

After moving to Georgia in 1983, Ms. MAJETTE continued working for her community, serving as a law clerk for the Georgia Court of Appeals, a special assistant attorney general and an administrative law judge. Then in 1993, Ms. MAJETTE was appointed as a judge on the State court of DeKalb County.

In 2002, DENISE resigned from the bench and was elected to Congress, a talented legislator fighting for our children, our seniors, our veterans, and yes, our families.

DENISE lives the lesson her parents taught her, that to whom much is given, much is required. So when it looked like time was running out for Democrats in Georgia, she put it all on the line. When no one else was willing to take a chance and give up what they had, DENISE made that sacrifice, and we thank her for her courage, her determination and for the thousands of new voters in Georgia.

She made history, the first African American woman in Georgia, and that is the deep south, to become the Democratic nominee for the United States Senate. The Democratic nominee for the United States Senate from Georgia, just think about that. There were a lot of little girls watching this race. They saw DENISE's commercials. They saw DENISE debate time and time again and hold her own. They saw a legitimate, professional campaigner. Those little girls now know about a new option, a new path in life that is open to them.

It is rare these days to meet a politician who is willing to make real sacrifices, someone willing to put it all on the line for the greater good. DENISE MAJETTE serves as a reminder to all of us that this position we hold is not really about us. It is not about how many titles we obtain or how many plaques hang on our walls or how many dollars we raise.

We are here to be of service. We are not celebrities, but we are servants, and I thank DENISE for reminding us of that.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are so proud of DENISE MAJETTE and all that she has accomplished, and I do not have to wish her luck because with her faith in God, who is on her side, a strong conscience and an unshakable will, DENISE MAJETTE will never need it. She will be sorely missed in this body. May God bless her.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2986. An act to amend title 31 of the United States Code to increase the public debt limit.

S. 2991. An act to suspend temporarily new shipper bonding privileges.

S. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent Resolution to direct the Secretary of the Senate to make corrections in the enrollment of the bill S. 150.

The message also announced that the Secretary be directed to return to the

House of Representatives (S. 1301) "An Act to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit video voyeurism in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes.", in compliance with a request of the House for the return thereof.

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

(Mr. DUNCAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask to claim the time of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

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

There was no objection.

#### THE HOUSE FACES A GRAVE MORAL CRISIS

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, as I reflect on my time as a member of this great institution, my most important concern is to leave the House of Representatives a better place than when I started. Unfortunately, the House faces a grave moral crisis, and we have already heard other Members speak, within the last few speakers, of these morals that we have brought to bear.

Two weeks have barely passed since election day and, the majority party has just perpetrated one of the biggest hypocrisies that this institution and, more importantly, our Nation has seen. Today, just as the Washington Post reported that it would and just as our nightly news reported that it did, the majority amended its own leadership structure, if we can believe it, to allow a Member under felony criminal indictment to hold a position of leadership in this body.

The majority party campaigned on its alleged moral values agenda, but when they got back to Washington, moral values flew right out the window. I am sorely disappointed to see the majority so quickly and so arrogantly turn its back on its biggest promise to America. The proposed leadership rule change is a flagrant and despicable insult to the American public and is firm evidence that the major-

ity party's moral compass is permanently off center.

Indeed, this rule was adopted by the majority in 1993 as an effort to bring accountability to this House's leadership structure, and rightly so. Our elected leaders must be of the highest, utmost moral fiber, and I dare anyone to disagree with that notion.

Now, the majority finds it politically inconvenient to hold congressional leaders accountable and wants to allow Members facing felony criminal charges to continue tarnishing this institution. What sort of moral value does the majority exhibit by allowing those under criminal investigation to infiltrate our highest leadership posts? Can our children ever truly understand moral clarity when the majority allows those facing criminal felony indictments to rule the roost? Has the majority lost so much control of its own moral balance by rewarding Members facing felony criminal indictments with the perquisites of leadership?

Clearly, the majority is struggling, and unsuccessfully at that, to find its own moral balance. The majority is verbally tap dancing around this issue, claiming incredulously that State court criminal indictments carry less weight than Federal court criminal indictments. Instead of supporting State prosecutors, the law enforcement officers who protect our communities against waves of criminal behavior, the majority has attacked them as partisan hacks with hidden agendas.

What sort of moral values does the majority display by declaring local law enforcement efforts irrelevant? Would any of us tell our children to ignore the safety warnings given by our brave police officers, firefighters and other law enforcement figures? For the safety of our Nation, I pray not.

Mr. Speaker, the law is the law, period. If you are suspected of breaking it, then you are the subject of a criminal indictment. This is a simple, basic and fundamental moral lesson anyone can faithfully recite, yet one the majority apparently does not understand.

The Congress is not the place to play fast and loose with the principles of moral clarity nor should any majority exploit its own internal rules and structure for crass political purposes.

When we make excuses to allow anyone under felony indictment to lead Congress, we set ourselves down a slippery slope of immoral activity and scheming. These are not the type of morals and values that the voters thought they were voting for on election day; nor should the majority so brazenly embrace this foundation of corruption.

Absolute power corrupts absolutely. The majority talked about moral values on the campaign trail but clearly blanked on their empty promise once back in Washington. The majority is not about morals. It is not about values but one thing and one thing only,

protecting their majority at any or all costs.

Shame, shame on this House of Representatives and the majority for caring more about protecting their majority than about promoting true moral values for the American people.

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

(Mr. BALLENGER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. STUPAK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to claim the time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

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

There was no objection.

#### ELECTION RESULTS

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, on November 2, George W. Bush was re-elected President of the United States, and the Republicans expanded their majorities in both the House and the Senate. I congratulate President Bush and his party on this victory.

I also congratulate the American people for once again proving the brilliance and foresight of our Founding Fathers who designed a system in which those who hold power are replaced or affirmed, peacefully and according to the rule of law.

Never in my lifetime have the American people expressed more emotion over their choice for President. It is a testament to our Founders and to present-day Americans that this passion did not devolve into violence and lawlessness when the results were finally in and the fervent desires of so many of us were rejected.

I remain deeply disappointed by the result of the 2004 election. This election exacerbated the main problem that has been at the root of all the other problems that we have experienced over the past 4 years; that is that our usual system of checks and balances has been replaced by a monolithic Federal Government.

It is not just that the legislative and executive branches are controlled by the same party that I find disturbing.

It is that the leaders of the majority party in Congress refuse to even question the judgment and the policies of the Bush administration. While partisan Republicans would view this as admirable party discipline, I see it as an abdication of constitutional responsibility.

Now President Bush is claiming a mandate, saying that he intends to spend political capital he earned during the campaign. He has stated a willingness to reach across party lines, but all his actions and most of his words belie that sentiment.

The President seems determined now to surround himself only with those who share his ideology. An administration already known for marching lockstep behind its leader will now have even fewer dissenting voices.

Neither will alternative viewpoints be found in the Republican congressional leadership. Witness the attacks on Senator SPECTER by the conservative base of the Republican party. The Senator apparently must agree to act merely as a rubber stamp on President Bush's judicial nominees or be denied the committee chairmanship that would otherwise be his.

Some may look at the Republican electoral majority and this victory and see a much diminished role for the Democrats. On the contrary, never has there been a greater need for a strong and vocal opposition.

Considering the closeness of the election that initially brought George W. Bush to the White House in 2000, this administration's lack of regard for dissenting views has been shocking. We can only imagine how much more arrogant the Bush II administration will be on the strength of its 51 percent victory.

Where some see a mandate, I see a country deeply and passionately divided in its opinion of this administration. While we respect the Office of the President and the system through which its occupant is selected, we in the opposition have a duty to continue making our voices heard more enthusiastically and more effectively.

#### STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2004 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2005 THROUGH FY 2009

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2005 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 401 of the conference report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2005 (S. Con. Res. 95, which is currently in effect as a concurrent resolution on the budget in the House under H. Res. 649).

This status report is current through November 15, 2004.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by S. Con. Res. 95. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2005 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under S. Con. Res. 95 for fiscal year 2005 and fiscal years 2005 through 2009. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2005 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under the section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for 2006 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 401 of S. Con. Res. 95. This list is needed to enforce section 401 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2005 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN S. CON. RES. 95—REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF NOVEMBER 15, 2004  
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 2005	Fiscal years 2005–2009
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority .....	2,012,726	n.a.
Outlays .....	2,010,964	n.a.
Revenues .....	1,454,637	8,638,287
Current Level:		
Budget Authority .....	1,983,784	n.a.
Outlays .....	1,987,695	n.a.
Revenues .....	1,450,801	8,565,554
Current Level over (+) / under (–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority .....	–28,942	n.a.
Outlays .....	–23,269	n.a.
Revenues .....	–3,836	–72,733

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2006 through 2009 will not be considered until future.

#### BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2005 in excess of \$28,942,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2005 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by S. Con. Res. 95.