. That is what this budget accomplishes. The other side offers nothing but fear and trying to talk down the economy and trying to scare people about our future. That is not an agenda. Fear and anger is not an agenda.

The agenda we need to adopt today is a positive one of strength, growth, and opportunity for our future; and we can do it if we adopt this conference report on the budget. I ask for the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this Budget Conference Report and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support.

I want to thank Budget Chairman JIM NUSSLE for his yeoman's work under difficult circumstances.

My friends, this is a war-time budget.

We are at war, a war started on September 11, 2001.

This is world war, stretching from Afghanistan to Iraq, to almost every other continent on the globe.

This war has two battlefields.

One is the foreign theater, where our troops are fighting a more conventional war, fought by our brave soldiers in Afghanistan and Iraq. The Department of Defense is coordinating that fight.

The other battlefield is here at home, where we are fighting against unknown terrorists. Our Department of Homeland Security is coordinating that fight.

This budget includes responsible increases for both Departments. It also includes 50 billion dollars for possible additional expenditures on the war. Everything else is kept at a freeze level.

To those who don't like this budget, I say this is the most fiscally responsible budget conference report we have considered on the House floor since I have been in the Congress.

Now some of our friends on the other side of the aisle don't like the modest number we include for tax relief in this budget. But they won't be satisfied until we raise taxes on every man, woman and child in America.

We keep the tax cuts in place because the tax cuts keep the economy growing. In fact, since we last met on the floor to talk about the budget, the economy has grown so quickly, that the estimates of the 10-year budget deficit have dropped by a hundred billion dollars. That is why we want to keep the tax cuts in place. To keep more people working, to keep the economy growing, to keep America strong, and to win this war. That is why we need to pass this budget.

Mr. Speaker, let's pass this budget and start the process of getting our work done for the rest of the year.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this distinguished body wanting more for the American public we were sworn to represent. It was my sincere hope that after 7 weeks in a Conference with Members of the Senate, that Republicans would find a way to make this budget better than it was; instead they somehow found a way to make it worse. Not only does this conference report maintain the prior insufficient funding for vital issues like

education, veterans funding, and Homeland Security; but this conference report may very well be the most irresponsible piece of budget legislation to ever come before this body.

The fact that this conference report only truly provides budget figures for 1 year goes beyond being irresponsible, but is in fact cowardly. It is cowardly because the Republicans are putting out a 1-year budget to hide from the long term effects of their own reckless fiscal policies. The truth about this conference report is the same truth that was evident from President Bush's budget and then the House version of the budget; the truth is that Republicans will go to any length to permanently extend tax cuts that benefit the rich.

No longer can Republicans in either body of Congress claim that Democrats are the ones who hold irresponsible fiscal policies. It has been in fact the Democrats who time after time have argued for a lower deficit and more reasonable planning. It has been Democrats who have been working tirelessly to get our budget back into balance. Instead of embracing these goals, goals that the American people clearly care about, the Republicans have decided instead to pursue an extreme agenda that only truly benefits upper-class Americans.

The last time Congress provided a one-year budget was 1979. Any reasonable person can tell you why that is true, because you need to know that the decisions we make today will still make sense in the future. The sad truth is that this conference report is bad now and getting exponentially worse in the future; and the Republicans know it's true.

A vote for this conference report is also a vote to increase the debt limit by \$690 billion, to a new limit of \$8.1 trillion. When in the history of this Nation or any other nation in fact, has it been in the best interest to incur more debt? Again, the truth is clear, Republicans have used this budget for one reason and one reason alone, to make permanent their tax cuts for the wealthy. In fact, their one-year budget provides \$122 billion less in defense funding than the President has requested for 2006 through 2009. Instead of making a reasonable compromise, Republicans in both chambers of Congress have found a way to increase the debt while still under-funding vital national priorities.

This conference report may also be classified as cowardly because not only does it shy away from budget enforcement rules, but it runs and hides. Once again, the truth is open and known; Republicans refuse to have any reasonable constraint on their reckless tax policies.

The most disturbing aspect of this conference report is the way it avoids practical Pay-As-You-Go (PAYGO) budget enforcement rules. For years, the calls for fiscal responsibility were deafening from the Republicans in this body and yet when they have the opportunity to truly be responsible they decide to take the course of recklessness. When Democrats wanted to increase funding for necessary programs in education, veterans funding, and Homeland Security we were told that increasing spending would harm the economy. Yet, when Republicans themselves present wholesale changes in tax policy that have only been proven to benefit the wealthy, they are unprepared and unwilling to offer any offsets. This conference report will make these drastic tax cuts permanent with having any offsets to help bring our budget in to balance. Revenues

coming in to the Federal Government are at an all-time low and yet this nation's needs are increasing.

This conference report represents the kind of irresponsible budget policies that have failed this Nation before. Republicans have not lived up to the promises they have made in the past. Unfortunately our children will be the ones forced to live with the consequences if we allow this conference report to pass today.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as we know, the policies we've put in place to support economic growth are working.

But in addition to getting and keeping the economy going, we must also control spending. It matters. If you're going to say that deficits matter, you'd better believe that spending matters. All spending must be paid for, either through taxes or borrowing—and both are burdens on the economy. And for that simple reason alone, controlling spending is itself a policy for sustaining stronger economic growth.

This budget calls for several measures to help us get our hands around what has become an unsustainable rate of spending growth. This includes holding the line on all nondefense, nonhomeland security spending.

As Chairman NUSSLE mentioned earlier, this won't be easy. Many of us here in Congress have gotten pretty comfortable signing off on huge spending increases, and free-flowing new spending.

But success at keeping taxes and spending down will mean a stronger economy and better standards of living for our Nation. If we don't control spending the result will be higher borrowing or higher taxes.

Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan has agreed that we need to control spending, not raise taxes, if we want to make sure that we don't harm our economy and our standards of living.

Here is his quote:

Tax rate increases of sufficient dimension to deal with our looming fiscal problems arguably pose significant risks to economic growth and the revenue base. The exact magnitude of such risks are very difficult to estimate, but they are of enough concern, in my judgment, to warrant aiming to close the fiscal gap primarily, if not wholly, from outlay restraint.

The simple translation of what he said is that we need to restrain spending because the economy would be hurt by higher taxes. Our budget resolution does just that: it restrains spending and keeps taxes from increasing. That's good for our economy, and it's good for our Nation.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, the Budget Resolution Conference Report marks the end of a long, arduous process, during which our staff do most of the work and get little of the credit they are due. I would like to thank my excellent staff for their expertise and energy and tireless work. They are as follows: Tom Kahn, Sarah Abernathy, Arthur Burris, Linda Bywaters, Dan Ezrow, Jennifer Friedman, Jason Lumia, Sheila McDowell, Diana Meredith, Joe Minarik, Kimberly Overbeek, Scott Russell, Andy Smullian, Lisa Venus, Andrea Weathers, and Jesse Contario.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Republican budget that we are being asked to vote on today. For several years now, responsible Members of this body have been speaking out against a budgeting process that has been getting more absurd and undemocratic by the year.

But I believe this year that the Republican leadership has outdone itself. Again this year, Republicans have given us a budget that fails to pay for health care, fails to pay for schools, fails to pay for veterans, and fails to pay for roads. Again this year, they have given us a budget that increases the debt that our children will have to pay, tying a thousand-pound weight around the neck of our economy.

But this year, the Republican leadership has added a new twist. This budget is structured so that it cannot even be passed by the other body and become law.

For those Americans outside of Washington who are watching this tonight, you deserve to know something about the cynical exercise we are engaged in here. The vote we will cast tonight will be purely symbolic. It will only be symbolic because some Republicans on the other side of the Capitol Building are finally saying enough is enough—that we cannot continue to rack up debt and force it onto our children. I regret that the Republican leadership in this House has not yet reached the same conclusion and decided to get our fiscal house in order.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. Con. Res. 95. As too many of us in this body know, this budget is a sham. It fails to account for the real costs of waging the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. At least on the House side, it allows tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans to go forward unchecked, while spending for important domestic programs is laid to waste.

Among those high priorities that will be severely underfunded is veterans' health care. Committee on Veterans Affairs Chairman CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH and I submitted Views and Estimates to the Budget Committee requesting that it add \$2.5 billion to VA's budget for fiscal year 2004. This was not a "pie in the sky" request, but rather, focused on maintaining current services, restoring funds from the administration's failed proposals to increase copayments and introduce new enrollment fees, and slightly enhancing some services that will have to respond to the needs of demobilizing troops. The resolution we are voting on today will make less than half of these funds available to VA's discretionary programs.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, I realize VA programs are among those considered "protected" in this budget fiasco. Many social programs will fare worse. Unfortunately, that's not good enough for our veterans, especially during a time of war when we should be most sensitive toward keeping our promises to the men and women who have borne the battle.

Many of the major veterans' organizations have expressed great concern about the budget. As underfunded as the budget was by the Committee's reckoning, it is even more so according to the Independent Budget. The four major veterans service organizations who prepare this document estimate that VA requires almost \$4 billion to maintain its services in fiscal year 2005. And that's not the worst of it—budget process bills that may be put forth in the near future may use the projections of future years spending to bind us to even more inadequate budgets. So as bad as fiscal year 2005 looks, the outlook for future years could be even bleaker.

Mr. Speaker, we must do better by the veterans who have served us. We must do better by the American people. Vote "no" on accepting this Conference Report.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise in opposition to the irresponsible budget conference report before us today.

This conference report, for the first time in over twenty years, only provides us with a one-year budget plan. In the first version of the bill, my colleagues attempted to use a five-year budget instead of a ten-year budget to hide the massive fiscal irresponsibility of their plan. Now, because even a five-year plan was too much, they have reduced it even further to merely one year. There is no plan to reduce the deficit or to provide funding for this Nation's most important domestic programs, for our veterans, our seniors and our children. This rascality on the part of my Republican colleagues is unacceptable. The American people deserve to know the outrageous bills the Bush Administration is racking up in their name and with our children's credit.

Further, this bill included \$55.2 billion in additional tax giveaways which will only add to the already ballooning deficit. My Republican colleagues will not even apply the "pay-as-you-go" (PAYGO) method to these tax giveaways because they know we cannot afford them. The PAYGO enforcement rule is a mere common sense attempt to steer clear of unnecessary excessive spending. This is especially necessary to afford the tremendous costs of war which we face today. In this budget, the PAYGO rule is only applied to entitlement spending for one year, and in reality would only apply to legislation in the Senate.

If this budget passes, we will also be agreeing to increase the debt limit by \$690 billion, to \$8.1 trillion. Including this measure in the budget and not as stand-alone legislation, is merely an attempt to conceal the catastrophic costs incurred by the fiscal policy of this Administration and Congress.

On the Medicare side, Republicans offer no proposals to improve the insufficient Medicare drug benefit enacted last year. Also absent from this budget are other proposals that could improve the Medicare program such as funding for increased nursing home staffing and quality improvement or fixing the flawed payment system for doctors. Nor are there any proposals to protect the Medicare program from being overcharged and defrauded by private insurance companies and Health Maintenance Organizations. And of course, there is the similarly outrageous effort of this White House to hide from both Democrats and Republicans the true cost of their Medicare privatization bill, which truly makes me wonder whether any of their budget numbers can even be trusted.

This budget continues the Republican war on the environment. The President and Republicans will try to sound like they are environmentalists, but the truth is in this budget which contains drastic cuts to major environmental protection programs. This budget cuts discretionary environmental spending by \$900 billion below 2004 levels. My Republican colleagues would rather give tax breaks to their fat cat friends than invest in clean water and cleaning up toxic waste sites.

In addition, this budget does nothing to protect the Social Security trust fund, five years from when the first of the baby boomer generation reach retirement age. These Republicans' fiscal mismanagement will squander the entire \$1 trillion Social Security surplus, adding to the ballooning deficit and throwing the long term economic security of millions of Americans into doubt.

For education, No Child Left Behind is already dramatically under funded and this budget will continue this disgrace. We cannot leave the states to pick up the tab for this federally mandated program. Special education, after school programs, teacher training, Pell grants, Perkins loans, and vocational education are all either frozen or cut under this draconian budget. I wonder if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying to ensure that public schools fail so they can privatize the entire system?

We need to get back to fiscal responsibility and get the nation's economy back on track before this economic crisis gets even further out of control. We need to take care of our veterans, our children and our environment. We need to ensure that our citizens have healthcare and education and opportunities. This conference report is nothing but a sham and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the conference report on S. Con. Res. 95, the Republican budget.

Rhode Islanders are facing challenges on many fronts, and the budget resolution gave us an opportunity to address many of them, including education, health care, and housing shortfalls. Instead, Republicans chose to continue borrowing money from future generations to pay for their failed fiscal policies that have left the economy more than two million jobs lighter since the beginning of the current Administration. Under the Republican budget, the obstacles we face today will only grow in the coming years.

Although I did not believe it possible, the conference report before us today is actually less fiscally responsible than the budget which barely passed this House in March by a razor thin margin of 215–212. As a member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security and the Armed Services Committee, I understand the unprecedented challenges our nation is facing at home and abroad. All of us want to ensure that our troops have all the resources needed to protect us and themselves at home and abroad. Both the physical and economic security of our families are at stake. Working within this framework, the Republican leadership could have negotiated a bipartisan compromise that both parties could support, but instead continued down an ideological path without reaching out to Democrats.

This budget has too many shortfalls to list, so I will just cite a few of the most egregious problems. For the first time in more than two decades, the budget conference report fails to specify multi-year policy numbers. By providing the costs for only a single year of programs and policies, the budget provides no plan to reduce the deficit and no commitment that critical resources for defense, homeland security, education, health care, veterans, and other priorities will be available in future years. The absence of meaningful numbers beyond the first year masks the true consequences of Republican priorities.

In addition, this budget automatically raises the debt limit by nearly \$700 billion, to \$8.1 trillion. There will be no further debate or votes on this crucial issue that affects the pocketbooks of every American. At a time when the CBO anticipates a budget deficit of more than \$400 billion, Congress must make the difficult decisions to return our budget to balance, but the Republicans failed to do so.

Finally, the budget rejects legitimate Pay-As-You-Go enforcement rules to keep the

budget deficit in check. The PAYGO rules would ensure that the government does not increase spending or cut taxes unless these changes would not add to the deficit. PAYGO rules fueled the unprecedented economic and job growth during the 1990s, but the budget before us chooses irresponsible deficits over fiscal restraint.

Deficit spending has stymied job growth and is plaguing our economy. We are facing a record deficit with no plan to return the budget to balance. No Rhode Islander would write a check without sufficient funds to cash that check. Neither should the government.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Republican budget and working towards a bipartisan, fiscally responsible plan.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 213, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 198]

YEAS—216

Aderholt	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk
Akin	Doolittle	Kline
Bachus	Dreier	Knollenberg
Baker	Duncan	Kolbe
Ballenger	Dunn	LaHood
Barrett (SC)	Ehlers	Latham
Bartlett (MD)	Emerson	LaTourette
Barton (TX)	English	Lewis (CA)
Bass	Everett	Lewis (KY)
Beauprez	Feeney	Linder
Bereuter	Ferguson	LoBiondo
Biggert	Flake	Lucas (OK)
Bilirakis	Foley	Manzullo
Bishop (UT)	Forbes	McCotter
Blackburn	Fossella	McCrery
Blunt	Frelinghuysen	McHugh
Boehlert	Galleghy	McInnis
Boehner	Garrett (NJ)	McKeon
Bonilla	Gibbons	Mica
Bonner	Gilchrest	Miller (FL)
Bono	Gillmor	Miller (MI)
Boozman	Gingrey	Miller, Gary
Bradley (NH)	Goodlatte	Moran (KS)
Brady (TX)	Goss	Murphy
Brown (SC)	Granger	Musgrave
Brown-Waite,	Graves	Myrick
Ginny	Green (WI)	Nethercutt
Burgess	Greenwood	Neugebauer
Burns	Gutknecht	Ney
Burr	Hall	Northup
Burton (IN)	Harris	Norwood
Buyer	Hart	Nunes
Calvert	Hastert	Nussle
Camp	Hastings (WA)	Osborne
Cannon	Hayes	Ose
Cantor	Hensarling	Otter
Capito	Herger	Oxley
Carter	Hobson	Pearce
Castle	Hoekstra	Pence
Chabot	Houghton	Peterson (PA)
Chocola	Hulshof	Petri
Coble	Hunter	Pickering
Cole	Hyde	Pitts
Collins	Isakson	Platts
Cox	Issa	Pombo
Crane	Istook	Porter
Crenshaw	Jenkins	Portman
Cubin	Johnson (CT)	Pryce (OH)
Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Putnam
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Quinn
Davis, Jo Ann	Keller	Radanovich
Davis, Tom	Kelly	Ramstad
Deal (GA)	Kennedy (MN)	Regula
DeLay	King (IA)	Rehberg
DeMint	King (NY)	Renzi
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston	Reynolds

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus

Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberti
Toomey
Turner (OH)

Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

bers are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2028

Mr. SERRANO and Mr. GERLACH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. HOBSON and Mr. BACHUS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

NAYS—213

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Chandler
Kind
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frost
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva

Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klecza
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender
 McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler

Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda
 T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Santolin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3473

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3473.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 648 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 bill, H.R. 4200.

□ 2028

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 bill (H.R. 4200) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2005, and for other purposes, with Mr. SWEENEY (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 108-499 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 416, noes 4, not voting 13, as follows:

NOT VOTING—5

Ballance
Delahunt

Hayworth
Leach
Tauzin

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) (during the vote). Mem-