

away from extinction. We didn't pass it to our children in the bloodstream. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on for them to do the same, or one day we will spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was once like in the United States where men were free."

Mr. Speaker, may Paul Ray Smith's memory be eternal, and may God bless the Smith family, and may God bless America.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly urge all Members to support H.R. 4380, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4380.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1730

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON) at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4766, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 710 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 710

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4766) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropria-

tions. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: Beginning with the colon on page 3, line 25, through "out" on page 4, line 6; section 717; and section 751. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution may be offered only by a Member designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against that amendment are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 710 provides for the consideration of H.R. 4766, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 2005, under an open rule, as is customary with annual appropriations measures. I am pleased that the normal open amendment process outlined in H. Res. 710 will allow any member to offer an amendment to the bill as long as it complies with the standing rules of the House.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate in the House on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. H. Res. 710 waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, which prohibits unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill, except as specified in the resolution.

H. Res. 710 also provides that the amendment printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution may be offered only by a mem-

ber of the subcommittee designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. H. Res. 710 waives all points of order against the amendment printed in the report.

The resolution gives the chair the ability to provide priority in recognition to those members who have preprinted amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This procedure will help the House in considering amendments in a more orderly manner. Finally, H. Res. 710 provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by commending the work product of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA). He has done a good job in crafting this funding bill, especially as we face budgetary limitations, and the bill deserves the support of the House today.

With regard to the underlying legislation, I do want to briefly note that this appropriations bill provides for more than \$33 billion in funding. Included in this bill is \$43 million in higher funding levels for food safety and counterterrorism activities. Also included is an increase of \$20 million for BSE, or mad cow disease, detection and prevention activities.

We are also fulfilling the commitments to our food and nutrition programs with an increase in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children, the WIC program. This measure also provides an increase in funding for Agricultural Research Service, including full funding to complete construction of the National Centers For Animal Health.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for an open amendment process for consideration of the agriculture appropriations bill. I urge my colleagues to support this fair rule.

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow for the consideration of H.R. 4766, the fiscal year 2005 agriculture appropriations bill. This important bill provides funding for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, select programs at the Department of Health and Human Services, and other agriculture and nutrition-related programs at various Federal agencies.

Like the other fiscal year 2005 appropriations bills, this bill is grossly underfunded. The allocation for these important programs continues to be reduced each year. Even though this bill is 1 percent more than the amount requested by President Bush, it is still below last year's funding level; and, unfortunately, it is the farmers, children, pregnant mothers, and seniors who rely on these programs who are hurt by these low allocations.

The gentleman from Texas (Chairman Bonilla), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), and the members of the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies have made the best out of a bad situation. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) did the best he could by stretching the limited funds he was allocated to fund many of the programs that are important to the American people.

While I am disappointed that the allocation is low, and I will urges the conferees, once appointed, to do what they can to increase the funding for these important programs, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA); the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR); and the members of this subcommittee for doing the best they could with this bill.

Specifically, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), and the entire committee for providing \$75 million for the George McGovern-Robert Dole Food For Education and Child Nutrition Program. This important and successful program provides nutritious meals to hungry children around the world in a school setting. The McGovern-Dole Program received only \$50 million last year, and I am very pleased that President Bush requested an increase for fiscal year 2005.

This program began as the Global Food For Education Initiative, a pilot program to use surplus American commodities to feed hungry children around the world. The pilot program received \$300 million and provided school breakfasts, school lunches, and other supplemental food to 7 million children in 38 countries.

The McGovern-Dole program, authorized in the farm bill, made this program permanent and subject to appropriations. While I support providing \$300 million for this program, which would restore funding for this program to the original level of the pilot program, I am pleased that this bill increases funding for the McGovern-Dole program over last year's level.

Mr. Speaker, I am not alone in supporting \$300 million for this program. In December, 102 members of this body sent a bipartisan letter to President Bush requesting that \$300 million be allocated for the McGovern-Dole program in fiscal year 2005.

Mr. Speaker, that letter is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, December 11, 2003.

Hon. GEORGE W. BUSH,
President of the United States,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to urge you to provide \$300 million in your Fiscal Year 2005 Budget Proposal for the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program. We believe it is urgent to restore funding for this program at levels similar to those of the original pilot program.

We strongly believe this funding is critical for sustaining and expanding the McGovern-Dole Program in order to combat terrorism and to help build and consolidate democracy in the Middle East, southern Asia, the Near East, and in other regions critical to U.S. national security. As you are aware, the McGovern-Dole Program provides donations of U.S. agricultural products, as well as financial and technical assistance, for school feeding and maternal and child nutrition programs in low-income countries. We note that recommendations made by the General Accounting Office (GAO) in February 2002 on how to strengthen and improve the administration and implementation of school feeding programs were fully integrated into the law establishing the McGovern-Dole Program, enhancements that we believe contribute to its success.

Both the initial pilot program and the current McGovern-Dole Program have a proven track record at reducing the incidence of hunger among school-age children and improving literacy and primary education, especially among girls, in areas devastated by war, hunger, poverty, HIV/AIDS, and the mistreatment or marginalization of women and girls. School meals, teacher training, and related support have helped boost school enrollment and academic performance. McGovern-Dole nutrition and school feeding programs also improve the health and learning capacity of children both before they enter school and during the years of primary and elementary school.

In February 2003, the U.S. Department of Agriculture evaluated the McGovern-Dole pilot program and found significant positive results. Specifically—"The results to date show measurable improvements in school enrollment, including increased access by girls. In projects involving more than 4,000 participating schools, the WFP reports an overall enrollment increase exceeding 10 percent, with an 11.7 percent increase in enrollment by girls. The PVO's report an overall enrollment increase of 5.75 percent in GFE-participating schools. In some projects, increases in enrollment were as high as 32 percent compared with enrollment rates over the previous three years." (USDA, the Global Food for Education Pilot Program: A Review of Project Implementation and Impact, page 2 February 2003)

We firmly believe that these programs reduce the risk of terrorism by helping to eliminate the hopelessness and despair that breed terrorism. American products and commodities are directly associated with hunger alleviation and educational opportunities, encouraging support and good will for the United States in these communities and countries.

We strongly urge that you restore the capacity of this critically important program by providing \$300 million for Fiscal Year 2005.

Sincerely,

James P. McGovern, Frank Wolf, Jo Ann Emerson, Marcy Kaptur, Doug Bereuter, Tom Lantos, Earl Pomeroy, Amo Houghton, Barbara Lee, Sam Graves, Edolphus Towns, Don Manzullo, Vic Snyder, Jim Leach, Tammy Baldwin,

Christopher Smith (NJ), Marty Meehan, Doc Hastings (WA), Dennis Moore, George Nethercutt, John Oliver, Jerry Moran (KS), Bennie G. Thompson (MS), Todd Tiahrt, Adam Schiff, David Price, Maurice Hinchey, James Oberstar, Betty McCollum, William Delahunt, Bob Filner.

Jan Schakowsky, Sheila Jackson Lee, Leonard Boswell, Gary Ackerman, George Miller, Dale Kildee, Julia Carson (IN), Albert Wynn, Carolyn Maloney, Bobby Rush, Diana Christensen, Raul M. Grijalva, Bob Etheridge, Pete Stark, Jim McDermott, Jim Matheson, Jerry Costello, Mike Capuano, Joseph Crowley, Susan Davis (CA), Rosa DeLauro, Martin Frost, Rick Larsen (WA), Sander Levin, Ed Markey, John Tierney, Lynn Woolsey, Donald Payne, Hilda Solis, Mike McNulty, Elijah Cummings, Mike Doyle, Joseph Hoeffel.

Lucille Roybal-Allard, Bernie Sanders, Sam Farr, Neil Abercrombie, Jim Marshall, Charles Gonzalez, Ruben Hinojosa, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Earl Blumenauer, Robert Wexler, Rob Andrews, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Jose Serrano, Maxine Waters, Lane Evans, Barney Frank, Ron Kind, Sanford Bishop, Jr., Sherrod Brown (OH), Henry Waxman, Steve Rothman, Nancy Pelosi, Dennis Kucinich, Tom Allen, Jim Moran (VA), Rick Boucher, Brad Sherman, Carolyn Kilpatrick, Lois Capps, Karen McCarthy, Patrick Kennedy (RI), Jane Harman, Alcee Hastings (FL), William Jefferson, Chris Van Hollen, Chaka Fattah, Stephen Lynch, Charles Rangel.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and others to work with the other body to further increase these funds as this bill moves into and through the conference committee.

This program is important, I believe, not only to helping feed hungry children around the world. I also believe it is important in combating terrorism because it gets to some of the root causes where terrorist groups go to recruit people to be involved in some of the terrible events that we have seen unfold over the last several years.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased that the fiscal year 2005 agriculture appropriations bill includes language blocking the FDA from spending money to enforce its ban on prescription drug reimportation.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that a bipartisan majority of our colleagues supports the reimportation of prescription drugs. It is even clearer that the American people support reimportation. They are being gouged by the high cost of prescription drugs, and they deserve access to these lower-cost prescription drugs. The current Medicare drug card and prescription drug plan are hardly a panacea for the high cost of prescription drugs.

It is vital that we provide access, especially for our seniors, to these low-cost prescription drugs. Until we can repeal this misguided law and pass a genuine and real prescription drug benefit that will provide genuine and real relief for seniors who rely on these import medicines, reimportation in many

respects is our only option; but it is also our best option.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is underfunded. There is no doubt about that. It is underfunded because of misguided tax cuts for rich people and wasteful spending adopted by this administration and I would say by those who are running this House of Representatives. It is underfunded because in 3 short years they turned record surpluses into record deficits. Now the programs that require Federal funds and especially the people who rely on these programs are paying the price for these misguided policies.

The low allocation for this bill means that WIC, our most important nutrition and health program for pregnant mothers and newborn children, will not be fully funded. It means homeland security activities at USDA's Food Safety and Inspection Service are underfunded. And it means rural water and waste programs and the rural single family housing direct loan program are funded below even last year's levels.

The policies enacted over the past few years, the tax cuts for rich people and the wasteful spending, are taking their toll on these programs. However, Mr. Speaker, having noted these concerns and reservations, I believe that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), have done the best they could with such an inadequate allocation. I commend them for this bill. I look forward to voting for it.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), a member of the committee.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying bill. This is a good rule, and it is a good bill. The committee has worked to put together a bipartisan bill, and I believe that goal has been accomplished.

The bill provides critical funding for basic agricultural programs, but it goes farther than that. It also supports rural and economic development, human nutrition, agricultural exports, land conservation and renewable energy, as well as food, drug, and medical safety. This bill will deliver benefits to every one of your constituents every day, no matter what kind of district you represent.

I would say to all Members that they can support this bill and tell all of their constituents that they voted to improve their lives while maintaining fiscal responsibility. Support the rule; support the bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member on the committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding me time and for all the attention that he, in particular, pays to this important bill on agriculture and the Food and Drug

Administration. I also wanted to thank the representative of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), today for this consideration under an open rule. We, therefore, support the rule. And to my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), from the committee for as hard as he has worked along with all of us on both sides of the aisle in trying to bring this measure before the full House.

This bill obviously has been put together under some of the most trying budget circumstances that we have ever seen. When last year's bill came before us, I said we were trying to stuff a size 10 foot into a shoe that was actually size 7. This in our country that needed more than we could provide in that bill. This year we have a size 6 shoe, and we have a size 11 foot. And so we have many more needs than we can accommodate in this bill.

We literally had requests from Members from across our country, hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of requests that we could simply not address. They are not addressed in this bill at all.

The discretionary portion of this bill totals \$16.772 billion, which is a reduction of \$67 million over this year, and compared to fiscal year 2003, a reduction of over \$1.1 billion. That is nearly a 6 percent reduction compared to 2 years ago.

□ 1745

That means that all the Members who came to us for water and sewer projects, rural water and sewer projects, we just simply could not meet the requests.

The Women, Infant and Children's food program, though, we have raised it from last year, is probably \$150 million short in view of the rising need around our country, the unevenness, of the economy and lackluster job creation. We just simply do not have adequate money in these bills to meet all needs.

At the same time, our country is now spending over \$100 billion in Iraq and Afghanistan. Imagine if we were able to take and divide that up and give every State in our Union an additional \$2 billion, \$2 billion that they could share with our localities that are short on funds. We seem to be able to find money for some things around the world. But then we do not find money for very other worthy needs across this Nation.

For example, in our Commodity Supplemental Food Program, we want to take surplus food commodities and give them to our food banks and to people who need them. We are about \$15 million short in that account, despite all the need across this country and the greater and greater numbers of people coming into our soup kitchens and our feeding kitchens all over this Nation.

Meanwhile, in this budget, we have been forced to put money into accounts to take care of what we call invasive

species, that is, all these little critters that are coming into our country for which there is no known biological control. The cost of this now totals hundreds of millions of dollars compared to 10 years ago. Whether it is the Asian Longhorned Beetle eating all those trees in Chicago and New York City or whether it is the Emerald Ash Borer in States like Michigan and Ohio, those invasive species are just eating their way through all the forest lands, with those cost burdens now being put on the taxpayer. We basically take this money from a very inadequate allocation and divert it in order to try to prevent additional damage, and really these costs should not be the responsibility of the localities and of the Federal Government but those commercial interests that caused the damage in the first place.

I just want to say that agricultural America, and rural small towns, are trying as hard as they can. They have always demonstrated a real vision toward the future. We hope that as this bill moves towards the Senate we will be able to fix some of the inadequacies that currently exist in this bill.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA), the chairman of our subcommittee, for his willingness to work across the aisle and to do the best we could, again with a size eleven foot bill when, in fact, we only have a shoe about size six. We just cannot meet all the needs that are being asked of us. But we have done the best we can.

I rise in support of the rule and ask the Members to vote for the rule and ultimately for the bill.

I will also say that when the bill comes to the floor for full consideration tomorrow we will be offering amendments in the area of biofuels, trying to help to generate new industry across this country, a renewable fuels industry in ethanol and biodiesel and some of the new alcohol based fuels we have not even invented yet.

We will have an amendment on Iraq and will bring to the attention of the country the misuse of the Commodity Credit Corporation back during the 1980s and 1990s which has led us to have to bail out banks in the Middle East as a result of what was done back then and potentially what could happen again by what is being proposed in this bill now.

We will have an amendment dealing with outsourcing of call centers by the Food Stamp Program, trying to bring those call centers back to the United States, to our own people who need work.

Finally, we may have amendments dealing with the reimportation of prescription drugs, and we want to keep the base amendment that we were able to insert at the subcommittee level, which is to allow the reimportation of drugs from nations like Canada so that our people can buy them at affordable prices. We want to be able to keep that in the bill.

We will have an amendment on the Farmers Market Promotion Program, trying to bring it to a level where it can serve a majority of our people.

So, again, I ask for the support of the membership on the rule, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

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

Let me just close by again saying I want to commend the work of the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ranking Member KAPTUR) for doing the best they could with the low allocation. It is not their fault they had a low allocation. The fault lies with the President and the White House and the leadership of this Congress.

I think that during this debate I think we will hear a number of Members question their sense of priorities when, in fact, the need, especially in this area of agriculture, is so great, and yet we do not have the resources to be able to address all those challenges.

They have done a good job with not a lot of resources. They deserve to be commended.

We have no problem with this rule, and I would urge adoption of the rule, and I also will vote for this bill and hope that in conference that Members will be able to get the allocation up to a more reasonable level.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues support both the rule and the underlying bill. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4755 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 707 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4755.

□ 1753

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

consideration of the bill (H.R. 4755) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, with Mr. LINDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

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

I rise today to present the Legislative branch appropriation bill for fiscal year 2005 to the House for consideration, and I want to start by thanking not just the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), my ranking member, but I wanted to say thanks to all the subcommittee staff who have worked hard to make this bill possible: Liz Dawson, who is our Chief Clerk; Chuck Turner, our Staff Assistant; Kathy Rohan; Celia Alvarado; Tom Forhan; Tim Aiken; Bill Johnson; Heather McNatt; and Jennifer Hing.

I wanted to say to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the ranking member, that I have enjoyed working with him and working with all the subcommittee members. We have put together I think a good bill. We have had a number of amendments, some committee debate on it, and I think the product is a better bill because of that.

It is a bipartisan bill and somewhat noncontroversial. I am not aware of any angst that Members have; although I know everybody would improve it here or there, given the opportunity.

This bill actually funds the House of Representatives and all the various support agencies, including the Capitol Hill Police, the Architect of the Capitol, the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office and the General Accounting Office.

The bill is \$2.7 billion, which does not include the Senate items; and traditionally we do not fill in the blanks for the Senate. They do not fill in the blanks for us.

The bill came in below the budget request and is basically flat, meaning that the size of it is about the same as what it was last year. It does, however, provide for the current staffing levels. It includes cost of living increases and other increases here and there for inflationary reasons. There are no deductions in force, and yet we have kept new initiatives off it and tried to defer funding on certain projects.

Overall, the bill started out with a request level of \$3.1 billion, and we were able to work that down to the \$2.7 billion.

My colleagues may also recall that the fiscal year 2004 bill was brought to the floor with a decrease from the 2003

levels. So the Subcommittee on Legislative of the Committee on Appropriations has done its best to practice fiscal restraint and try to keep the President's goal in mind of a 1 percent increase for nondefense and homeland security discretionary spending, and we are actually below that.

There are a number of important things in this bill, but what I might do is I see some Members are here to speak on it. At this point, I see the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the ranking member, is here; and I will give him an opportunity to speak.

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) has, in fact, been fair. We have worked out an appropriations bill that we can both live with. So this should not take an inordinate amount of time.

Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, there is some disagreement over the rule, and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) I know will be addressing a consideration of the rule, but that was not a matter that was left open to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) or myself. It was an amendment that might have been added.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) has an amendment that he would at least like to talk about, and I think it has considerable merit, but there are a lot of things that had considerable merit that are not included within this bill.

We had a very tight, tough 302(b) allocation; and it was felt that the Congress itself has to lead by example. Our original requests were not realistic. They would have increased spending in this appropriations bill by more than 14 percent above last year's spending level; and some of the major parts of this campus, the Capitol Police, the Architect of the Capitol, et cetera, had increases that were over 30 percent this year over last year. So they were not granted.

What we have before us is basically a flat bill. It is actually a .1 percent cut below last year's level. It is probably unprecedented. Maybe somebody is going to find an appropriation bill that was actually cut below the prior year, but I am skeptical that there is such a thing. I think all of us would have liked more money for a number of components of this bill, but it is responsible, and, as far as I am concerned, it is a fair bill. It covers in full, mandatory cost increases without resorting to any layoffs or RIFs.

In terms of percentages, the Office of the Attending Physician, who does a great job, Dr. Eisold and his colleagues are terrific and often called for in crisis situations, they receive a 13.7 percent increase, well justified, but the Open World Leadership Program, which I also think is well-justified, fared the worst with a 50 percent cut.