

of the country. Our tax code is literally sucking jobs right out of the economy by depriving our businesses of the money that should be invested in hiring.

Only one other country, Japan, taxes its companies more than we, only one other country. Mr. Speaker, clearly that is not the road we want to travel and it is not the way we want to create jobs.

REJECT WOLFOWITZ AS WORLD BANK NOMINEE

(Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed to learn that President Bush has nominated the architect of the ongoing war of Iraq, Mr. Paul Wolfowitz, to head the World Bank.

The nominee's intimate relationship with the Iraq policy's gravest failures, phony intelligence, torture, contractor corruption, and incompetent planning, makes his nomination extremely disturbing.

□ 1015

Mr. Wolfowitz may be qualified as an expert in conducting preemptive war, but he is far from qualified to battle global poverty, overcome the AIDS pandemic or to promote gender equity, all World Bank priorities.

The world community deserves a development expert to champion the World Bank's mission of fighting poverty, a leader who can rally the world's support.

To enhance America's reputation in the world, to ensure that future success of the World Bank and to build a better future for the world's poorest citizens, I urge the World Bank's board of directors to reject this nomination.

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 and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 95.

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

There was no objection.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 154 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 95.

□ 1016

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010, with Mr. SHAW (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 16, 2005, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 109-19, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), had been postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 109-19.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. OBEY:

In section 101 (relating to recommended levels and amounts for the budget year):

(1) In paragraph (4) (relating to the deficit), the amount of the deficit for fiscal year 2006 shall be reduced by \$10,091,000,000.

(2) In paragraph (1) (relating to Federal revenues), the recommended level of Federal revenues for fiscal year 2006 shall be increased by \$18,073,000,000 and the amount by which the aggregate level of Federal revenues should be changed shall be increased by \$18,073,000,000.

(3) In paragraph (2) (relating to new budget authority), the appropriate level of total new budget authority for fiscal year 2006 shall be increased by \$15,800,000,000.

(4) In paragraph (3) (relating to budget outlays), the appropriate level of total budget outlays for fiscal year 2006 shall be increased by \$7,982,000,000.

In section 102, for fiscal year 2006:

(1) In paragraph (1) (relating to National Defense (050)), the amount of new budget authority shall be reduced by \$1,000,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be reduced by \$678,000,000.

(2) In paragraph (2) (relating to International Affairs (150)), the amount of new budget authority shall be reduced by \$423,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be reduced by \$193,000,000.

(3) In paragraph (3) (relating to General Science, Space and Technology (250)), the amount of new budget authority shall be increased by \$300,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$150,000,000, to fund basic research and development to allow American workers to compete in the international economy.

(4) In paragraph (5) (relating to Natural Resources and Environment (300)), the amount of new budget authority shall be increased by \$100,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$63,000,000, to provide clean water and open spaces for future generations.

(5) In paragraph (6) (relating to Agriculture (350)), the amount of new budget authority shall be increased by \$540,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$446,000,000, to improve economic opportunities, infrastructure, and the quality of life for rural Americans.

(6) In paragraph (8) (relating to Transportation (400)), the amount of new budget au-

thority shall be increased by \$600,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$460,000,000, to improve infrastructure development.

(7) In paragraph (10) (relating to Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500)), the amount of new budget authority shall be increased by \$8,050,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$2,977,000,000, to create opportunities for our children and young adults, and to address the needs of low-income communities and assist the long-term unemployed.

(8) In paragraph (11) (relating to Health (550)), the amount of new budget authority shall be increased by \$1,950,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$723,000,000, to provide health care for children and others in need, control infectious diseases, foster medical research, and alleviate shortages of nurses and other health professionals.

(9) In paragraph (13) (relating to Income Security (600)), the amounts of new budget authority shall be increased by \$1,091,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$695,000,000, to help provide housing and energy assistance to the poor and alleviate the impact of refugees on State and local communities.

(10) In paragraph (15) (relating to Veterans Benefits and Services (700)), the amounts of new budget authority shall be increased by \$2,903,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$2,447,000,000, to maintain quality health care for veterans.

(11) In paragraph (17) (relating to General Government (800)), the amounts of new budget authority shall be decreased by \$56,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be decreased by \$44,000,000, which shall include the following changes:

(A) Increase new budget authority by \$200,000,000 and outlays by \$155,000,000, to ensure corporate responsibility.

(B) Reduce new budget authority by \$256,000,000 and outlays by \$199,000,000.

(12) To improve our hometown response capabilities, strengthen our borders and ports, and meet our security mandates, amounts of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2006 shall be further modified as follows:

(A) In paragraph (9) (relating to community and regional development (450)), increase new budget authority by \$660,000,000 and outlays by \$121,000,000.

(B) In paragraph (16) (relating to Administration of Justice (750)), increase new budget authority by \$935,000,000 and outlays by \$759,000,000.

(C) In paragraph (11) (relating to Health (550)), increase new budget authority by \$150,000,000 and outlays by \$56,000,000.

In section 201(b) (relating to reconciliation in the House of Representatives), insert "(1)" after "(b)" and add at the end the following new paragraph:

(2) REDUCTION IN TAX CUTS FOR TAXPAYERS WITH INCOMES ABOVE \$1,000,000.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall also include in the reconciliation bill reported pursuant to paragraph (1) changes in tax laws sufficient to increase revenues by \$25,818,000,000, to be achieved by reducing or offsetting the tax reductions received during 2006 by taxpayers with adjusted gross income above \$1,000,000 for taxpayers filing joint returns and comparable amounts for taxpayers with other filing statuses as a result of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 and the Jobs and Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 154, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will enable the House to choose between the social Darwinism of the President's budget and a different budget which more accurately reflects the message of the social gospel.

If we take a look at what the President has done, he inherited a \$240 billion surplus when he came into office, and yet the budget he presents to the Congress today contains a \$290 billion deficit. That deficit does not include the \$80 billion that we spent yesterday on the war on Iraq. It does not include the \$2 trillion it is estimated will be the cost of borrowing to pay for the personal or private accounts that the President wants to use to blow up Social Security. It does not include dollar one of the \$1.2 trillion it is estimated that it will cost to make the President's previously passed tax cuts permanent. So we have a huge deficit as far as the eye can see, under the President's budget.

Then the President tries to reclaim the mantle of fiscal responsibility by making some well-publicized cuts in the domestic discretionary portion of the budget. In plain terms, that is the appropriated part of the budget that goes for programs like education, health care, science, veterans benefits, things like that.

The President's cuts in the domestic arena do not lay a glove on the deficit because the deficit is so large; but I would point out, for instance, that those cuts average only about 5 percent of the over \$200 billion cost in this year's budget alone of the President's tax cuts. They are less than 20 percent of the over-\$50 billion in costs, for the cost of the supersize tax cuts that the President has given to the top 1 percent of earners in this country. But those cuts are large enough, Mr. Chairman, to do great damage over time in the investments that we need to make in education, health care, science, veterans, community infrastructure and the like.

In real terms, those cuts amount, after you adjust for inflation, to about \$16 billion; and if you further adjust them for population growth, that is a real reduction in services of about \$19 billion for those programs.

So this amendment does basically three things. It cuts \$5 million from some of the President's proposed initiatives, and it combines those cuts with savings on the tax front. What we do on the tax front is to just simply recognize the essential injustice of the fact that right now folks who make more than \$1 million in this country this year will on average get a \$140,000 tax cut. This amendment would limit that \$140,000 tax cut to about \$27,000 and save enough money to devote \$10 billion to deficit reduction and to use the other \$16 billion for the initiatives that we have outlined in the amendment in

the area of education, health, science, veterans, homeland security, environment, law enforcement, and community development.

Now, within that framework, we are able to add \$2.4 billion to programs that can do real things to reduce the pressures for abortions. Among the critical investments made by this amendment are a cluster of programs that would make it economically easier for low-income and vulnerable women who choose to carry pregnancies to term by providing additional funding for maternal and infant health care, for child care and Head Start and after-school programs, for low-income housing assistance, for the community service block grant, to provide people with the opportunity to get help in the education and training areas, and also to provide additional medical services such as dental care. We also provide additional funding for child abuse and domestic violence prevention programs.

Now, I would simply say that if our concern for life does not stop at the checkbook's edge, then these are initiatives which ought to be supported by everybody in this Chamber.

The reason I offer this amendment is because over the last 30 years something really bad has happened in this country. Thirty years ago, we had the smallest gap between rich and poor of any industrialized country in the world. Today, we have the largest gap between the rich and the poor of any industrialized country.

The wealthiest 1 percent of people in this country control 33 percent of the Nation's wealth. The poorest 40 percent are struggling to hang on to less than 3 percent of the Nation's wealth, and the President's budget makes it worse.

That is why I say that this amendment helps us choose between the social Darwinism of the President's package and values that more accurately reflect the social gospel.

Now, the opposition will say, "Oh, we do not need these additional education dollars because we have had such a large increase in education the past 2 years!" Let me point out the Republican majority has been dragged kicking and screaming into supporting those education increases.

If Congress had approved House Republican Labor-H bills for education over the past 10 years, we would be spending \$19 billion less on education than we are spending today. On title I, if House Republican bills had passed, we would have spent \$2.8 billion less for title I grants to school districts than we are spending today. After-school centers, if the administration's budget request had been passed throughout the years, we would be providing \$1 million less to local school districts for help in that program, and the list goes on and on.

So I would ask, Mr. Chairman, do we really want to pay for \$140,000 tax cuts for the most well-off people in this society by providing real cuts in the

number of grants that the National Institutes of Health will be able to finance research grants into cancer, diabetes, Parkinson's and the like? Do we really want to pay for \$120,000 in tax cuts for the most well-off in this society by continuing to mount barriers that prevent people without means to get a college education for their kids?

The College Board last year indicated that the average cost of attendance at a 4-year public university has increased by \$2,300 over the past 4 years, biggest 4-year increase in history. The President's answer to that is to toss an extra hundred dollars on the table in the form of Pell grants, and then he pays for it by wiping out Perkins loans and a number of other education initiatives for those same people.

I really think that the issue is very simple. All this amendment does is to prevent real reductions in the kinds of programs that I have just talked about. What it does is to restore our ability to at least keep up with inflation on those programs by saying to the most well-off people in this country, "Sorry, folks, you are going to have to get along with a tax cut of only \$27,000." Most of them I think would agree that this is a far more socially just and economically wise set of decisions to make than the budget resolution we have before us.

This applies only for 1 year. We do not get into any games about 5-year or 10-year budgets. This applies only for the next year. This is the priority statement which people will be able to make on appropriated portions of the budget for the coming year; and if they think these priorities are better, I hope they vote for the amendment. If they think they are not, then they have a perfect right to vote against it.

I would urge an "aye" vote.

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

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

I rise with great respect for the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations and in agreement, frankly, with his final comments about this, his alternative to our budget, laying out a different approach, a different set of priorities for this Nation, and that is the beauty of this deliberative body. Frankly, it was the beauty of the fairness of the rule I believe that was crafted that allowed four separate approaches, four separate sets of priorities in budgeting to be debated and considered on this House floor.

But I must strongly oppose the Obey amendment. It authorizes higher, uncontrolled spending, while at the same time cutting national defense in a time when our soldiers and sailors and Marines and airmen and Guardsmen and Reservists are engaged all around the world, an unacceptable notion.

In addition to cutting our spending on national defense, it raises taxes by an estimated \$18 billion for the next fiscal year. It does increase education

spending by \$8 billion. It increases veterans spending and health care spending as well, but I would add that in a time when we are engaged in an unprecedented war on terror and waging a separate effort against growing budget deficits, that the level of growth laid out by the House Committee on the Budget's spending plan meets our national priorities, continues our commitment to veterans and education.

□ 1030

The Department of Education under the House budgets for the last 10 years, the Department of Education's spending has gone up 146 percent over the last decade. It is hard to argue that is an inadequate rate of growth. Veterans spending continues to grow. Investments in IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act have gone up dramatically higher than in the previous 10 years under a different management of this House.

This budget resolution that comes out of the House committee sets these priorities moving our Nation forward and protecting our homeland, investing in homeland security, investing in national defense and in our personnel who are in harm's way, and it maintains those policies of pro-growth that allows our economy to expand, that allows small businesses, medium businesses, and even large businesses to operate in a climate where they want to grow and hire employees and continue to open up new markets around the world, giving Americans new opportunities to move products and giving Americans the opportunity to achieve the American dream.

Congress has addressed extraordinary spending demands in the last several years. They bring us face to face with the reality that it is an unsustainable rate of spending growth, one that must be slowed. Last year's projected deficit was \$521 billion, but we ended the year with a deficit of \$412 billion, reducing that deficit by 20 percent. Although that number is staggeringly high, admittedly, this House-passed budget, the committee-passed budget, puts us on track to cut that deficit in half in 5 years. In doing so it makes some tough decisions, which is what we are paid to do around here.

It requires us to prioritize and make tradeoffs while ensuring that those highest priorities are fully funded and met, and in the House budget we identify that highest priority as being national security and homeland security. This amendment, the amendment we are debating today, cuts defense spending and we find that to be unacceptable in today's climate.

The budget slows the growth of mandatory spending by 0.1 percent over 5 years, from its current rate of 6.4 percent to 6.3 percent. I think that is an important fact. While we spend an awful lot of time in this Chamber talking about cuts, what we are doing is slowing the rate of growth. If someone were to offer workers a 6.3 percent pay

raise, it would be a pretty good deal. The fact that these programs continue to grow at 6.3 rather than 6.4 percent is not throwing starving children into the streets. It is not taking food out of seniors' mouths. It is not wrecking our ability to be a compassionate and decent society, it is simply recognizing the simple fact that we cannot maintain the dramatic rates of growth we have been engaged in for the past decade and solve the deficit problem.

This budget resolution continues to make homeland and national security major priorities. Since September 11, Congress has spent nearly \$1.9 trillion to provide for defense and homeland security, not including supplementals. Like last year's budget, this plan takes into account funding for the ongoing war in Iraq. The resolution budgets \$50 billion to provide for the ongoing war against terrorism. The national defense budget continues the multiyear plan to enable our Armed Services both to fight the war against terrorism now and to transform itself to counter unconventional threats in the future. It fully accommodates the President's request for defense.

Mr. Chairman, the last time we made any real effort to rein in spending, that piece of spending in our budget that makes up 55 percent of the budget, was in 1997. That 55 percent is what we call mandatory spending. I know that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is very familiar with this. As an appropriator, he has seen his share of the budget in discretionary shrink over time, and it will continue to without us making important reforms on the mandatory side of the ledger.

This budget, again for the first time since 1997, instructs the authorizing committees, those committees with the greatest expertise in their areas of jurisdiction, through the reconciliation process to find \$7.8 billion in savings for next year and \$68.6 billion in savings over the next 5 years. What that means is we are putting the people who understand these policy areas best, we are putting them on the trail to find out the ways to help make those programs be the most effective and the most efficient. They know best the successes and failures in the myriad of government programs that are now on autopilot through the mandatory spending process.

It is estimated that if mandatory spending grows at its current pace, by 2015 it will consume 62 percent of the Federal government. I think it is an important piece of our budget that we begin the process of mandatory spending reform. That reform happens through the reconciliation process.

A number of the President's key initiatives supported in this budget include \$40 billion for homeland security outside the Department of Defense; an additional \$2.5 billion for Project BioShield to secure new vaccines against smallpox, anthrax and other deadly bioterrorist threats. These funds follow on the heels of massive increases over

the past several years to make sure our Nation is prepared to deal with the terrorist threats we know are out there.

I support our budget. It is an important, thoughtful, prioritized budget that makes some tough decisions. I appreciate the gentleman's right to offer an alternative vision. That is what this is. This is a clash of visions, a clash of priorities that our Nation faces. Do we grow our way out of the deficit by fostering a climate that encourages people to find work and start businesses and grow existing businesses, or do we take the approach that we should tax our way out of the deficits? Do we fund our priorities? And what are our highest priorities? Our approach is our highest priority in a time of war is national defense, and our high priority in a time of increased threats from terrorism is homeland security.

We believe that it is important to follow the lead of other Presidents, other administrations, other Congresses that have found themselves budgeting in a time of war to make necessary tradeoffs. The New Deal agencies when World War II came about did not continue to receive the same level of funding. In fact, it was President Roosevelt himself who curtailed and even eliminated a number of the agencies he created.

We recognize in our budget that we cannot continue to spend on the domestic side as aggressively as we had at a time of peace when we are at war, and to that end we call for a 0.8 percent reduction in nonsecurity domestic discretionary spending. While it is an important first step and it has not been done since the Reagan administration, it will hardly cause starvation and pandemonium in the streets at a 0.8 percent reduction. Nor will the directed reconciliation process to the authorizing committees do the same.

We make some tough choices. We admit that. We lay out our priorities, and we proudly defend them. And those priorities include investing in defense, caring for those most in need and creating an economic climate that allows people to succeed without raising the burden of taxation on them.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), but I think he must have been talking about a different amendment. The gentleman refers to significant cuts in national defense. There is only one cut in any program that can be considered at all related to national defense in this amendment, and that is a \$1 billion reduction in the Star Wars account because they have had so many technical problems with that program that they cannot in the coming fiscal year spend all of the money that has been provided to them. So the practical impact on the program will be zero. That is the only reduction in defense.

I would point out that this comes on top of a \$16 billion increase in the defense budget which is before us right now, and it comes on top of the \$80 billion that we added yesterday for Iraq that was not counted in the President's budget. So I would suggest it is a red herring to claim this has any significant negative effect on defense. In fact, I will bet Members that considerably more than a billion dollars remains unspent from that Star Wars account at the end of the fiscal year because of technical problems that the Pentagon itself has admitted are there.

With respect to tax increases, I know the majority party likes to pretend that Democrats are talking about tax increases for the middle class. The facts are quite to the contrary. The only people who will lose anything by way of tax cuts in this amendment are people who make more than a million dollars a year. Under existing law if we leave things as they are right now, if you make less than \$10,000, you average about an \$8 tax cut under the President's package. If you make less than \$20,000, you will get back the princely sum of \$326. If you make \$500,000 to \$1 million, you will get on average a \$27,000 tax cut. And if you make \$1 million adjusted gross income or more, on average you will get a tax cut of \$140,000.

I do not know many people in that bracket who would not feel that investing in children, investing in homeland security, investing in veterans' benefits is preferable to giving those folks a super-size tax cut. We are not saying they cannot have a tax cut, we are simply limiting the size of their tax cut to \$27,000 so we can meet these other investment needs. I think the vast majority of citizens in this country would think that is a better balance and a better set of priorities.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to be here on the floor once again, this time as a member of the Committee on the Budget. After being absent from this floor for 16 years, some things are comforting, such as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) still maintains his skepticism about the anti-missile system. I appreciate that. I appreciate that in terms of his concern about us spending too much money this year in that regard.

With respect to the comments made by some on the other side of the aisle that somehow the Republican budget is immoral, and I heard that during the one-minute speeches, and somehow it does not follow a standard of social justice or the social gospel, I tried to look at the numbers to see what we are talking about, and if one looks at any graph that looks at the mandatory spending, we see the difference between the baseline and what we have placed

in this budget is almost indistinguishable.

So then I looked at some of the other areas that the gentleman has spoken to, and one is the National Institutes of Health. I thought since I have been gone and since the Republicans have taken over the House of Representatives that reflecting the comments about the Republican attitude toward NIH, that somehow we had denuded NIH in the time since Republicans had taken over. So I went back and checked it out, and under Republican Congresses, NIH spending has doubled between 1999 and the year 2003, rising from \$13.6 billion in 1999 to \$27.2 billion in the year 2003.

□ 1045

Again I heard a comment about veterans, that somehow Republicans are not concerned about veterans. I went back and checked the numbers since I was last here. Since 1995, total spending on veterans, that is, 1995 since the Republicans took over, total spending on veterans has increased from \$38.2 billion to \$67.6 billion. That is a 77 percent increase.

I wanted to see how that compared with the previous 10 years, again, most of which I was gone, but during which the Democrats were in control of the House; and I found out that there was a 40 percent increase during the previous 10 years.

I would not on this floor suggest that the Democrats were immoral in their approach to the veterans in their previous 10 years even though their increase for veterans was substantially lower than Republicans'. It is not a question of morality, it is not a question of social justice, it is not a question of social gospel, the words that I heard expressed just a moment ago; but, rather, it is a question as to where we are now. After we have had significant, hefty increases in these particular areas during the time that Republicans have been in control, is it a time for us to slow down that increased rate of growth during a time in which we finally are confronting the fiscal responsibility that is visited upon this House as our obligation and our authority?

During the time I was gone, I was able to observe this House from a distance, and I realized there is a real disconnect. People back home seem to think that we are spending too much. They are not arguing for increased taxes. I understand the gentleman believes that an increase in taxes on some people is not a general increase in taxes. We can always follow that old slogan, Don't tax you, don't tax me, tax that guy behind the tree. It is always that game, I will not call it a game, it is always that approach that can be relevant in debates such as this.

But the fact of the matter is that the gentleman from Wisconsin has with sincerity presented us an amendment that increases taxes and increases spending. That is the long and short of

it. The suggestion is that somehow we have been unfaithful to our charge to be concerned about the education of the people of America and the veterans. That charge is just patently false. The fact of the matter is we now have established priorities overall for our spending. We believe we have done this in a responsible way. We believe we have done this in a way that most Americans would support. We believe we have made sure that we are not going to cut defense.

The gentleman has suggested \$1 billion less spending in defense. I think most Members would not support that. We can suggest to the appropriators and the authorizing committees where they ought to cut, but we cannot demand that. So the gentleman's desire that they take the \$1 billion out of a particular place is not necessarily where it is going to come out of. The only thing we know if we adopt the gentleman's amendment is that we will be spending \$1 billion less on national defense at a time when very few Americans would support that.

With all due respect to the gentleman from Wisconsin, I appreciate his approach. It is a consistent approach that he has used; but it is an approach that, yes, increases spending and increases taxes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes. I find the logic of the gentleman interesting. He says that this amendment will result in cutting defense \$1 billion. It will not. It will result in a defense budget increase of \$16 billion, not counting the \$80 billion add-on that we provided yesterday. All we are doing is eliminating \$1 billion of the increase because it cannot be spent because of technical problems in the program. That does not reduce the effective firepower of the United States by one bullet.

Let me also note the gentleman had some interesting comments on mandatories. This amendment does not touch mandatories. All we are dealing with in our amendment is the appropriated side of the budget for 1 year alone. We are not getting into the argument about mandatories. That is in the jurisdiction of another committee. So the gentleman's remarks are interesting, but irrelevant in terms of this amendment.

With respect to NIH, let me simply say, we can talk about how much it has been increased the past few years. If you think it is a good idea for us to have 500 fewer research grants out in the field attacking cancer, attacking Parkinson's, attacking diabetes, then by all means vote against my amendment. If you think we ought to correct that, I would urge you to vote for it. If you think we are spending enough on veterans, then by all means vote against this amendment. If you think we are not, then I would suggest you vote for our amendment which adds \$3 billion to the veterans health care budget.

We have a huge hole in the services that we provide veterans. All you have

to do to realize that is to talk to some of those soldiers who have come back missing arms, missing legs, missing eyes. If you are comfortable with the amount that we are providing for the VA now, by all means vote against my amendment. Otherwise, vote for it. If you are comfortable with the fact that the President's budget will make it harder for low-income seniors to keep their houses heated during wintertime, then by all means vote against the amendment.

But do not do what 40 Members of the majority party did last year. After they voted for a budget which required a squeeze on all kinds of domestic programs, then they wrote our committee a letter asking us to increase funding for LIHEAP, increase funding for education, something which we could not do under the budget which the majority imposed on us.

As the gentleman said, this is a question of priorities, and I make no apology for mine.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the distinguished ranking member's suggestion that if we disagree we should vote against it, and I assure him that we shall.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I was listening and I heard the very distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin suggest that his cuts to defense were slowing down the rate of growth for defense. It is kind of an interesting argument. I hope that the Members on his side listened to that argument because we are doing the same thing. We are slowing down the rate of growth. All of the mandatory programs will receive increases. All of those automatic spending programs will receive increases. All we are asking for is reform in slowing down the rate of growth. I have enormous respect for the gentleman when it comes to his advocacy for finding savings in defense. We should look for savings in defense. We should look for reforms. I do not think we should do that necessarily today during a war; but when you argue to slow the rate of growth, I think it is a valuable argument. I hope that we hear that more often now. When we hear about these drastic, dramatic cuts to the mandatory programs in the future, I hope they will listen to the very distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I could not resist speaking this morning on this amendment that promotes, in my opinion, family values. The budget instructions call for \$4.3 billion in cuts in education. How does that reflect family values? It calls for a \$69 billion reduction in health care programs like Medicaid and food stamps. I as a parent and as a Member of this body would hope that the majority

would see the wisdom in adopting the Obey amendment.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the newest member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, he did mention I am the newest member, but I am also the only CPA on the committee. I brought that burden to the activities of the committee. It seems that every business that I have ever consulted with, every client that I have ever had, every family that I am aware of has to live within their means. All of us can at one point or another spend more money than we are bringing in, whether it is family or a business; but you cannot do it very long.

The only organization that can do it over an extended amount of time is this body, is the Federal Government here in Washington, DC. Just because it can should not mean that it should. And we should not be doing that. We are leaving debt to our children that they will have to pay off or that they will have to look their children in the eye and say, We're going to pass it on to you. Our grandparents passed it on to us, and we're going to keep passing this thing on.

The issue of living within our means means that you have to make some tough choices and you do have to set some priorities. The Budget Committee hearing on members' day, we sat there all day long and listened to a long litany of amendments just like this one, couched in the phrases that we have already heard, that these are not family values when you, quote-unquote, cut spending; these are not love for the military when you cut spending for veterans and veterans affairs. You can make these arguments that if you vote against mom, apple pie and the girl you left behind, you are a horrible person; but the truth of the matter is all across this Nation, all of us have to make tough decisions on where we spend our money.

I stand in opposition to this amendment. The budget that is going to be proposed later on today does in fact make some of those tough choices, begins to start that process of trying to force this government to live within its means. Tax revenues are going up because the economy that we live in is improving. That is the way that we ought to do it. But we have to hold down spending. Reducing the rate of growth overall in mandatory spending by one-tenth percent from 6.4 percent growth to 6.3 percent growth, I am hard pressed as an accountant and a CPA to understand why that is a cut. It is just a slowdown in the growth of increases.

The other side presents every one of these very good programs as if they are the best they can be, that they are totally efficient, that they are not spending money where they should not. I do not think that is the case. I stand in

opposition to this gentleman's amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply cite a couple of other specifics. One of my objections to the President's budget is that the President is not asking to slow the rate of increase in education; the President is asking us to cut education funding below last year's level at the same time that we have laid the mother of all mandates on local school districts. Under No Child Left Behind, we have given them a whole set of marching orders. They are very expensive marching orders, but we have fallen more than \$9 billion behind the amount that we promised in the authorization that we would be providing to those local school districts if we passed those education mandates. It seems to me we ought to live up to our promise.

Pell grants. Pell grants is the major program that enables young people from poor families to go to college so that "equal opportunity" is something other than a slogan in this country. Under the President's budget, the percentage of cost at a 4-year public university that will be paid for by Pell grants will drop from 41 percent to 34 percent. I do not call that progress.

I would also point out that the President's budget requires the imposition of new fees on veterans in order to gain access to the veterans health care system. I do not think we ought to do that.

So the issue before us is very simple. Do you want to insist that we give tax cuts of \$140,000 on average to people who make over a million bucks? Or do you want to scale those tax cuts back to \$27,000 on average and use that money to invest in more care for our veterans, to invest in better education for our kids, to invest in a stronger homeland defense, to invest in more efforts to protect our parks from encroachment?

The choice is simple. I think it is very clear where the American people come down on this.

I will repeat my assertion. I believe the President's budget adds to the gap between the wealthy and the poor in this country. In that sense, I think it is social Darwinism. I repeat that charge, I stand by it, and I think that this in contrast more nearly recognizes the message of the social gospel, which is that we do need to care about each other.

I would remind you of the words, "What you do for the least of these, you do for me." That is what this amendment is trying to do. I make no apology for it.

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

The gentleman is right. It is simple. His amendment is not a complete substitute for our budget. It is simply reducing the amount of growth in defense, as he clarified for us, and increasing taxes.

□ 1100

He points out the eight-tenths of 1 percent reduction in nonsecurity domestic discretionary spending. Does the gentleman believe that in amongst the stacks of GAO reports that come across his desk as the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, our desk in the Committee on the Budget, that there is not eight-tenths of 1 percent? Eight-tenths of 1 percent in one's personal budget they lose on diet Cokes on the way to work every morning. Eight-tenths of 1 percent cannot be found in negotiating a better deal on computer equipment, office supplies, travel, increased financial accounting?

Spending for education, one that he pointed out specifically, has gone up 146 percent over the last 10 years, and now we are talking about shaving eight-tenths of 1 percent off. Pell grants, the President calls for them to go up. Our budget would allow for that. Fees for veterans are not even budgeted for in this. While the gentleman rightly pointed out the President's budget, the President's budget is not up for debate today, and this budget that the House will vote on later does not call for fees on our veterans.

I urge a "no" vote on the Obey amendment and support for the underlying House budget.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would simply say the gentleman asked whether I thought that we could possibly find places in the budget that are wasteful that we could eliminate in order to meet the limits of the budget resolution. I would ask him how did he vote yesterday on our motion to create a Truman-like committee to investigate the fraud that is going on in the part of a number of military contractors in Iraq? We hear daily stories about how taxpayers are being ripped off. If the gentleman is concerned about taxpayers' money being wasted, why did he not vote for that amendment yesterday instead of voting against it like every other good soldier did over there yesterday? They all voted against it.

So, Mr. Chairman, what we have before us is very simple. We have a choice of sticking with the Committee on the Budget's budget, which will leave in place tax cuts of \$140,000 on average for people who make over 1 million bucks or whether they think in the interest of social justice and compassion, we ought to scale back those tax cuts so they have to skimp by on only \$27,000. The poor devils. They are going to have to get food stamps to get along, I guess, if they are only getting a \$27,000 tax cut.

The question is, are we going to scale back those super-sized tax cuts so we can meet our obligations in the area of education, veterans health care, homeland security, and the other items I have just named? I think economically and morally it is not even a close choice.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHAW). All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, this 15-minute vote on the Obey amendment will be followed by a 5-minute vote, if ordered, on the Hensarling amendment on which proceedings were postponed last evening.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 242, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

AYES—180

Abercrombie	Herseth	Olver
Ackerman	Higgins	Ortiz
Allen	Hinchey	Owens
Andrews	Hinojosa	Pallone
Baca	Holden	Pascarell
Baird	Holt	Pastor
Baldwin	Honda	Payne
Becerra	Hooley	Pelosi
Berkley	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Berman	Insee	Price (NC)
Berry	Israel	Rahall
Bilirakis	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Bishop (GA)	Jackson-Lee	Reyes
Bishop (NY)	(TX)	Ross
Blumenauer	Jefferson	Rothman
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Boyd	Jones (NC)	Ruppersberger
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Rush
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Ryan (OH)
Brown, Corrine	Kaptur	Sabo
Butterfield	Kennedy (RI)	Sánchez, Linda
Capps	Kildee	T.
Capuano	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cardin	Kind	Sanders
Carnahan	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Carson	Langevin	Schiff
Chandler	Lantos	Schwartz (PA)
Clay	Larsen (WA)	Lee
Cleaver	Lee	Scott (GA)
Clyburn	Levin	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Costello	Lipinski	Sherman
Crowley	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lowe	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lynch	Snyder
Davis (AL)	Maloney	Solis
Davis (CA)	Markey	Spratt
Davis (FL)	Matsui	Stark
Davis (IL)	McCarthy	Strickland
DeFazio	McCollum (MN)	Stupak
DeGette	McDermott	Tauscher
DeLauro	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Dicks	McKinney	Tierney
Dingell	McNulty	Towns
Doggett	Meehan	Udall (CO)
Doyle	Meek (FL)	Udall (NM)
Edwards	Meeks (NY)	Van Hollen
Emanuel	Menendez	Velazquez
Engel	Michaud	Visclosky
Eshoo	Millender-	Wasserman
Etheridge	McDonald	Schultz
Evans	Miller (NC)	Waters
Farr	Miller, George	Watson
Fattah	Mollohan	Watt
Filner	Moore (WI)	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)	Weiner
Gonzalez	Murtha	Wexler
Green, Al	Nadler	Wilson (NM)
Green, Gene	Napolitano	Woolsey
Grijalva	Neal (MA)	Wu
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Wynn
Hastings (FL)	Obey	

NOES—242

Aderholt	Bachus	Barrow
Akin	Baker	Bartlett (MD)
Alexander	Barrett (SC)	Barton (TX)

Bass	Gordon	Osborne
Bean	Granger	Otter
Beauprez	Graves	Oxley
Biggart	Green (WI)	Paul
Bishop (UT)	Gutknecht	Pearce
Blackburn	Hall	Pence
Blunt	Harman	Peterson (MN)
Boehlert	Harris	Peterson (PA)
Boehner	Hart	Petri
Bonilla	Hastings (WA)	Pickering
Bonner	Hayes	Pitts
Bono	Hayworth	Platts
Boozman	Hefley	Poe
Boren	Hensarling	Pombo
Boswell	Herger	Porter
Boustany	Hobson	Price (GA)
Bradley (NH)	Hoekstra	Pryce (OH)
Brady (TX)	Hostettler	Putnam
Brown (SC)	Hulshof	Radanovich
Brown-Waite,	Hunter	Ramstad
Ginny	Hyde	Regula
Burgess	Inglis (SC)	Rehberg
Burton (IN)	Issa	Reichert
Buyer	Istook	Renzi
Calvert	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Camp	Jindal	Rogers (KY)
Cannon	Johnson (CT)	Rogers (MI)
Cantor	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Capito	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Cardoza	Keller	Royce
Carter	Kelly	Ryan (WI)
Case	Kennedy (MN)	Ryun (KS)
Castle	King (IA)	Salazar
Chabot	Kingston	Saxton
Chocola	Kirk	Schwarz (MI)
Cole (OK)	Kline	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Knollenberg	Sessions
Cooper	Kolbe	Shadegg
Costa	Kuhl (NY)	Shaw
Cox	LaHood	Shays
Cramer	Latham	Sherwood
Crenshaw	LaTourette	Shimkus
Culberson	Leach	Shuster
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Simmons
Davis (KY)	Lewis (KY)	Simpson
Davis (TN)	Linder	Skelton
Davis, Jo Ann	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Tom	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Deal (GA)	Lungren, Daniel	Sodrel
DeLay	E.	Souder
Dent	Mack	Stearns
Doolittle	Manzullo	Sullivan
Drake	Marchant	Sweeney
Dreier	Marshall	Tancredo
Duncan	Matheson	Tanner
Ehlers	McCaul (TX)	Taylor (MS)
Emerson	McCotter	Taylor (NC)
English (PA)	McCrery	Terry
Everett	McHenry	Thomas
Feeney	McHugh	Thompson (CA)
Ferguson	McIntyre	Thornberry
Fitzpatrick (PA)	McKeon	Tiahrt
Flake	McMorris	Tiberi
Ford	Melancon	Turner
Fortenberry	Mica	Upton
Fossella	Miller (FL)	Walden (OR)
Fox	Miller (MI)	Walsh
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Wamp
Frelinghuysen	Moore (KS)	Weldon (FL)
Galleghy	Moran (KS)	Weldon (PA)
Garrett (NJ)	Murphy	Weller
Gerlach	Musgrave	Westmoreland
Gibbons	Myrick	Whitfield
Gilchrest	Neugebauer	Wicker
Gillmor	Ney	Wilson (SC)
Gingrey	Northup	Wolf
Gohmert	Norwood	Young (AK)
Goode	Nunes	
Goodlatte	Nussle	

NOT VOTING—12

Coble	Diaz-Balart, M.	Larson (CT)
Cubin	Foley	Portman
Delahunt	Forbes	Reynolds
Diaz-Balart, L.	King (NY)	Young (FL)

□ 1133

Messrs. SCHWARZ of Michigan, TERRY, CHOCOLA, DAVIS of Tennessee and FORD changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MURTHA and Mr. BILIRAKIS changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 82 I was unavoidably detained at a meeting at the White House. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. GILLMOR). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION. 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010 are hereby set forth.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND REPORT SUBMISSIONS

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.
Sec. 202. Submission of report on savings to be used for members of the Armed Forces in Iraq and Afghanistan.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE

Sec. 301. Rainy Day Fund for nonmilitary emergencies.
Sec. 302. Contingency procedure for surface transportation.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. Point of Order Protection.
Sec. 402. Restrictions on advance appropriations.
Sec. 403. Automatic votes on expensive legislation.
Sec. 404. Turn off the Gephardt Rule.
Sec. 405. Restriction on the use of emergency spending.
Sec. 406. Compliance with section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.
Sec. 407. Action pursuant to section 302(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.
Sec. 408. Changes in allocations and aggregates resulting from realistic scoring of measures affecting revenues.
Sec. 409. Prohibition in using revenue increases to comply with budget allocation and aggregates.
Sec. 410. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 411. Entitlement safeguard.
Sec. 412. Budget Protection Mandatory Account.

Sec. 413. Budget Protection Discretionary Account.

TITLE V—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

Sec. 501. Sense of the House on spending accountability.
Sec. 502. Sense of the House on entitlement reform.
Sec. 503. Sense of the House regarding the abolishment of obsolete agencies and Federal sunset proposals.
Sec. 504. Sense of the House regarding the goals of this concurrent resolution and the elimination of certain programs.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2010:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,483,971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,589,905,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,693,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$1,824,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$1,928,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,043,903,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: \$53,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$16,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$24,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$4,927,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$8,570,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$9,063,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: \$2,070,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$2,125,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$2,185,198,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,291,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,404,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,497,636,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: \$2,052,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$2,143,613,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$2,192,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,275,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,377,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,476,988,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: \$568,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$553,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$499,004,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$451,170,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$448,602,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$433,085,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: \$4,685,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$5,060,705,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$5,374,742,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$5,626,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$5,865,547,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$6,074,877,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: \$7,958,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$8,623,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$9,249,860,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$9,839,054,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$10,438,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$11,029,815,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2005 through 2010 for each major functional category are as follows:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$500,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$497,196,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$441,562,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$475,603,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$465,260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$460,673,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$483,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$471,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$503,763,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$489,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$513,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$505,908,000,000.
(2) Homeland Security (100):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,896,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$29,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$29,673,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,081,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,910,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$31,404,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,703,000,000.
(3) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(4) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(13) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(14) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(15) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(16) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(17) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(18) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(19) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$276,942,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$276,942,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$310,247,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$310,247,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$358,951,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$358,951,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$395,414,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$395,414,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$423,169,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$423,169,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$448,789,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$448,789,000,000.

(20) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,325,002,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,315,687,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,399,360,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,384,939,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,394,577,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,407,005,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,477,937,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,444,052,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,505,999,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,493,927,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,566,983,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,553,407,000,000.

(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, -\$54,104,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$54,104,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, -\$55,362,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$55,362,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, -\$63,263,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$64,388,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, -\$65,480,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$66,292,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, -\$60,876,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$60,251,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, -\$63,447,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$62,822,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND REPORT SUBMISSIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.—(1) Not later than July 15, 2005, the House committees named in

paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$893,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and \$5,959,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$2,128,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and \$21,803,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(C) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$1,419,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and \$30,725,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(D) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$30,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2006 and \$270,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(E) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The House Committee on Government Reform shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$268,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and \$3,164,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(F) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—The House Committee on House Administration shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$57,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and \$2,673,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(G) COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.—The House Committee on International Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$45,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and \$504,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(H) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$144,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and \$826,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(I) COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES.—The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$114,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and \$1,598,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(J) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE.—The House Committee on Science shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$303,000,000 in outlays for fis-

cal year 2006 and \$3,864,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(K) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$65,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and \$690,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(L) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$155,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and \$798,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(M) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by \$6,534,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and \$52,391,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(N) SPECIAL RULE.—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may take into account legislation enacted after the adoption of this resolution that is determined to reduce the deficit and may make applicable adjustments in reconciliation instructions, allocations, and budget aggregates and may also make adjustments in reconciliation instructions to protect earned benefit programs.

(b) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR CHANGES IN REVENUE.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report a reconciliation bill not later than June 24, 2005, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues by not more than \$17,700,000,000 for fiscal year 2006 and by not more than \$105,900,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(c)(1) Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget of the House of a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of section 310(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of that committee may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(2) Upon the submission to the House of a conference report recommending a reconciliation bill or resolution in which a committee has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of this section, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(3) Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to be allocations and aggregates established by the concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of such Act.

SEC. 202. SUBMISSION OF REPORT ON DEFENSE SAVINGS.

In the House, not later than May 15, 2005, the Committee on Armed Services shall submit to the Committee on the Budget its findings that identify \$2,000,000,000 in savings from (1) activities that are determined to be of a low priority to the successful execution of current military operations; or (2) activities that are determined to be wasteful or unnecessary to national defense. Funds identified should be reallocated to programs and activities that directly contribute to enhancing the combat capabilities of the U.S. military forces with an emphasis on force protection, munitions, and surveillance capabilities. For purposes of this subsection,

the report by the Committee on Armed Services shall be inserted in the Congressional Record by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget not later than May 21, 2005.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE

SEC. 301. RAINY DAY FUND FOR NON-MILITARY EMERGENCIES.

In the House of Representatives and the Senate, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for nonmilitary emergencies, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of that House shall make the appropriate revisions to the allocations and other levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but the total adjustment for all measures considered under this section shall not exceed \$20,000,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2006 and outlays flowing therefrom.

SEC. 302. CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House reports legislation, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority for the budget accounts or portions thereof in the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in excess of the following amounts:

- (1) for fiscal year 2005: \$42,806,000,000,
- (2) for fiscal year 2006: \$45,899,100,000,
- (3) for fiscal year 2007: \$47,828,700,000,
- (4) for fiscal year 2008: \$49,715,400,000, or
- (5) for fiscal year 2009: \$51,743,500,000,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate budget aggregates and increase the allocation of new budget authority to such committee for fiscal year 2005 and for the period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009 to the extent such excess is offset by a reduction in mandatory outlays from the Highway Trust Fund or an increase in receipts appropriated to such fund for the applicable fiscal year caused by such legislation or any previously enacted legislation.

(b) ADJUSTMENT FOR OUTLAYS.—For fiscal year 2006, in the House, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that changes obligation limitations such that the total limitations are in excess of \$42,792,000,000 for fiscal year 2006 for programs, projects, and activities within the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and if legislation has been enacted that satisfies the conditions set forth in subsection (a) for such fiscal year, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays and appropriate aggregates for such fiscal year for the committee reporting such measure by the amount of outlays that corresponds to such excess obligation limitations, but not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a).

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. POINT OF ORDER PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) A report by the Committee on Rules on a rule or order that would waive section 302(f) or 303(a) (other than paragraph (2)) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 may not be called up for consideration (over the objection of any Member) except when so determined by a

vote of a majority of the Members duly chosen and sworn, a quorum being present.

(2) A question of consideration under this paragraph shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided by a proponent and opponent of the question but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn.

(3) This paragraph does not apply to any rule providing for consideration of any legislation the title of which is as follows: "A bill to preserve Social Security."

(b) **WAIVER PROHIBITION.**—The Committee on Rules may not report a rule or order proposing a waiver of subsection (a).

SEC. 402. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—(1) In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), an advance appropriation may not be reported in a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto.

(2) Managers on the part of the House may not agree to a Senate amendment that would violate paragraph (1) unless specific authority to agree to the amendment first is given by the House by a separate vote with respect thereto.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for fiscal year 2007 and fiscal years 2008 for programs, projects, activities or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading 'Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations' in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$23,568,000,000 in new budget authority.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term "advance appropriation" means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2006 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2006.

SEC. 403. AUTOMATIC VOTES ON EXPENSIVE LEGISLATION.

In the House, the yeas and nays shall be considered as ordered when the Speaker puts the question on passage of a bill or joint resolution, or on adoption of conference report, which authorizes or provides new budget authority of not less \$50,000,000. The Speaker may not entertain a unanimous consent request or motion to suspend this section.

SEC. 404. TURN OFF THE GEPHARDT RULE.

Rule XXVII shall not apply with respect to the adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

SEC. 405. EMERGENCY SPENDING.

(a) **EXEMPTION OF OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.**—In the House, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is filed thereon, that makes supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism, then the new budget authority, new entitlement authority, outlays, and receipts resulting therefrom shall not count for purposes of sections 302, 303, and 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for the provisions of such measure that are designated pursuant to this subsection as making appropriations for such contingency operations.

(b) **EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.**—In the House, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is filed thereon, that designates a provision as an emergency requirement pursuant to this section, then the new budget authority, new entitlement authority, outlays, and receipts resulting therefrom shall not count for purposes of sections 302, 303, 311, and 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(c) **DESIGNATIONS.**—

(1) **GUIDANCE.**—In the House, if a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under subsection (b), the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in paragraph (2). If such legislation is to be considered by the House without being reported, then the committee shall cause the explanation to be published in the Congressional Record in advance of floor consideration.

(2) **CRITERIA.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Any such provision is an emergency requirement if the underlying situation poses a threat to life, property, or national security and is—

(i) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(ii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iii) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(iv) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) **UNFORESEEN.**—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report that contains an emergency designation unless that designation meets the criteria set out in subsection (c)(2).

(e) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of subsection (d).

(f) **DISPOSITION OF POINTS OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE.**—As disposition of a point of order under subsection (d) or subsection (e), the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the point of order. A question of consideration under this section shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent of the point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

SEC. 406. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE.**—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts provided for the Social Security Administration.

SEC. 407. ACTION PURSUANT TO SECTION 302(b)(1) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT.

(a) **COMPLIANCE.**—When complying with Section 302(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee on Appropriations of each House shall consult with the Committee on Appropriations of the other House to ensure that the allocation of budget outlays and new budget authority among each Committee's subcommittees are identical.

(b) **REPORT.**—The Committee on Appropriations of each House shall report to its House when it determines that the report made by the Committee pursuant to Section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the report made by the Committee on Appropriations of the other House pursuant to the same provision contain identical allocations of budget outlays and new budget authority among each Committee's subcommittees.

(c) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report providing new discretionary budget authority for Fiscal Year 2006 allocated to the Committee on Appropriations unless and until the Committee on Appropriations of that House has made the report required under paragraph (b) of this Section.

SEC. 408. CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES RESULTING FROM REALISTIC SCORING OF MEASURES AFFECTING REVENUES.

(a) Whenever the House considers a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report, including measures filed in compliance with section 201(b) or 201(c), that propose to change federal revenues, the impact of such measure on federal revenues shall be calculated by the Joint Committee on Taxation in a manner that takes into account—

(1) the impact of the proposed revenue changes on—

- (A) Gross Domestic Product, including the growth rate for the Gross Domestic Product;
- (B) total domestic employment;
- (C) gross private domestic investment;
- (D) general price index;
- (E) interest rates; and
- (F) other economic variables;

(2) the impact on Federal Revenue of the changes in economic variables analyzed under subpart (1) of this paragraph.

(b) The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make any necessary changes to allocations and aggregates in order to conform this concurrent resolution with the determinations made by the Joint Committee on Taxation pursuant to paragraph (a) of this Section.

SEC. 409. PROHIBITION ON USING REVENUE INCREASES TO COMPLY WITH BUDGET ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) For the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution in the House, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall not take into account the provisions of any piece of legislation which propose to increase revenue or offsetting collections if the net effect of the bill is to increase the level of revenue or offsetting collections beyond the level assumed in this concurrent resolution.

(b) Paragraph (a) of this section shall not apply to any provision of a piece of legislation that proposes a new or increased fee for the receipt of a defined benefit or service (including insurance coverage) by the person or entity paying the fee.

SEC. 410. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) **APPLICATION.**—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the appropriate Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

SEC. 411. ENTITLEMENT SAFEGUARD.

(a) It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a direct spending legislation that would increase an on-budget deficit or decrease an on-budget surplus as provided by paragraph (e) for any applicable time period.

(b) For purposes of this clause, the term “applicable time period” means any of the following periods:

(1) The period of the first 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) The period of the 5 fiscal years following first 5 years covered in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(c) For purposes of this section and except as provided in paragraph (d), the term “direct-spending legislation” means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) For purposes of this section, the term “direct-spending legislation” does not include—

(1) any legislation the title of which is as follows: “A bill to preserve Social Security.”; or

(2) any legislation that would cause a net increase in aggregate direct spending of less than \$100,000,000 for any applicable time period.

(e) If direct spending legislation increases the on-budget deficit or decreases an on-budget surplus when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or decrease the on-budget surplus when taken together with all direct spending legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline assumed for the most recent concurrent resolution on the budget, except that direct spending effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted pursuant to reconciliation instructions since the beginning of that same calendar year shall not be available.

(f) This section may be waived by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(g) For purposes of this section, the levels of budget authority and outlays for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

(h) The Committee on Rules may not report a rule or order proposing a waiver of paragraph (a).

SEC. 412. BUDGET PROTECTION MANDATORY ACCOUNT.

(a)(1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain an account to be known as the “Budget Protection Mandatory Account”. The Account shall be divided into entries corresponding to the allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget, except that it shall not include the Committee on Appropriations.

(2) Each entry shall consist only of amounts credited to it under subsection (b). No entry of a negative amount shall be made.

(b)(1) Upon the engrossment of a House bill or joint resolution or a House amendment to a Senate bill or joint resolution (other than an appropriation bill), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall—

(A) credit the applicable entries of the Budget Protection Mandatory Account by the amounts specified in subparagraph (2); and

(B) reduce the applicable 302(a) allocations by the amount specified in subparagraph (2).

(2) Each amount specified in subparagraph (A) shall be the net reduction in mandatory budget authority (either under current law or proposed by the bill or joint resolution under consideration) provided by each amendment that was adopted in the House to the bill or joint resolution.

(c)(1) If an amendment includes a provision described in subparagraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall, upon the engrossment of a House bill or joint resolution or a House amendment to a Senate bill or joint resolution, other than an appropriation bill, reduce the level of total revenues set forth in the applicable concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year or for the total of that first fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years in an amount equal to the net reduction in mandatory authority (either under current law or proposed by a bill or joint resolution under consideration) provided by each amendment adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution. Such adjustment shall be in addition to the adjustments described in subsection (b).

(2)(A) The provision specified in subparagraph (1) is as follows: “The amount of mandatory budget authority reduced by this amendment may be used to offset a decrease in revenues.”

(B) All points of order are waived against an amendment including the text specified in subparagraph (A) provided the amendment is otherwise in order.

(d) As used in this rule, the term—

(1) “appropriation bill” means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of fiscal year 2006 or any subsequent fiscal year, as the case may be.

(2) “mandatory budget authority” means any entitlement authority as defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) During the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain a running tally, which shall be available to all Members, of the amendments adopted reflecting increases and decreases of budget authority in the bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 413. BUDGET DISCRETIONARY ACCOUNTS.

(a)(1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain an account to be known as the “Budget Protection Discretionary Account”. The Account shall be divided into entries corresponding to the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, and the committee’s suballocations, under section 302(a) and 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) Each entry shall consist only of amounts credited to it under subsection (b). No entry of a negative amount shall be made.

(b)(1) Upon the engrossment of a House appropriations bill, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall—

(A) credit the applicable entries of the Budget Protection Discretionary Account by the amounts specified in subparagraph (2).

(B) reduce the applicable 302(a) and (b) allocations by the amount specified in subparagraph (2).

(2) Each amount specified in subparagraph (A) shall be the net reduction in discre-

tionary budget authority provided by each amendment adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution.

(c)(1) If an amendment includes a provision described in subparagraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall, upon the engrossment of a House appropriations bill, reduce the level of total revenues set forth in the applicable concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year or for the total of that first fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years in an amount equal to the net reduction in discretionary budget authority provided by each amendment that was adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution. Such adjustment shall be in addition to the adjustments described in subsection (b).

(2)(A) The provision specified in subparagraph (1) is as follows: “The amount of discretionary budget authority reduced by this amendment may be used to offset a decrease in revenues.”

(B) All points of order are waived against an amendment including the text specified in subparagraph (A) provided the amendment is otherwise in order.

(d) As used in this rule, the term “appropriation bill” means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of fiscal year 2006 or any subsequent fiscal year, as the case may be.

(e) During the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain a running tally, which shall be available to all Members, of the amendments adopted reflecting increases and decreases of budget authority in the bill or joint resolution.

TITLE V—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

SEC. 501. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON SPENDING ACCOUNTABILITY.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) authorizing committees should actively engage in oversight utilizing—

(A) the plans and goals submitted by executive agencies pursuant to the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993; and

(B) the performance evaluations submitted by such agencies (that are based upon the Program Assessment Rating Tool which is designed to improve agency performance); in order to enact legislation to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse to ensure the efficient use of taxpayer dollars;

(2) all Federal programs should be periodically reauthorized and funding for unauthorized programs should be level-funded in fiscal year 2006 unless there is a compelling justification;

(3) committees should submit written justifications for earmarks and should consider not funding those most egregiously inconsistent with national policy;

(4) the fiscal year 2006 budget resolution should be vigorously enforced and legislation should be enacted establishing statutory limits on appropriations and a PAY-AS-YOU-GO rule for new and expanded entitlement programs; and

(5) Congress should make every effort to offset nonwar-related supplemental appropriations.

SEC. 502. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ENTITLEMENT REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that welfare was successfully reformed through the application of work requirements, education and training opportunity, and time limits on eligibility.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that authorizing committees should—

(1) systematically review all means-tested entitlement programs and track beneficiary participation across programs and time;

(2) enact legislation to develop common eligibility requirements for means-tested entitlement programs;

(3) enact legislation to accurately rename means-tested entitlement programs;

(4) enact legislation to coordinate program benefits in order to limit to a reasonable period of time the Government dependency of means-tested entitlement program participants;

(5) evaluate the costs of, and justifications for, nonmeans-tested, nonretirement-related entitlement programs; and

(6) identify and utilize resources that have conducted cost-benefit analyses of participants in multiple means- and nonmeans-tested entitlement programs to understand their cumulative costs and collective benefits.

SEC. 503. SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING THE ABOLISHMENT OF OBSOLETE AGENCIES AND FEDERAL SUNSET PROPOSALS.

(a) The House finds the following:

(1) The National Commission on the Public Service's recent report, "Urgent Business For America: Revitalizing The Federal Government For The 21st Century," states that government missions are so widely dispersed among so many agencies that no coherent management is possible. The report also states that fragmentation leaves many gaps, inconsistencies, and inefficiencies in government oversight and results in an unacceptable level of public health protection.

(2) According to the Commission, there are: more than 35 food safety laws administered by 12 different federal agencies; 541 clean air, water, and waste programs in 29 federal agencies; 50 different programs to aid the homeless in eight different Federal agencies; and 27 teen pregnancy programs operated in nine Federal agencies; and 90 early childhood programs scattered among 11 Federal agencies.

(3) According to the General Accounting Office (GAO), there are 163 programs with a job training or employment function, 64 welfare programs of a similar nature, and more than 500 urban aid programs.

(4) GAO also indicates 13 agencies coordinate 342 economic development programs, but there is very little or no coordination between them. This situation has created a bureaucracy so complex that many local communities stop applying for economic assistance. At the same time, the GAO reports that these programs often serve as nothing more than funnels for pork, have "no significant effect" on the economy, and cost as much as \$ _____ to create each job.

(5) In 1976, Colorado became the first state to implement a sunset mechanism. Today, about half of the Nation's States have some sort of sunset mechanism in effect to monitor their legislative branch agencies. On the Federal level, the United States Senate in 1978 overwhelmingly passed legislation to sunset most of the Government agencies by a vote of 87-1.

(6) In Texas, "sunsetting" has eliminated 44 agencies and saved the taxpayers \$ _____ million compared with expenditures of \$ _____ million for the Sunset Commission. Based on these estimates, for every dollar spent on the Sunset process, the State has received about \$ _____ in return.

(b) It is the Sense of the House that legislation providing for the orderly abolishment of obsolete Agencies and providing a federal sunset for government programs should be enacted during this Congress.

SEC. 504. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE GOALS OF THIS CONCURRENT RESOLUTION AND THE ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS.

(a) The House of Representatives finds the following:

(1) The concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006 should achieve the following key goals:

(A) Ensure adequate funding is available for essential government programs, in particular defense and homeland security.

(B) Foster greater economic growth and increased domestic employment by eliminating those provisions in the tax code that discourage economic growth and job creation and by extending existing tax relief provisions so as to prevent an automatic tax increase.

(C) Bring the Federal budget back into balance as soon as possible.

(2) The Government spends billions of dollars each year on programs and projects that are of marginal value to the country as a whole.

(3) Funding for these lower priority programs should be viewed in light of the goals of this concurrent resolution and whether or not continued funding of these programs advances or hinders the achievement of these goals.

(4) This concurrent resolution assumes that funding for many lower priority programs will be reduced or eliminated in order increase funding for defense and homeland security while at the same time controlling overall spending.

(b) It is the Sense of the House of Representatives that the following programs should be eliminated:

- (1) Title X Family Planning.
- (2) Corporation for Public Broadcasting.
- (3) National Endowment for the Arts.
- (4) Legal Services Corporation.
- (5) the Advanced Technology Program.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 102, noes 320, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

AYES—102

Akin	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Norwood
Bartlett (MD)	Gutknecht	Otter
Barton (TX)	Harris	Paul
Beauprez	Hayworth	Pence
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Petri
Blackburn	Herger	Pitts
Blunt	Hoekstra	Poe
Boehner	Hostetler	Pombo
Bonner	Inglis (SC)	Price (GA)
Boozman	Istook	Radanovich
Brady (TX)	Jenkins	Reynolds
Brown-Waite,	Jindal	Rogers (MI)
Ginny	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Keller	Royce
Cannon	Kennedy (MN)	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	King (IA)	Ryun (KS)
Case	Kline	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Kuhl (NY)	Sessions
Chocola	Linder	Shadegg
Cole (OK)	Lungren, Daniel	Shimkus
Conaway	E.	Shuster
Cox	Mack	Sodrel
Deal (GA)	Manzullo	Stearns
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marchant	Sullivan
Drake	McCaul (TX)	Tancredro
Duncan	McCotter	Terry
English (PA)	McHenry	Thornberry
Feeney	McMorris	Tiahrt
Flake	Mica	Walden (OR)
Foxx	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Weller
Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)	Westmoreland
Gibbons	Musgrave	Wilson (SC)
Gingrey	Myrick	

NOES—320

Abercrombie	Aderholt	Allen
Ackerman	Alexander	Andrews

Baca	Gilchrest	Moore (KS)
Bachus	Gillmor	Moore (WI)
Baird	Gonzalez	Moran (VA)
Baker	Goode	Murphy
Baldwin	Gordon	Murtha
Barrow	Granger	Nadler
Bass	Graves	Napolitano
Bean	Green (WI)	Neal (MA)
Becerra	Green, Al	Ney
Berkley	Green, Gene	Northup
Berman	Grijalva	Nunes
Berry	Gutierrez	Nussle
Biggert	Hall	Oberstar
Bilirakis	Harman	Obey
Bishop (GA)	Hart	Olver
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz
Blumenauer	Hastings (WA)	Osborne
Boehlert	Hayes	Owens
Bonilla	Hefley	Oxley
Bono	Herseth	Pallone
Boren	Higgins	Pascrell
Boswell	Hincheey	Pastor
Boucher	Hinojosa	Payne
Boustany	Hobson	Pearce
Boyd	Holden	Pelosi
Bradley (NH)	Holt	Peterson (MN)
Brady (PA)	Honda	Peterson (PA)
Brown (OH)	Hooley	Pickering
Brown (SC)	Hoyer	Platts
Brown, Corrine	Hulshof	Pomeroy
Burton (IN)	Hunter	Porter
Butterfield	Hyde	Price (NC)
Buyer	Inslee	Pryce (OH)
Calvert	Israel	Putnam
Camp	Issa	Rahall
Capito	Jackson (IL)	Ramstad
Capps	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Capuano	(TX)	Regula
Cardin	Johnson (CT)	Rehberg
Cardoza	Johnson (IL)	Reichert
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Renzi
Carson	Jones (NC)	Reyes
Carter	Jones (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Castle	Kanjorski	Rogers (KY)
Chandler	Kaptur	Ros-Lehtinen
Clay	Kelly	Ross
Cleaver	Kennedy (RI)	Rothman
Clyburn	Kildee	Royal-Allard
Conyers	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ruppersberger
Cooper	Kind	Rush
Costa	Kingston	Ryan (OH)
Costello	Kirk	Sabo
Cramer	Knollenberg	Salazar
Crenshaw	Kolbe	Sanchez, Linda
Crowley	Kucinich	T.
Cuellar	LaHood	Sanchez, Loretta
Culberson	Langevin	Sanders
Cummings	Lantos	Saxton
Cunningham	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Davis (AL)	Latham	Schiff
Davis (CA)	LaTourette	Schwartz (PA)
Davis (FL)	Leach	Schwarz (MI)
Davis (IL)	Lee	Scott (GA)
Davis (KY)	Levin	Scott (VA)
Davis (TN)	Lewis (CA)	Serrano
Davis, Jo Ann	Lewis (GA)	Shaw
Davis, Tom	Lewis (KY)	Shays
DeFazio	Lipinski	Sherman
DeGette	LoBiondo	Sherwood
DeLauro	Lofgren, Zoe	Simmons
DeLay	Lowey	Simpson
Dent	Lucas	Skelton
Dicks	Lynch	Slaughter
Dingell	Maloney	Smith (NJ)
Doggett	Markey	Smith (TX)
Doolittle	Marshall	Smith (WA)
Doyle	Matheson	Snyder
Dreier	Matsui	Solis
Edwards	McCarthy	Souder
Ehlers	McCollum (MN)	Spratt
Emanuel	McCrery	Stark
Emerson	McDermott	Strickland
Engel	McGovern	Stupak
Eshoo	McHugh	Sweeney
Etheridge	McIntyre	Tanner
Evans	McKeon	Tauscher
Everett	McKinney	Taylor (MS)
Farr	McNulty	Taylor (NC)
Fattah	Meehan	Thomas
Ferguson	Meek (FL)	Thompson (CA)
Filner	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Menendez	Tiberi
Ford	Michaud	Tierney
Fortenberry	Millender-	Towns
Fossella	McDonald	Turner
Frank (MA)	Miller (MI)	Udall (CO)
Frelinghuysen	Miller (NC)	Udall (NM)
Gallegly	Miller, George	Upton
Gerlach	Mollohan	Van Hollen

Velázquez Watt Wicker
Visclosky Waxman Wilson (NM)
Walsh Weiner Wolf
Wasserman Weldon (FL) Woolsey
Schultz Weldon (PA) Wu
Waters Wexler Wynn
Watson Whitfield Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Coble Foley Larson (CT)
Cubin Forbes Melancon
Delahunt Jefferson Portman
Diaz-Balart, L. King (NY) Young (FL)

□ 1141

Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 83 I was unavoidably detained at a meeting at the White House. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. NUSSLE. 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. TERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. GILLMOR, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXPRESSING GRAVE CONCERN OF CONGRESS REGARDING OCCUPATION OF REPUBLIC OF LEBANON BY SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 32, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 32, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 1, answered “present” 4, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—419

Abercrombie Baird Beauprez
Ackerman Baker Becerra
Aderholt Baldwin Berkley
Akin Barrett (SC) Berman
Alexander Barrow Berry
Allen Bartlett (MD) Biggert
Andrews Barton (TX) Bilirakis
Baca Bass Bishop (GA)
Bachus Bean Bishop (NY)

Bishop (UT) Fitzpatrick (PA) Lewis (KY)
Blackburn Flake Linder
Blumenauer Ford Lipinski
Blunt Portenberry LoBiondo
Boehert Fossella Lofgren, Zoe
Boehner Foxx Lowey
Bonilla Frank (MA) Lucas
Bonner Franks (AZ) Lungren, Daniel
Bono Frelinghuysen E.
Boozman Gallegly Lynch
Boren Garrett (NJ) Mack
Boswell Gerlach Maloney
Boucher Gibbons Manzullo
Boustany Gilchrest Marchant
Boyd Gillmor Markey
Bradley (NH) Gingrey Marshall
Brady (PA) Gohmert Matheson
Brady (TX) Gonzalez Matsui
Brown (OH) Goode McCarthy
Brown (SC) Goodlatte McCaul (TX)
Brown, Corrine Gordon McCollum (MN)
Brunt-Waite, Granger McCotter
Ginny Graves McCrery
Burgess Green (WI) McGovern
Burton (IN) Green, Al McHenry
Butterfield Green, Gene McHugh
Buyer Grijalva McIntyre
Calvert Gutierrez McKeon
Camp Gutmacht McMorris
Cannon Hall McNulty
Cantor Harman Meehan
Capito Harris Meek (FL)
Capps Hart Meeks (NY)
Capuano Hastings (FL) Melancon
Cardin Hastings (WA) Menendez
Cardoza Hayes Mica
Carnahan Hayworth Michaud
Carson Hefley Millender-
Carter Hensarling McDonald
Case Herger Miller (FL)
Castle Herseth Miller (MI)
Chabot Higgins Miller (NC)
Chandler Hinojosa Miller, Gary
Chocola Hobson Miller, George
Clay Hoekstra Mollohan
Cleaver Holden Moore (KS)
Clyburn Holt Moore (WI)
Cole (OK) Honda Moran (KS)
Conaway Hooley Moran (VA)
Conyers Hostettler Murphy
Cooper Hoyer Murtha
Costa Hulshof Musgrave
Costello Hunter Myrick
Cox Hyde Nadler
Cramer Inglis (SC) Napolitano
Crenshaw Inslee Neal (MA)
Crowley Israel Neugebauer
Cuellar Issa Ney
Culberson Istook Northup
Cummings Jackson (IL) Norwood
Cunningham Jackson-Lee Nunes
Davis (AL) (TX) Nussle
Davis (CA) Jefferson Oberstar
Davis (FL) Jenkins Obey
Davis (IL) Jindal Oliver
Davis (KY) Johnson (CT) Ortiz
Davis (TN) Johnson (IL) Osborne
Davis, Jo Ann Johnson, E. B. Otter
Davis, Tom Johnson, Sam Owens
Deal (GA) Jones (NC) Oxley
DeFazio Jones (OH) Pallone
DeGette Kanjorski Pascrell
DeLauro Kaptur Pastor
Dent Keller Payne
Diaz-Balart, L. Kelly Pearce
Diaz-Balart, M. Kennedy (MN) Pelosi
Dicks Kennedy (RI) Pence
Dingell Kildee Peterson (MN)
Doggett Kilpatrick (MI) Peterson (PA)
Doolittle Kind Petri
Doyle King (IA) Pickering
Drake Kingston Pitts
Dreier Kirk Platts
Duncan Kline Poe
Edwards Knollenberg Pombo
Ehlers Kolbe Pomeroy
Emanuel Kuhl (NY) Porter
Emerson LaHood Price (GA)
Engel Langevin Price (NC)
English (PA) Lantos Pryce (OH)
Eshoo Larsen (WA) Putnam
Etheridge Larson (CT) Radanovich
Evans Latham Rahall
Everett LaTourrette Ramstad
Farr Leach Rangel
Fattah Lee Regula
Feeney Levin Rehberg
Ferguson Lewis (CA) Reichert
Filner Lewis (GA) Renzi

Reyes Shays Tierney
Reynolds Sherman Towns
Rogers (AL) Sherwood Turner
Rogers (KY) Shimkus Udall (CO)
Rogers (MI) Shuster Udall (NM)
Rohrabacher Simmons Upton
Ros-Lehtinen Simpson Van Hollen
Ross Skelton Velázquez
Rothman Slaughter Visclosky
Roybal-Allard Smith (NJ) Walden (OR)
Royce Smith (TX) Walsh
Ruppersberger Smith (WA) Wamp
Rush Snyder Wasserman
Ryan (OH) Sodrel Schultz
Ryan (WI) Solis Waters
Ryun (KS) Souder Watson
Sabo Spratt Watt
Salazar Stark Waxman
Sánchez, Linda Stearns Weiner
T. Strickland Weldon (FL)
Sanchez, Loretta Stupak Weldon (PA)
Sanders Sullivan Weller
Saxton Sweeney Westmoreland
Schakowsky Tancredo Wexler
Schiff Tanner Whitfield
Schwartz (PA) Tauscher Wicker
Schwarz (MI) Taylor (MS) Wilson (NM)
Scott (GA) Taylor (NC) Wilson (SC)
Scott (VA) Terry Wolf
Sensenbrenner Thomas Woolsey
Serrano Thompson (CA) Wu
Sessions Thompson (MS) Wynn
Shadegg Thornberry Young (AK)
Shaw Tiahrt

NAYS—1

Paul

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—4

Hinchey McDermott
Kucinich McKinney

NOT VOTING—10

Coble Foley Tiberi
Cubin Forbes Young (FL)
Delahunt King (NY)
DeLay Portman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1159

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: “A concurrent resolution expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the occupation of the Lebanese Republic by the Syrian Arab Republic.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 84 I was unavoidably detained at a meeting at the White House. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

PROVIDING FOR FINAL PERIOD OF GENERAL DEBATE ON H. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I have a unanimous consent request that has been worked out between both sides. I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H. Con. Res. 95 in the Committee of the Whole, a final period of general debate shall be in order at the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for