

amendment, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

□ 1159

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. GILLMOR (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 109-19, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), had been disposed of.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, there shall be a final period of general debate at the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 109-19.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. WATT

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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

Amendment No. 3 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. WATT:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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

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 2007 through 2010 are set forth.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2006 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 2006: \$1,643,962,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$1,757,771,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$1,878,285,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$2,002,315,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: \$2,115,768,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2006: \$36,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$38,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$42,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$46,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: \$49,400,000,000.

(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 2006: \$2,167,892,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$2,234,617,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$2,347,844,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$2,462,004,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: \$2,567,326,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2006: \$2,173,159,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$2,227,030,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$2,333,346,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$2,439,718,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: \$2,545,019,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2006: \$-529,197,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$-469,259,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$-455,061,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$-437,403,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: \$-429,251,000,000.

(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 2006: \$8,602,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$9,188,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$9,767,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$10,333,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: \$10,896,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2006: \$5,039,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$5,313,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: \$5,555,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$5,760,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: \$5,941,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2006 through 2010 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$434,862,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$471,148,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$444,650,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$437,735,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$455,521,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$450,234,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$466,677,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$460,789,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$478,016,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$471,926,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,718,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,571,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,580,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,231,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,281,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,424,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,984,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,560,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,706,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,686,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,235,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,149,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,670,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,040,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,203,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,512,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,727,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,019,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,256,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,532,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,147,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,027,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,971,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,479,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,031,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,113,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,811,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,352,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,747,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,451,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,563,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,306,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,660,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,394,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,494,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,420,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,118,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,556,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,896,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,317,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,780,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,733,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,324,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,190,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,576,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,545,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,073,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,195,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,012,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,220,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,772,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,629,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,124,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,245,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,151,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,938,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,235,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,143,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,326,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,810,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,157,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,455,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,638,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$72,176,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,911,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$73,730,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,556,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$74,668,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,180,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,619,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,679,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,727,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,537,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,668,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,754,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,257,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,056,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,295,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,357,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,061,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$115,878,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$100,398,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$117,983,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$112,710,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$120,075,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$116,968,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$122,075,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$119,556,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$124,711,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$121,907,000,000.

(11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$263,151,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$262,872,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$277,813,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$276,036,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$298,412,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$296,301,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$321,498,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$317,159,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$342,449,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$340,349,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$331,181,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$330,944,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$372,132,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$372,353,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$395,766,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$395,759,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$420,916,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$420,450,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$449,089,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$449,346,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$349,218,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$355,125,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$356,381,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$361,033,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$370,455,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$373,930,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$381,030,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$383,313,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$392,106,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$393,720,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,891,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,891,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,704,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,704,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,768,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,768,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,743,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,743,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,029,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,029,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$73,351,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$71,594,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,849,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$71,561,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$77,093,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,029,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$78,864,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$77,734,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$80,676,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$79,461,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,840,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,013,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,551,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,249,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,635,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,926,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,741,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,575,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,880,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,599,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,017,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,308,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,442,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,080,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,549,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,290,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,135,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,673,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,755,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,275,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$308,584,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$308,584,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$355,775,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$355,775,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$391,505,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$391,505,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$419,077,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$419,077,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$444,335,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$444,335,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,050,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,098,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,761,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,146,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,990,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,206,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,113,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,246,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,199,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 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.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 154, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

□ 1200

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

I am honored to stand here as the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus for the 109th Congress and to offer as this substitute amendment the Congressional Black Caucus' budget for this year.

We believe that a budget is a statement of priorities and in that respect Members should know where the money is coming from that is being budgeted and how the money is being spent.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who has led the task force for the Congressional Black Caucus to put together the budget.

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

The Congressional Black Caucus is offering an alternative budget proposal that differs from both the President's budget and the House majority's budget by putting America and Americans

first. Its focus is to reduce disparities that exist in America's communities by investing in the priorities and challenges that Americans face today. It also provides significant support for our troops in Iraq. At the same time, the CBC budget alternative accomplishes these goals in a manner that is much more fiscally responsible than the Republican budget, so much so, as this chart shows, the budget deficit each year is much less, a total of a \$167 billion deficit reduction over 5 years, so much so that it saves just in interest cost alone \$27.5 billion over 5 years.

The Congressional Black Caucus alternative builds for America's future and addresses the domestic challenges our country faces. The bulk of the CBC budget has been applied to a comprehensive approach to education and training. With the intention of closing achievement and opportunity gaps in education, the CBC budget dramatically increases funding for education and training programs by \$23.9 billion over the proposed Republican budget next year alone.

The CBC budget supports public education by fully funding No Child Left Behind, provides critical funding for Head Start, TRIO, IDEA, and elementary and secondary school counseling. To address the education needs of our military families, the CBC budget allocates more funding for Impact Aid. Millions of at-risk students are hoping to succeed in high school and enroll in college, and to make that dream a reality the CBC alternative allocates funding for the GEAR-UP program, raises the maximum amount for Pell Grants, increases funding for historically black colleges and universities and Hispanic-serving institutions. In addition, the CBC budget funds for the Perkins student loan program, as well as job training, adult education, and vocational education programs that are critical in today's global economy.

In order to close the existing economic disparities in the United States and to help entrepreneurs realize the American dream, the CBC alternative funds job creation programs under the Small Business Administration. It supports community development programs, including community development block grants, child nutrition programs, and health programs such as Community Health Centers.

The budget also addresses disparities in housing, and believes that everyone in the United States is entitled to a safe and comfortable home. It supports HOPE VI, section 8 housing programs, housing for the disabled and elderly, and low income energy assistance. The budget also provides funding for Amtrak and public transportation.

The CBC recognizes that advancements in technology and science are necessary to maintain America's competitiveness in today's global economy. The budget supports funding for research and development, particularly in aeronautics and NASA, and increases funding for the National

Science Foundation, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the Department of Energy, as well as measures for space shuttle safety.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget alternative also recognizes the importance of adding to the safety of our communities by funding initiatives such as juvenile crime prevention programs and prisoner reentry programs.

The funding for these important domestic needs comes from rolling back tax cuts for an individual's adjusted gross income that is over \$200,000, and eliminating several abusive tax loopholes, including corporate incentives to move jobs overseas. Moreover, the Congressional Black Caucus budget does not adopt the new tax cuts included in the Republican budget. The CBC revenues are used for the domestic and deficit reduction portions of the alternative budget.

The CBC budget is also committed to making America more secure. The funding for urgent homeland security needs, veterans programs and benefits, and additional support for defense and our troops in Iraq comes from a \$7.8 billion reduction in ballistic missile defense, leaving \$1 billion in the program for continued research.

It is a priority of the CBC to provide American soldiers with the equipment necessary to return home from Iraq in a safe, quick and successful manner. To that end, a portion of these funds have been reallocated to protect our troops in Iraq by providing them with body armor, vehicle armor, and other personal support equipment, as well as for the construction and maintenance of our Navy vessels, which will preserve jobs.

The CBC understands that providing homeland security requires appropriate funding to meet the many pressing needs in homeland security; and, therefore, we have substantial funding for port security grants and rail security grants as well as funding for first responders, Federal air marshals and border patrol agents.

The remainder of these funds are used to restore cuts in veterans' programs and benefits. The CBC understands that today's soldiers are tomorrow's veterans who deserve our respect and sacrifices, not just in word but in deed and in budget. Thus, the alternative budget makes critical increases in veterans' programs and benefits, a substantial portion of which is health care.

It also supports funding for long-term care initiatives, medical and prosthetic research, and mental health care, among others. We believe that the sum of these initiatives will make us more secure as a Nation.

The CBC is committed to reducing disparities in all of America's communities. At the same time, our budget recognizes that we cannot place the burden on our children and grandchildren. A top priority of the CBC is to address the exploding deficit problem, and that is why our budget re-

duces the deficit by \$167 billion and saves \$27 billion in interest payments compared to the House majority's budget.

Members of the CBC have worked tirelessly to create a budget that is fiscally responsible, supports our troops and recognizes the need of American individuals and American communities around the country. We believe this is a sound budget that will reduce disparities in America's communities and promote and protect the best that America and Americans have to offer.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) and his colleagues for bringing forth an alternative budget. We know how difficult it is to put together a budget of this magnitude. As the gentleman said, this is a substitute budget, a true alternative budget to what was passed out of the committee. It highlights the differences between the Democrats' strategy and the Republican budgeting strategy. The Democrats seem to love spending increases and tax increases, and that is exactly what this alternative budget does.

It increases spending compared to the committee budget that is on the floor. It increases spending by \$32.5 billion in budget authority and also \$18.9 billion increased spending in the year 2006. That is just in 1 year. It also increases spending by \$173 billion in budget authority over 5 years and \$149 billion in outlays in the next 5 years. It also massively increases taxes by \$35.1 billion in fiscal year 2006 alone and \$169 billion over the next 5 years as opposed to the budget that was passed by the Committee on the Budget.

Again, these tax increases are above and beyond, on top of enormous spending increases. But that is not the only problem that we have with this budget alternative. It also decreases defense spending. Again, while the Nation is at war, this alternative budget cuts defense spending by \$10.7 billion in budget authority and \$7 billion in outlays just in fiscal year 2006. Again, during fiscal years 2006 through 2010, this alternative budget would reduce defense spending by \$149.5 billion in budget authority and \$129 billion in outlays. So we have very clear differences that have been illustrated by these two budgets.

Once again, I commend the gentleman for doing the hard work and putting an alternative budget together that is being discussed right now. Again these two budgets obviously highlight the difference. This budget that they are proposing increases taxes and cuts spending on defense in a time of war.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), a member of the Committee on the Budget who has done an incredible job and shown incredible leadership on this issue.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

First, I commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) for offering a budget alternative. I know that the gentleman and his staff, along with the other members of the Congressional Black Caucus, worked very hard to put this budget together. Working on the Committee on the Budget this year, I realize how difficult it is to get agreement on the type of budget we need. Even to get a small group of people to agree on a budget is very difficult, so I commend the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus for putting this together and I certainly respect what the gentleman has done.

But on so many issues we have disagreement on the content of the budget. First, I do not think we need to raise taxes at a time when our economy is trying to get its footing back. And at a time of war, we need to fully fund defense and homeland security. We have so many needs in this country that we have to fund and so many priorities that we must fund. I think our budget that we produced out of the Committee on the Budget is well balanced. I think it is appropriate for the time we are living, the time of war, the time of very strong homeland security needs, and we need to properly fund those items, which I believe our House budget that we produced out of the Committee on the Budget does.

So I am very proud of the work that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has done to get a balanced approach for our budgeting.

I would like to talk more about the qualities of our House budget that we have on the floor today. I think that is why we need to pass that budget unamended. First, our House budget fully funds the defense budget request of our President. There is a 4.8 percent increase, which totals \$419 billion in defense spending, and a net increase of 2.3 percent in nonmilitary appropriated accounts for homeland security, including \$32.5 billion for the Department of Homeland Security.

But furthermore, I think it is important that we talk about what it does for veterans. With veterans I have a chart here today discussing, showing our increase in veterans programs and the spending we have increased in veterans programs. There is a rapid increase in veterans spending especially during this time of war. We are funding veterans programs appropriately in this Congress. We are funding more veterans health care programs. We are doing more for those serving to defend our country. The current House budget we have will increase veterans program spending to \$67 billion. I think that is a move in the right direction.

Furthermore, spending per veteran has increased to \$2,700 per veteran. I think it is appropriate to notice the rapid rise in veterans spending. So we are funding priorities. This budget, although restraining nondefense, non-

homeland security discretionary spending, and taking on mandatory government programs and finding savings, although slight, we are finding savings in those programs that will enable us to keep continuing to cut taxes and enable us to avoid raising taxes at the same time.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) for offering this budget alternative. I respect what the gentleman is trying to do, but we have different ways of achieving the same result of funding the priorities and helping the American people.

□ 1215

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for their kind words. If you listened to them, it would make it sound like we have the same budget, but I want to assure you and our colleagues that that is not the case. And I want to assure you that by the end of this debate, you are going to know what the differences are.

We set out at the beginning of this Congress to set an agenda for the Congressional Black Caucus. Our agenda is about closing disparities that exist between African American citizens and other citizens in this country and have persisted over time. They involve closing the achievement and opportunity gaps in education, closing the gaps in health care for every American, closing the gaps in employment and economic security in wealth and business opportunity in our country, closing the gaps that continue to exist in our justice system, closing the gaps that continue to exist in retirement security for our citizens, and closing the inequities that have persisted throughout our history in foreign policy.

Is it true that we have a different set of priorities? You bet we do. To close these disparities, we have set a different course, and we decided that it was more important to devote resources to closing these gaps and closing these disparities than it was to give a tax cut to people who make above \$200,000 a year. We decided that these priorities were more important than continuing to fund a ballistic missile defense program that has already failed every single test that it has undergone. We believe that the education of our children is more important than tax cuts for people over \$200,000.

I am not here to make any excuses about that. I want every Member of this Congress to understand that that is a choice that we have made and that is a choice that we are calling on this Congress to make. The people in my district who make over \$200,000 a year have told me that they would rather educate our children and fully fund No Child Left Behind than they would have a tax cut. So this is a question of what your priorities are, no ifs, ands, butts about it. That is what you will be voting on today.

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

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

There are differences in the two budgets. The budget that we passed out of committee funds our essential services without raising taxes, without cutting defense, without hurting our economy. Unfortunately, this proposed alternative raises taxes and thoroughly cuts defense suspending in a time of war.

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

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT). Their budget and our budget really is the compassionate budget that is fiscally responsible.

I have comments from the American Legion, from the national legislative director of AMVETS, from the national legislative director of the Disabled American Veterans, from the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I just want to paraphrase what they said:

We think cutting veterans benefits, talking about the majority budget, is, and I paraphrase, unacceptable, especially at a time when American soldiers, sons and daughters, are being wounded and killed every day in Iraq.

In addition, it appears that this pattern of shortchanging veterans medical care continues in the 109th Congress. American veterans and their families deserve better.

Let me just give a few examples of how we strengthen one national defense. I will put all of it in the RECORD; but clearly in this House, in closing, only the big dogs eat in this House.

I rise strongly to support the Congressional Black Caucus Budget. We are truly the conscience of this Congress.

This budget represents true compassion with fiscal responsibility. It includes increases in programs that the American people believe in and that the Republicans just give lip service to. Our budget includes increased funding for: education programs, school construction, job creation programs, child nutrition programs, community health centers, and Amtrak, which 800,000 American's use to get to work, and whose budget got Zeroed out by this foolish Administration.

And unlike the Republican's, it doesn't balance the budget on the backs of the veterans, the homeless, seniors, and the poor.

In the Republican's House, the Big Dogs Eat first, and everyone else has to get in line.

Do the right thing for the American people. Support the Congressional Black Caucus Budget.

I would like to thank Mr. WATT and Mr. SCOTT for their hard work on putting the CBC alternative budget together.

If we do not take care of our veterans now, we will not have the boots on the ground in the future to respond to any attack against us or our allies.

This budget straightens our priorities to include both defending our country and the freedom it cherishes and giving our veterans the chance they need to succeed once they leave the service.

All of the funds reduced from Ballistic Missile Defense are reallocated within various functions to provide for additional support for the troops in Iraq and other defense items necessary to maintain our military strength and jobs (\$1.1 billion), homeland se-

curity needs (\$2.05 billion), and veterans programs and benefits (\$4.65 billion). All calculations are for changes above/below proposed Fiscal Year 2006 levels included in the Republican budget.

National Defense:

Body armor, personal support equipment, and other protective gear for troops, and vehicle armor	\$75 million.
Ammunition for Marine Corps	\$10 million.
Small Arms for Army	\$10 million.
Building/Maintenance of Navy ships	\$1 billion.
To study instances of waste, fraud and abuse within DoD business processes and implement specific GAO recommendations for reform	\$5 million.
Veterans: +\$4.65 billion	
Veterans Health Care	\$1 billion.
Survivor Benefit Plan	\$100 million.
Disabled Veterans Tax ["concurrent receipt"]	\$2.5 billion.
Fund long-term care initiatives for veterans	\$400 million.
Remove proposed \$250 enrollment fee on Priority 7&8 veterans	\$300 million.
Remove proposed increases in co-payments for Priority 7&8 veterans	\$150 million.
Prosthetic needs for veterans	\$100 million.
VA Medical and Prosthetic Research	\$50 million.
Mental Health Care for Veterans	\$50 million.
Allowances (all for purposes of Homeland Security): +\$2.05 billion	
Rail Security	\$100 million.
Port Security, including air cargo screening, preventing nuclear/radiological weapons in cargo containers, research and development, and grants	\$500 million.
Centers for Disease Control	\$250 million.
First Responders	\$900 million.
Interoperable communications systems for first responders	\$85 million.
Federal air marshals	\$65 million.
Internal Customs Enforcement/Border Patrol Agents	\$150 million.
Total Defense Funds Used, All of Which Are Reallocated to Defense, Homeland Security Needs, and Veterans Programs and Benefits	\$7.8 billion.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2005.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, Committee on Budget, House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The American Legion is deeply troubled with and cannot support your Committee's proposed budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 95, with regard to funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), especially the reconciliation instructions targeted at earned Veterans' benefits. Reducing mandatory appropriations for veterans' disability compensation, pensions, and educational benefits at a time of war is inconsistent with the thanks of a grateful Nation.

The American Legion believes VA's own admission that the cost of doing business increases annually about 13-14 percent because of Federal pay increases and inflation in the health care arena. The President's budget request is "scrubbed" by the Office of Management and Budget, so VA's true fiscal requirements to meet the health care needs of America's veterans are somewhat skewed. During the 108th Congress, former VA Secretary Principi reported to your colleagues that The FY 2005 proposed budget was \$1.2 billion short of what he had actually requested. It appears this pattern of short-changing VA medical care continues in the 109th Congress. America's veterans and their families deserve better.

The American Legion recognizes and appreciates the Bradley Amendment adopted by the Committee, but believes it falls well short of the total funding needed in VA medical care. Unfortunately, the Committee rejected the Edwards Amendment that would have provided VA with adequate resources to maintain current services.

The American Legion would encourage adoption of one of the amendments to be offered by Representatives Spratt and Obey with regard to increasing VA funding. Clearly, both of these amendments are in the best interest of veterans and their families. Without adoption of one of these two amendments, The American Legion cannot support this budget resolution.

The American Legion appreciates your leadership and the hard work of your colleagues on behalf of America's veterans and their families.

Sincerely,

THOMAS P. CADMUS,
National Commander.

THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET,
March 17, 2005.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, House Budget Committee, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE NUSSLE: As you know, the President's fiscal year 2006 budget would provide an appropriation for veterans' medical care that is less than one-half of one percent above the FY 2005 appropriation. Because this amount would not begin to cover employee wage increases and other inflationary costs, it amounts to a substantial cut in funding and thus would unavoidably result in a reduction of critical medical care services for our Nation's sick and disabled veterans. Although we appreciate the adoption of the Bradley Amendment which added \$229 million to the President's recommendation for veterans' medical care, this is still grossly inadequate.

In addition, we understand that H. Con. Res. 95 includes instructions to cut spending on mandatory veterans' programs, such as disability compensation, by \$798 million. We think cutting veterans' benefit programs is unconscionable, especially at a time when America's son and daughters are being wounded and killed every day in Iraq.

The four major veterans organizations of The Independent Budget, AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, therefore strongly urge support for amendments offered by Representatives Spratt and Obey to increase funding for veterans' programs. Passage of these amendments is crucial if the VA is to maintain an adequate level of health care and other services.

Sincerely,

RICK JONES,

National Legislative
Director, AMVETS.

RICHARD B. FULLER,
National Legislative
Director, Paralyzed
Veterans of America.

JOSEPH A. VIOLANTE,
National Legislative
Director, Disabled
American Veterans.

DENNIS CULLINAN,
National Legislative
Director, Veterans of
Foreign Wars of the
United States.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I do want to respond to only the big dogs eat in this House. I am a small dog, and I think I am doing just fine.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCHENRY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. It is not you; it is your policy. When I say "big dog," I am talking about those huge tax cuts to the rich while we cut veterans programs, programs for health care, programs for the people that need it the most.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, this is an interesting chart on the rapid increase in veterans spending per veteran. I think this is very important. We are spending \$2,773 per veteran. We are fully funding our veterans' needs. That is a priority of this Congress. As a small fellow, I must admit, I do think it is important that we keep our taxes low so that we

can create economic growth and development which will help us fully fund our programs going forward. A strong economy is what is going to move our Nation forward, not tax increases.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), for his steadfast support of the development of this CBC budget alternative and also the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for his leadership. I appreciate and applaud their steady stream of ideas and positions on issues we all care about.

This Republican budget proposal clearly ignores the needs of my State and all working Americans. The \$2.57 trillion budget for fiscal year 2006 that President Bush laid before Congress is more out of touch than all the rest that he has submitted. It fails to include huge costs that taxpayers will have to bear, and its priorities do not match the needs of millions of people. It is, in short, a budget in need of a thorough congressional overhaul.

The level of funding proposed in the President's budget for research and development, especially basic research, is far from adequate. I believe that Federal investments in science and technology make sense. Americans have funded groundbreaking research into disease prevention and amazing new medical breakthroughs, cutting-edge business technology, energy efficiency and educational tools that help our children learn in new ways. But in this budget, funding for the National Science Foundation would struggle to keep up with inflation and programs at most other major agencies are cut.

There is a direct connection between investments in research and development today and economic prosperity and world leadership tomorrow. That is why the CBC budget plan would continue to invest in the National Science Foundation, in NASA, research at schools and universities and new energy technologies to give business consumers more affordable, cleaner energy. Just this week, EPA issued a statement that really rolls us back in protecting our air. We have no clean air in Texas. I do not know about anyplace else.

As lawmakers, we do have the responsibility to ensure that all Americans, including minorities, are able to move ahead to achieve the American Dream. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness meant all people.

Mr. Chairman, it is up to the Congress to inject a dose of realism into this budget debate. Only then will the country get a budget that makes sense.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Mr. WATT, for his steadfast support of the development of this CBC budget alternate. I also want to thank Mr. SCOTT for his leadership. I appreciate

and applaud their steady stream of ideas and positions on issues we all care about. I also would like to thank all of the members of the CBC and their staff for their help in completing this very worthwhile project.

The Republican budget proposal clearly ignores the needs of Texas and of all working Americans. The \$2.57 trillion budget for fiscal 2006 that President Bush laid before Congress is more out of touch than most. It fails to include huge costs that taxpayers will have to bear, and its priorities don't match the needs of millions of people. It is, in short, a budget in need of a thorough congressional overhaul.

Mr. Chairman, the level of funding proposed in the President's budget for research and development, especially basic research, is far from adequate. I believe that federal investments in science and technology make sense. Americans have funded groundbreaking research into disease prevention and amazing new medical breakthroughs, cutting-edge business technology, energy efficiency, and educational tools that help our children learn in new ways. But in this budget package, funding for the National Science Foundation (NSF) would struggle to keep up with inflation, and programmes at most other major agencies are cut.

Bush's science and technology budget would drop from an estimated \$61.7 billion in fiscal year 2005 to \$60.8 billion in 2006. The science and technology includes programs such as space exploration, renewable energy, and agricultural research, as well as technology-related research and development at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST).

There is a direct connection between investments in research and development today, and economic prosperity and world leadership tomorrow. That's why CBC budget plan would continue to invest in the National Science Foundation, NASA, research at schools and universities; and new energy technologies to give business and consumers more affordable, cleaner energy.

As lawmakers, we have the responsibility to ensure that all Americans, including minorities, are able to move ahead to achieve the American dream: life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. Chairman, it is up to Congress to inject a dose of realism into the budget debate. Only then will the country get a budget that makes sense.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. I am full of charts today, my friends.

I do want to address our funding for health and for research. Under a Republican-controlled Congress, we have doubled funding for NIH, the National Institutes of Health. I think it is important to note what we are doing in health research as an American government, and the American people need to know that we are fully funding these programs to look at innovative ways to solve pressing medical issues in our country. We have doubled the funding for NIH over the last 6 years.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, more needs to be done to address the ongoing global challenges of health, poverty, disease, and disasters so that we can end the inequities in foreign policy. Therefore, the CBC budget increases funding for these core development accounts with the overall goals of reducing poverty disparities and improving quality of life.

There is \$3.7 billion in the CBC budget for global AIDS, which is \$500 million more than the President's budget. That is an increase of \$900 million from last year and will support prevention, care and treatment for thousands more people.

Foreign aid to Africa and the Caribbean is increased by \$250 million in the Congressional Black Caucus budget to allow developing countries to participate in the global economy. These funds support strategic priorities in the Caribbean region, improve good governance and reduce corruption, increase economic growth and free trade and reduce narcotics trafficking.

Public health and preventable illness initiatives is increased by \$250 million in the CBC budget. More than one-third of the children in Africa are malnourished. In the last 10 years, approximately 2 million children have been killed in armed conflicts.

AFRICA

Overall disparity—Nearly 1.3 billion people around the world live in poverty and do not have safe drinking water; more than one-third of the world's children are malnourished; within the last ten years, approximately two million children have been killed in armed conflicts, many after being forced to be child soldiers; many poor countries spend 30%–40% of their annual budgets on repaying their foreign-held debt (often more than they spend on health and education combined); and horrific conditions can lead individuals to become more disaffected and susceptible to recruitment by terrorist organizations.

ERADICATING HUNGER, POVERTY, AND DISEASES MUST BE A PRIORITY

HIV/AIDS Solution—AIDS is a global humanitarian disaster that demands robust leadership from the United States. According to the need based numbers advanced by UNAIDS, The Stop TB Partnership, and Roll back Malaria, we believe the US should provide \$6.7 billion next year. And at least \$1.5 billion in funding this year for the Global Fund to operate efficiently and effectively.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Again, what we have not heard from the sponsors of this amendment is part of what is in their amendment. Again, their amendment has massive increases in spending. It also has massive tax increases on the American people. And it also has massive reductions in defense spending in a time of war. Those are huge differences. I just want to make sure that everybody understands what the differences are.

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

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the CBC budget is sane, rational, logical, serious. It recognizes the tremendous need that exists in our country to assist those 2 million people who are currently in jails and prisons and the 650,000 who return home every year. Therefore, it increases juvenile justice programs by \$300 million, \$100 million for the weed and seed drug elimination program, and \$300 million for prisoner reentry programs, and it does not raise taxes. It rolls back the tax breaks that were given in 2001 and 2003 to those individuals with adjusted gross incomes of more than \$200,000. People in my community say, provide the services, don't give to the rich.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) mentioned the fact that our budget does not increase taxes and the alternative budget that we are discussing today does increase taxes.

Does the gentleman know how many jobs are created because of this Republican Congress cutting taxes in the last year?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I think I may have a chart on that.

Payroll jobs have rebounded because of tax cuts. With a weakness of the economy going into the Bush administration from the Clinton years and with the advent of 9/11, we had a weakening of the economy.

□ 1230

But once the tax cuts took hold, we have rebounded. We have got over 3 million jobs because of this.

Beyond that, there has been reference to the fact that tax cuts have created the deficit. That is not true. Actually, that is borne out with statistical proof here. The largest cause of deficits between 2001 and 2004 was the economy. And the best way to address the economy and get the economy to rebound is by cutting taxes, spurring growth, reducing regulations, empowering small businesses and businesses all across the country to create more jobs, to increase earnings.

So what we see here, the largest cause, 49 percent of the cause of the deficit, was the economy. And because of that, we have been able to rebound. Because of the tax cuts and because of the rebound in the economy, we are reducing the deficit. We are taking on this, and we are going to further cut taxes in order to keep spurring the economy.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus's budget that is being presented here today. This budget is

more responsible certainly than the President's budget, certainly than the Republican budget, and it has taken into consideration the real needs of the people of this country. I want to talk a little bit about CDBG; that is, the Community Development Block grant.

By formula, every city, town, State in America receives funds from this Community Development Block Grant program. This money is block granted to these entities in order to assist these cities with everything from infrastructure development, assistance with housing so that people can get into homes, being assisted with down payments, with rental assistance; with 501(c)(3)s, nonprofit organizations, that are providing services for at-risk youth, for seniors, for the kinds of programs that these cities and towns could never fund without this block grant.

In many ways this money that is going to the cities is the last of the moneys to deal with poverty, to deal with the lack of resources because of the inability of these cities and towns to be able to raise the kind of revenue that could help them with the very basic needs of their cities.

This President decided to cut this particular block grant by 35 percent. I think that amounts to about \$1.9 billion. The good thing about what this President has done is he has brought together from both sides of the aisle Representatives who know the value of this program and who are going to work together and support the kind of funding that has been put back into this budget by the CBC budget. The CBC funds CDBG to the 2005 level, and that is the way it should be.

I would urge support for the Congressional Black Caucus's very thoughtful and well developed budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the CBC substitute budget. The CBC budget rejects the failed budget policies of the Bush Administration and would return us to a policy of investing in education, job training, housing, veterans and community development programs that millions of people depend on. It would reduce the deficit and restore fiscal responsibility to a budget process that has run amuck.

Mr. Chairman, because the CBC believes that education is the greatest legacy that we can provide to our children, the CBC's budget fully funds No Child Left Behind. We also provide an additional \$2.5 billion for school construction and an additional \$450 million for Pell Grants which will help thousands more students attend college. We also increase funding for Head Start by \$2 billion over the Republican budget so that we can ensure that more low-income children are properly prepared to enter the first grade.

The CBC budget substitute recognizes the vital role that the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program plays in improving our communities. The Republican budget proposes to cut CDBG by at least \$800 million and the cuts could end up as high as the \$1.9 billion cut proposed by the President. These cuts to the CDBG program will leave a huge hole in the budgets of our local governments,

a hole they cannot and will not be able to fill with their own resources.

The CBC budget substitute rejects these cuts, and instead provides an increase of \$1.2 billion more than the Republican budget for CDBG.

We also reject the \$286 million in cuts proposed for the Hope VI program and instead provide \$500 million for Hope VI so that it may continue its important role in rehabilitating our nation's public housing. The CBC budget also provides an additional \$880 million for Section 8 Housing Programs, preserving and expanding this vital safety net program for millions of people.

Mr. Chairman, the CBC substitute is a strong and compassionate budget that meets the needs of the American people. I urge my colleagues to support it and to reject the Republican budget.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The House budget resolution addresses CDBGs. As a matter of fact, it adds \$1.1 billion aimed specifically at that. The difference between our budget, though, and this proposed amendment is our budget does not raise taxes, does not reduce defense spending in a time of war.

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

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. GILLMOR). The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus's alternative budget.

Among the critical investments it makes are those in health. Mr. Chairman, without these albeit moderate increases, we would do nothing to reduce the almost 100,000 premature preventable deaths that will occur in the African American community this year and every year because of our failure to act.

It is important to note that while the increases in the CBC budget apply specifically to programs that improve minority health, many studies have demonstrated that our lack of access, our poor health, and the failure of this country to focus on prevention in our

communities contribute greatly to escalating health care costs and adversely impacts the quality of health care for everyone.

So the CBC budget through improving the health of African Americans and other people of color improves health and the quality of life for all Americans. And with the additional \$167 billion reduction in our national deficit it provides, this is a budget that everyone can and should vote for.

I proudly applaud the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and this committee for this outstanding budget.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank both our chairman as well as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for their leadership on this most important effort.

I rise to support the CBC budget, the only budget in this Congress at this time that invests in America's families.

There are three things wrong with America and why we are not doing well. The permanent tax cuts cost \$1.2 trillion. On the war in Iraq we have spent \$300 billion, and the deficit is blooming.

Our CBC budget reduces the deficit. Our CBC budget invests in defense, homeland security, and the veterans at the same numbers that were given to this House by the President.

We must support the CBC budget. Americans have to be outraged that we are not investing in their families and their children and their health care. I hope that we will do right. The CBC budget must be adopted.

SUPPORT THE CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS FISCAL YEAR 2006 BUDGET SUBSTITUTE

The Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) fiscal year 2006 budget substitute focuses on the CBC's Agenda (Closing Disparities in America's Communities) and restoring fiscal responsibility to the federal budget process. The disparities that continue to exist in our society in education, health care, economic opportunity, justice, retirement security and foreign policy are addressed in the CBC budget. In addition, our budget focuses on strengthening our efforts at the Department of Homeland Security, meeting some of the critical needs of our troops and improving services to our veterans. And, while making these important investments in our country's future, our budget places a high priority on reducing the record federal budget deficit.

The CBC budget uses the Republican budget as the base budget and makes the following adjustments:

DOMESTIC

It includes a reduction in the tax cuts from 2001 and 2003 for an individual's adjusted gross income that exceeds \$200,000; furthermore, it does not adopt the new Republican tax cuts.

Most of the revenue raised in the CBC budget is used to address disparities in America's communities; a substantial portion is reserved to reduce the deficit.

MILITARY

Ballistic Missile Defense spending is reduced by \$7.8 billion, leaving \$1 billion for research and development.

All of these funds are spent on other defense items to support our troops, homeland security needs, and veterans programs and benefits.

The total for defense, homeland security and veterans is equal to the Republican budget.

BOTTOM LINE

The CBC budget addresses critical domestic challenges, and supports our troops.

The CBC budget reduces the deficit by \$167 billion compared to the House majority's budget over the next five years; this fiscal responsibility is rewarded by a reduction of \$27 billion in interest payments compared to the House majority's budget.

The CBC budget focuses on closing disparities that exist in our society and investing in America's future. We hope you will join us in supporting these efforts by supporting the CBC budget substitute.

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 2006 CBC ALTERNATIVE BUDGET

Total general revenue: \$32.4 billion.
Amount applied to deficit reduction: \$3.9 billion.

FUNCTION 150—INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The United States is facing unprecedented challenges to our national security and broader national interests. Although there is an overall increase in the President's request for international assistance for FY 06, more needs to be done to address the ongoing global challenges of health, poverty, disease, and disasters. Therefore, the CBC budget increases funding for these core development accounts with the overall goals of reducing poverty disparities and improving quality of life. +\$1 billion.

FUNCTION 250—GENERAL SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

The CBC supports the research and development efforts of NASA, the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Institute of Standards and Technologies (NIST), and the Department of Energy. In addition to research and development, the CBC supports additional safety measures for the Space Shuttle program. +\$500 million.

FUNCTION 300—NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

The CBC is concerned about adequate funding for the preservation of Historically Black Colleges and Universities. The alternative budget supports additional efforts to protect the historical heritage and important cultural role of HBCUs in the United States. +\$50 million.

FUNCTION 350—AGRICULTURE

The CBC alternative budget supports farms owned by African-Americans and other minorities. The CBC realizes that these farmers continue to depend on the Department of Agriculture's loan and grant programs and has allocated funding to modify cuts in agriculture programs that affect minorities. The Caucus's priorities also include increasing funding for expanding food and nutrition education programs and for the USDA Office of Civil Rights. +\$300 million.

FUNCTION 370—COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT

The CBC alternative budget works towards eliminating the housing and small business disparities created by the President's FY06 budget. The alternative budget allocates funding to the Small Business Administration and the Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP), and provides additional funding for adult training and dislocated workers programs. By supporting these programs, the CBC is working to close the existing economic disparities in the U.S. and to help entrepreneurs realize the American dream. +\$1 billion.

FUNCTION 400—TRANSPORTATION

The CBC believes that it is important to provide support for Amtrak. The Caucus is also determined to ease the transportation disparities in the United States by funding public transportation. +\$150 million.

FUNCTION 450—COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The CBC understands that federal support for community and regional development helps promote growth in economically distressed urban and rural communities. To remedy these economic disparities, the CBC would like to ensure that the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program will continue to improve housing conditions in low to moderate income neighborhoods. +\$1.5 billion.

FUNCTION 500—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The CBC alternative budget represents a comprehensive approach to education and training by closing the achievement and opportunity gaps in education. While the Administration proposes eliminating 48 programs (\$4.3 billion cost), the CBC budget dramatically increases funding for education and training programs by \$23.9 billion over the Republican budget. It provides funds for school construction, fully funds No Child Left Behind, and provides critical funding for Head Start, GEAR-UP, TRIO and IDEA. For those in college, the CBC budget raises the maximum amount of Pell Grants. In addition, the CBC budget funds the Perkins Loan Programs as well as job training, adult education, and vocational education programs that are critical in today's global economy. +\$23.9 billion.

FUNCTION 550—HEALTH

The CBC alternative budget makes eliminating health care disparities a top priority by funding health care programs such as Community Health Centers. +\$1 billion.

FUNCTION 600—INCOME SECURITY

Programs that serve children and families in times of need are essential to fixing the disparities that exist in the U.S. The CBC alternative budget supports additional funding for programs such as Hope VI, Section 8 Housing, housing for the disabled and the elderly, Low Income Home Energy Assistance and Child Nutrition. +\$2 billion.

FUNCTION 750—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

The CBC is concerned about the proposed cuts that affect local law enforcement personnel and programs. The alternative budget will help fix these budget disparities and fund the programs that keep our streets and neighborhoods safe. Moreover, the CBC understands the importance of providing adequate funding to Juvenile Justice programs that promote prevention and intervention. These programs support effective local efforts that reduce crime and delinquency, save money, and save lives. +\$1 billion.

Total Defense funds used, all of which are reallocated to Defense (\$1.1 B), Homeland Security needs (\$2.05 B), and veterans programs and benefits (\$4.65 B): \$7.8 billion.

FUNCTION 050—NATIONAL DEFENSE

It is a priority of the CBC to provide American soldiers with the equipment necessary to return home from Iraq in a safe, quick, and successful manner. Therefore, the CBC budget alternative reallocates \$1.1 billion within defense. These funds are used to protect our troops with body armor, personal gear, small arms and ammunition, as well as vehicle armor; for the construction and maintenance of Navy vessels in order to maintain the U.S. Naval fleet and jobs associated with it; and for other defense purposes to maintain our military strength. -\$6.7 billion.

FUNCTION 700—VETERANS

The CBC understands that today's soldiers are tomorrow's veterans who deserve our respect for the sacrifices they made. Thus, the CBC alternative budget aims to make critical increases in veterans programs, especially funding for veterans health care, as well as long-term care initiatives, VA medical and prosthetic research, and mental health care. +4.65 billion.

FUNCTION 920—ALLOWANCES (ALL FOR PURPOSES OF HOMELAND SECURITY)

The CBC understands that providing homeland security requires appropriate funding to meet the many pressing homeland security needs that face our nation. The alternative budget therefore devotes additional resources for guarding against terrorist attacks through our rails and ports, including cargo screening that prevents nuclear or radiological weapons from entering the U.S. It also supports essential funding for the Centers for Disease Control to help us prepare for a possible biological attack. Moreover, America depends on its first responders, federal air marshals, and boarder patrol agents; the CBC alternative budget ensures that they—and our collective homeland security effort—receive the resources that are urgently needed to protect the citizens of the United States. +\$2.05 billion.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank again the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of our Congressional Black Caucus, for their stellar leadership in spearheading this responsible budget. It should not be an alternative. This is the budget we should be voting on.

The Republican budget is fiscally reckless and morally irresponsible. The CBC budget, if we think about it, really is a faith-based budget. The CBC budget is not only fiscally responsible, but it is also morally responsible.

The Republican budget fails to live up to any standard of morality that speaks to the least of these. On the other hand, the Congressional Black Caucus budget acknowledges that in order to have a strong America, we must have all Americans who are not vulnerable. Our people cannot be desperate if, in fact, we want a strong America.

The Republican budget cuts housing, housing for the disabled by 50 percent. Where is the morality in that? That is turning our backs on the disabled. The CBC budget not only restores these cuts but adds \$120 million for housing the disabled.

The Republican budget is an immoral budget, if one asks me. Vote for the CBC budget because it is a faith-based budget that takes care of the least of these.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the Dean of the CBC.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus has carefully considered its responsibility here, and they have asked me to point out a couple of things.

In the Justice Department we need to put more money into three programs

that were cut: First, the programs that investigate gang-related crimes; secondly, the problems of juvenile delinquency; and, third, prison reentry. These are incredibly important.

And I just want to add that this budget that we are trying to replace ours with is one of the most mean-spirited documents that I have witnessed. Over 150 domestic program cuts. The \$81 billion for Iraq was not even included in this budget, as if it was a supplemental consideration.

So I ask the Members to join with us and let us have a great number of people supporting the CBC budget this year.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY), and I would like to wish her a happy birthday today. She thought I did not know that.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and I will not tell my colleagues which birthday it is.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the CBC budget and against the priorities of the Republican budget.

The Republican budget does nothing to decrease the racial disparities that exist in our country. In fact, it exacerbates them. Seventy-six years to close the college graduation gap, 581 years to close the wealth gap, 1,664 years to close the homeownership gap.

But when Republicans talk about growth, it is clear that too many American communities are just not included. It is also clear that the Republicans do not see our constituents because if they did, they would not legislate public policy that hurts them.

Even Alan Greenspan has decried the unsustainable income imbalances in our country. The Republicans continue to ignore him, us, and our constituents. It is a sad day when veterans, children, seniors, small business owners, rural Americans, and poor Americans have to take a back seat to the scions of industry and Wall Street.

I support the CBC budget and reject the priorities of the Republican budget.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, again I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) for offering this alternative budget. I do commend him for his hard work and efforts on behalf of his constituents, which are my neighbors in North Carolina. I am very proud to have him as a neighbor. I am very proud of his leadership and the stature he brings back home to North Carolina.

With that, we do have a disagreement on policy. His version of the budget increase taxes at a time when we are just now recovering from those tough days of the late 1990s and early 2000s when our economy was soft.

I think it is important that we keep cutting taxes for years to come so that

we can keep this economic growth going. And the best way to lift people up, the best way to give people an opportunity, to give them ownership, is by allowing them to keep more of their own money. In the last few years we have seen numerous people falling off the tax rolls because of tax cuts. We have seen strong job growth, new businesses being formed, greater homeownership in America. Across the board every group in America is increasing in homeownership. And I think it is important that we continue those policies to keep growth going while restraining government spending, cutting deficits, and funding national defense and homeland security.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, happy birthday to my colleague.

Let me resoundingly support the Congressional Black Caucus' budget, and let me ask my colleagues what better budget to have than the one that saves \$27.5 billion more in interest than the Republican budget? I cannot imagine that my good friend on the floor of the House would not welcome the opportunity of putting that interest into the needs of the American people.

We need affordable housing. We can go to any city, any rural community, and not see people standing in line to access affordable housing. Section 8 vouchers, which allows affordable housing for families of four and five and six hard-working Americans, there are 25,000 people on the list in Houston, Texas alone. Millions of people are still on the list because they do not have affordable housing.

□ 1245

Finally I congratulate the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) on this budget because it also invests in homeland security. With all of the talk of the Republican budget, they do not fund immigration and customs officers. They do not fund border patrol officers to secure our borders and provide for internal security. The CBC budget does. The CBC budget puts \$150 million in for Border and Customs needs. This is a strong budget for the American people. Vote for the Congressional Black Caucus budget. Save \$27.5 billion in interest. I think you will like that in your pocket and in your savings account!

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer another choice to those Americans who are disheartened by the current budget proposal being offered by this Republican Congress. Today, we offer them the choice of accepting the Congressional Black Caucus's, CBC, alternative budget. Truly, it is the budget of hope and compromise; it is the budget that closes the disparities in America's communities. The CBC alternative budget provides both social

and economic equality for Americans, instead of allowing the richest Americans to pay fewer taxes at the expense of vital programs needed by lower and middle class Americans. Surely, this administration and the Republican leadership in Congress will pay lip service to the needs of these Americans, but this budget does more. It demonstrates in writing that under our current budgetary situation it is possible to maintain necessary social programs while practicing true fiscal responsibility.

The CBC alternative budget is particularly strong in its support of educational programs, the greatest key we possess to close disparities in our society. This administration and the majority in this Congress promised to leave no child behind, but clearly they have reneged on their promise. The Republican budget eliminates 48 education programs that receive \$4.3 billion this year. These eliminations include wiping out \$1.3 billion for all vocational education programs, \$522 million for all education technology programs, and \$29 million for all civic education programs. The Republican budget eliminates other large programs including the Even Start family literacy program, \$225 million, and state grants for safe and drug-free schools and communities, \$437 million. In fact, the President's budget cuts 2006 funding for the Department of Education by \$1.3 billion below the amount needed to maintain purchasing power at the current level, and by \$530 million below the 2005 enacted level of \$56.6 billion. This is the first time since 1989 that an administration has submitted a budget that cuts the Department's funding.

The CBC alternative budget in stark contrast provides a much needed boost of \$23.9 billion to education and training, including \$2.5 billion for school construction. The CBC alternative fully funds the fiscal year 2006 authorization level for No Child Left Behind, NCLB and provides for an expansion of the Head Start program. In addition, the CBC alternative doubles federal funding for Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Hispanic Serving Institutions; again closing the disparities often witnessed in higher education. In that regard the CBC alternative increases the Pell grant allotment for college students. Because as we all know, a mind, any mind, is a terrible thing to waste. Clearly, the CBC alternative emphasizes this ideal more than the Republican budget resolution.

Few things are more important to Americans than their home and their communities. While the President and this Republican Congress take steps to make it harder for average Americans to reach homeownership, the CBC alternative invests heavily in this vital sector. It funds home ownership initiatives that help families build real wealth. In the city of Houston alone we have 25,000 people waiting on a list to obtain affordable housing. These homes will provide them the stability and equity to build their lives and eventually achieve their own prosperity, we shame ourselves when we deny them the opportunity to do so. The CBC alternative also restores \$1.122 billion for vital Community Block Grants which were gutted in the Republican budget resolution. Without the ability to build up our communities how can we change people's realities? Without community development we allow these disparities to continue unabated.

The CBC alternative budget does not remove any money from the overall Defense and Homeland Security budget. Instead, it

takes \$7.7 billion out of the Ballistic Missile Defense Program, which has so far proven to be a failure and redirects the money to additional support for the troops in Iraq, homeland security needs, and veterans programs and benefits. Among the items of support for the troops in Iraq is \$75 million of body armor, personal support equipment, and other protective gear for troops, and vehicle armor; all of which we know the troops are in urgent need of. The CBC alternative provides an additional \$2.05 billion for Homeland Security including funds for improving rail and port security, which have always been high risk targets for attack. This alternative budget provides \$4.65 billion for veterans funding, so that when our brave men and women return home from fighting the war on terror they will know that their nation is ready and willing to take care of them.

The CBC alternative also funds the important sector of immigration. As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims I worked with the CBC to get funding for \$150 million for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, agents and border patrol agents, truly we are undermanned in this vital sector. In addition, as a member of the House Science Committee I worked with the CBC to fund an additional \$500 million for general science, space, and development and support the research and development efforts of NASA, the National Science Foundation, NSF, the National Institute of Standards and Technologies, NIST, and the Department of Energy. In addition to research and development, the CBC alternative also supports additional safety measures for the Space Shuttle program, which should be at the forefront of NASA's efforts after the *Columbia* Space Shuttle tragedy. Space and Science represent yet another way to eliminate disparities through knowledge and discovery.

This CBC alternative budget is proof positive that we can properly fund social programs while still paying down more of the national debt than the Republican budget. Again, I say that this budget represents hope instead of the despair we feel when looking at the Republican budget resolution. It is a hope for ending the disparities that continue to divide us and keep us to this day from achieving our full potential as a nation.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if I may inquire of the gentleman from North Carolina how many speakers he has left.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I was hoping that the gentleman would give us a little bit more time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if I may inquire of the gentleman how many speakers he has.

Mr. WATT. I have two speakers left.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. And how much time does he have left, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. GILLMOR). The gentleman from North Carolina has 2 minutes.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I believe I have 2½ minutes, Mr. Chairman. Is that correct?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I will, in a spirit of incredible generosity to the opposition, yield another half minute to the gentleman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina now has 2½ minutes. The gentleman from Florida now has 2 minutes.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) who prepared this budget, has his imprint on it and knows more about it than anybody.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me this time. I want to make a couple of comments as we wrap up. One is the massive tax increase. What we did was started with the base budget, the Republican budget. On income we changed the revenue by rolling back the tax cuts to the level they were at in 2001 for income over 200,000. If someone makes more than \$200,000, they get all the income tax cuts up to the 200,000, but no tax cuts after 200,000. Again, we spend \$167 billion less deficit than the Republican budget, creating \$27 billion less in interest payments.

Now, we have heard all of this about massive cuts in defense. Let us be very clear. All of the numbers on defense are exactly the same numbers as the Republican budget, with one exception. We fund missile defense at \$1 billion rather than \$8.8 billion.

If you look at defense, homeland security, and veterans, that total is the same because we use that money to fund defense, homeland security and veterans.

Now, on defense, I hope the gentleman from Florida is working with the Virginia delegation in maintaining a 12-aircraft carrier fleet. This budget, the Congressional Black Caucus budget, has a billion dollars more in shipbuilding than the underlying budget. We have \$75 million more in shipbuilding than the underlying budget. We have \$75 million more in body armor. We have in homeland security, \$500 million for port security; \$100 million for rail security, veterans benefits.

Those charts did not show what the present level of services would cost. It also did not show the fact that the Republican budget has co-pays and deductibles that our budget does not have. We say we have \$4 billion more for veterans, over \$1 billion more for shipbuilding, over \$2 billion more for homeland security. So if you look at that as a group, we are more secure with the Congressional Black Caucus budget than the Republican budget.

I would hope that we would adopt the budget. It saves money and makes us more secure.

I include for the RECORD the fiscal year 2006 CBC alternative budget breakdown:

FISCAL YEAR 2006 CBC ALTERNATIVE BUDGET BREAKDOWN

Working off the Chairman's Mark, As Amended, all calculations are for changes above/below proposed Fiscal Year 2006 levels.

On behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus, this Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute seeks to offer to Congress and the American people an alternative budget that is fiscally responsible and aimed at reducing disparities in our communities. The CBC alternative budget raises revenue by reducing the tax cuts from 2001 and 2003 for an individual's adjusted gross income that exceeds \$200,000 and not adopting the new Republican tax cuts, eliminating corporate tax incentives for off-shoring jobs, closing tax loopholes, abusive shelters, and methods of tax avoidance, and eliminating the repeal of the limitation on itemized deductions (Pease) and the phase-out of personal exemptions (PEP) scheduled to take place between 2006 and 2010. These funds total an estimated \$36.3 billion in FY 2006. The CBC budget uses nearly \$4 billion of these additional revenues for deficit reduction. The remaining funds are used to restore cuts and fund increases in specific budget function areas. These include full funding for No Child Left Behind and providing funds for school construction and increases for other education and job training programs. The CBC alternative budget allocates additional funding for job creation programs under SBA, community and regional development programs including community development block grants, and law enforcement initiatives such as juvenile justice and prisoner reentry programs. It provides funding for child nutrition programs, community health centers, NASA research and development, Amtrak, Hope VI and Section 8 housing programs, and housing for the disabled and the elderly.

In addition, the CBC alternative budget reduces funding for the Ballistic Missile Defense program by \$7.8 billion. The CBC alternative budget reallocates all of this money for additional support for the troops in Iraq and other defense items necessary to maintain our military strength and jobs, homeland security needs, and veterans programs and benefits.

I. REVENUE RAISERS AND DEFENSE REALLOCATION [IN BILLIONS]

	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10
General (\$36.3 billion):					
Reduce Tax Cut					
Over \$200k	22.9	24.5	25.5	27.6	28.9
Elim Offshoring Incentives	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Closing Tax Loopholes	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Elim Repeal Pease & PEP	1.4	2.0	4.6	6.5	8.5
Defense (\$7.8 billion):					
Reduce Ballistic Missile Def.	7.8				
Total	44.1				

General Revenue Raisers

A reduction in the tax cuts from 2001 and 2003 for an individual's adjusted gross income that exceeds \$200,000; furthermore, the CBC budget alternative does not adopt the new Republican tax cuts.

Eliminating corporate tax incentives for off-shoring jobs.

The closing tax loopholes category includes closing abusive (tax) shelters and methods of tax avoidance.

Eliminating the repeal of the limitation on itemized deductions (Pease) and the phase-out of personal exemptions (PEP) scheduled to take place between 2006 and 2010.

The CBC budget applies nearly \$4 billion out of the general revenue to deficit reduction in Fiscal Year 2006.

Defense Reallocation

The cost of the Ballistic Missile Defense program is \$8.8 billion in Fiscal Year 2006. This budget leaves \$1 billion in that program for research and development.

All of the funds reduced from that program are then reallocated to additional support

for the troops in Iraq and other defense items necessary to maintain our military strength and jobs, homeland security needs (under the general allowances function), and veterans programs and benefits.

II. PROGRAMS (GENERAL): \$36.3 BILLION

All functions except Function 050 (National Defense), Function 700 (Veterans), and Function 920 (Allowances). All calculations are for changes above/below proposed Fiscal Year 2006 levels included in the Republican budget.

Function 150—International Affairs	+\$1 billion
Foreign Aid to Africa and the Caribbean	\$250 million
Global AIDS Initiative/State Department	\$500 million
Public Health and Preventable Illness Initiatives	\$250 million
Function 250—General Science, Space, and Technology	+\$500 million
NASA Aeronautics Research and Development	\$200 million
NASA Space Shuttle safety	\$100 million
Restore R & D funding for the NSF, DOE and NIST	\$170 million
NOAA Funding	\$30 million
Function 270—Energy	no change
Function 300—Natural Resources and Environment	+\$50 million
Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation Program	\$50 million
Function 350—Agriculture	+\$300 million
1890 Land-grant Historically Black Colleges and Universities	\$75 million
Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program	\$100 million
USDA Office of Civil Rights	\$25 million
Restore/modify draconian cuts in agriculture programs that affect minorities	\$100 million
Function 370—Commerce and Housing Credit	+\$1 billion
SBA Loan Programs—7(a), Microloan, PRIME, New Market Venture	\$145 million
Adult training and displaced workers program	\$185 million
Manufacturing Extension Partnership	\$70 million
Home Ownership Initiatives	\$600 million
Function 400—Transportation	+\$150 million
Amtrak	\$100 million
Public Transportation	\$50 million
Function 450—Community and Regional Development	+\$1.5 billion
Community Development Block Grants ...	\$1.122 billion

Brownfields Economic Development	\$24 million
Empowerment Zones ...	\$22 million
Community Development Financial Institutions	\$48 million
Economic Development Assistance	\$284 million
Function 500—Education and Training	+\$23.9 billion
School Construction ...	\$2.5 billion
Full Funding for No Child Left Behind, including:	\$12 billion
Title I	
Safe and Drug Free Schools	
21st Century Learning Centers	
Teacher Quality Programs	
Education Technology	
Fund for the Improvement of Education	
English Language Acquisition	
Migrant Education	
Elementary and Secondary School Counseling	\$50 million
Vocational Education ..	\$1.5 billion
Job Training	\$750 million
Adult Education	\$400 million
Pell Grants	\$450 million
Head Start	\$2 billion
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)	\$2 billion
Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)	\$500 million
Hispanic Serving Institutions	\$400 million
TRIO	\$500 million
Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP)	\$350 million
Perkins Loans	\$100 million
Impact Aid	\$300 million
SEOG	\$100 million
Function 550—Health	+\$1 billion
Minority Health and Eliminating Health Disparities	\$490 million
Community Health Centers	\$500 million
Office of Minority Health	\$10 million
Function 570—Medicare	no change
Function 600—Income Security	+\$2 billion
Section 8 Housing Program	\$880 million
HOPE VI	\$500 million
Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program	\$200 million
Child Nutrition Programs	\$200 million
Housing for the Disabled	\$120 million

Housing for the Elderly	\$100 million
Function 650—Social Security	no change
Function 750—Administration of Justice	+\$1 billion
Juvenile Justice	\$600 million
Department of Justice Prisoner Reentry Program	\$300 million
Weed and Seed and Drug Elimination Programs	\$100 million
Function 800—General Government	no change
Total General	\$32.4 billion
Amount to be applied to deficit reduction	\$3.9 billion

III. PROGRAMS (DEFENSE, HOMELAND SECURITY AND VETERANS): \$7.8 BILLION

All of the funds reduced from Ballistic Missile Defense are reallocated within various functions to provide for additional support for the troops in Iraq and other defense items necessary to maintain our military strength and jobs (\$1.1 billion), homeland security needs (\$2.05 billion), and veterans programs and benefits (\$4.65 billion). All calculations are for changes above/below proposed Fiscal Year 2006 levels included in the Republican budget.

Function 050—National Defense	-\$6.7 billion
Body armor, personal support equipment, and other protective gear for troops, and vehicle armor	\$75 million
Ammunition for Marine Corps	\$10 million
Small Arms for Army ..	\$10 million
Building/Maintenance of Navy ships	\$1 billion
To study instances of waste, fraud and abuse within DoD business processes and implement specific GAO recommendations for reform	\$5 million
Function 700—Veterans	+\$4.65 billion
Veterans Health Care ..	\$1 billion
Survivor Benefit Plan Disabled Veterans Tax ("concurrent receipt")	\$2.5 billion
Fund long-term care initiatives for veterans	\$400 million
Remove proposed \$250 enrollment fee on Priority 7&8 veterans	\$300 million
Remove proposed increases in co-payments for Priority 7&8 veterans	\$150 million
Prosthetic needs for veterans	\$100 million
VA Medical and Prosthetic Research	\$50 million
Mental Health Care for Veterans	\$50 million
Function 920—Allowances (all for purposes of Homeland Security)	+\$2.05 billion
Rail Security	\$100 million

Port Security, including air cargo screening, preventing nuclear/radiological weapons in cargo containers, research and development, and grants	\$500 million
Centers for Disease Control	\$250 million
First Responders	\$900 million
Interoperable communications systems for first responders	\$85 million
Federal air marshals ...	\$65 million
Internal Customs Enforcement/Border Patrol Agents	\$150 million

Total defense funds used, all of which are reallocated to defense, Homeland Security needs, and veterans programs and benefits

\$7.8 billion

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify one thing, and then I will just close. I heard a few minutes ago that our budget, the House resolution does not fund the war against global terrorism. In fact, it does. There is \$80 billion for 2004, plus an additional \$50 million for 2005.

Again, I want to thank the chairman for bringing up a budget. The problem with that budget again is that it kills job creation with huge tax increases. But if you believe in huge taxes, you should vote for their amendment and not vote against it. It has, again, huge additional spending of the hardearned money of the American taxpayers. It has huge reductions in defense spending in a time of war. And because of all those reasons, Mr. Chairman, by the way, it also assumes that there is no waste in the Federal budget whatsoever because it does not go after one penny, not one little penny of waste in the Federal budget.

And for those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully request that we vote down this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remaining part of my time.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman have time left that he might be able to yield to me instead of yielding back?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has yielded back his time and the gentleman from North Carolina has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself my remaining time, and I thank the gentleman for his time. I want to thank all of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, and I especially want to thank their staffs who have really gone to a lot of trouble to help us put this budget together. This is the budget, Members, that gives you the choice. And a budget is about making choices. That is really what a budget is.

In our own households, we have to make choices. The choices we have

made favor closing disparities that exist in our society that have been here for years and years. The choice we make is to fund No Child Left Behind fully, and not to fund a ballistic missile system that has been a failure, even though we allow research to continue on that front.

So I would ask our friends to face up to these choices and resolve them in a way that helps us close these disparities that have existed throughout the history in this country.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the CBC Budget, a common-sense framework that embraces our values, that focuses on fiscal discipline and that invests in our nation's future.

To be frank, the budget that President Bush presented us with is a betrayal of the trust that is placed in us as legislators. It violates the commitments that we have made to our children, to our veterans, and to our farmers and it does so while amassing mountains of debt, that we have no means of repaying.

I stand in support of the CBC Budget because it is a fiscally responsible alternative that targets the disparities that plague our communities and puts our priorities where they belong. It lowers the astronomical budget deficit, by eliminating corporate tax loopholes and abusive tax shelters at the same time that it lowers tax cuts for individuals making more than \$200,000 a year.

This adjustment would restore an estimated \$36.3 billion in FY 2006, including nearly \$4 billion for deficit reduction. We will fully fund No Child Left Behind; build and repair schools; increase investment in job training and job creation programs. We will not slash community and regional development programs, rather we will continue to invest in housing for those who need assistance. We provide funding for child nutrition programs, community health centers, NASA research and development, Amtrak, Hope VI and Section 8 housing programs, and housing for the disabled and the elderly. And we keep our commitments to our nation's farmers who are depending on us to keep the promises that we made in the 2002 Farm Bill.

Additionally, the CBC Budget allocates funding for Veterans and Defense above the president's requested level, to support our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, bolster our homeland security needs, and fully fund our veterans programs and benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in fiscal responsibility. I believe that in times of national and fiscal crisis, sacrifices need to be made. But, I also believe that they need to be made by all Americans. It is unfair to scale back government programs that benefit hard working families in order to fund tax cuts that most benefit the wealthiest of Americans. We all need to make sacrifices, but we must also keep our priorities straight.

I believe that the CBC Budget does just that.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, this Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget continues the CBC tradition of advocating for increased federal aid to education as the first priority of the world's only superpower. For the last ten years the Members of the CBC have boldly trumpeted the fact that there is an Education State-of-Emergency in the African American community and in the mainstream of America.

The American people enhanced by universal quality education constitute the greatest Weapon of Mass Construction our nation can have. To maintain this Weapon of Mass Construction, to maximize Homeland Security, education must be our front line of defense. To confront violent fanatics and zealots in the military arena our soldiers must be the best trained and most educated fighting force in the world. To maintain, expand and guide the most complex economic system in the history of our civilization in ways that guarantee continued prosperity we must accept nothing less than overwhelming supremacy in education.

Our budget must reflect this overwhelming quest for supremacy. Members of the CBC have proudly supported an increase of 23.9 billion dollars in the education budget. More specifically we have supported the following restorations and increases:

Function 500—Education and Training	+ \$23.9 billion
School Construction	\$2.5 billion
Full Funding for No Child Left Behind, including: Title I, Safe and Drug Free Schools, 21st Century Learning Centers, Teacher Quality Programs, Education Technology, Fund for the Improvement of Education, English Language Acquisition, and Migrant Education	\$12 billion
Elementary and Secondary School Counseling	\$50 million
Vocational Education	\$1.5 billion
Job Training	\$750 million
Adult Education	\$400 million
Pell Grants	\$450 million
Head Start	\$2 billion
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)	\$2 billion
Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)	\$500 million
Hispanic Serving Institutions	\$400 million
TRIO	\$500 million
Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP)	\$350 million
Perkins Loans	\$100 million
Impact Aid	\$300 million
SEOG	\$100 million

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 134, noes 292, answered “present” 3, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

AYES—134

Abercrombie	Baldwin	Bishop (NY)
Ackerman	Becerra	Blumenauer
Andrews	Berman	Brady (PA)
Baca	Bishop (GA)	Brown (OH)

Brown, Corrine	Jefferson	Pascarell
Butterfield	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor
Cardin	Jones (OH)	Payne
Carson	Kaptur	Pelosi
Clay	Kennedy (RI)	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rahall
Clyburn	Kucinich	Rangel
Conyers	Lantos	Rothman
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	LaTourette	Ruppersberger
Cummings	Lee	Rush
Davis (AL)	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Davis (FL)	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Sánchez, Linda T.
DeFazio	Lowey	Sanders
DeLauro	Lynch	Schakowsky
Dingell	Maloney	Scott (GA)
Doyle	Markey	Scott (VA)
Emanuel	Matsui	Serrano
Engel	McCollum (MN)	Sherman
Eshoo	McDermott	Skelton
Etheridge	McGovern	Slaughter
Evans	McKinney	Solis
Farr	McNulty	Stark
Fattah	Meehan	Thompson (MS)
Filner	Meek (FL)	Tierney
Frank (MA)	Meeks (NY)	Towns
Gonzalez	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Green, Al	Millender-McDonald	Van Hollen
Green, Gene	Miller (NC)	Velázquez
Grijalva	Miller, George	Wasserman
Gutierrez	Moore (WI)	Schultz
Hastings (FL)	Moran (VA)	Waters
Higgins	Nadler	Watson
Hinchee	Napolitano	Watt
Hinojosa	Neal (MA)	Waxman
Holt	Oberstar	Weiner
Honda	Obey	Wexler
Hoyer	Olver	Woolsey
Jackson (IL)	Owens	Wu
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Pallone	Wynn

NOES—292

Aderholt	Conaway	Hall
Akin	Cooper	Harman
Alexander	Costa	Harris
Allen	Costello	Hart
Bachus	Cox	Hastings (WA)
Baird	Cramer	Hayes
Baker	Crenshaw	Hayworth
Barrett (SC)	Culberson	Hefley
Barrow	Cunningham	Hensarling
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (CA)	Herger
Barton (TX)	Davis (KY)	Herseth
Bass	Davis (TN)	Hobson
Bean	Davis, Tom	Hoekstra
Beauprez	Deal (GA)	Holden
Berkley	DeGette	Hooley
Berry	DeLay	Hostettler
Biggert	Dent	Hulshof
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hunter
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hyde
Blackburn	Dicks	Inglis (SC)
Blunt	Doggett	Inslee
Boehlert	Doolittle	Israel
Boehner	Drake	Issa
Bonilla	Dreier	Istook
Bonner	Duncan	Jenkins
Bono	Edwards	Jindal
Boozman	Ehlers	Johnson (CT)
Boren	Emerson	Johnson (IL)
Bowell	English (PA)	Johnson, Sam
Boucher	Everett	Jones (NC)
Boustany	Feeney	Kanjorski
Boyd	Ferguson	Keller
Bradley (NH)	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Kelly
Brady (TX)	Flake	Kennedy (MN)
Brown (SC)	Foley	Kildee
Brown-Waite,	Forbes	Kind
Ginny	Fortenberry	King (IA)
Burgess	Fossella	King (NY)
Burton (IN)	Fox	Kingston
Buyer	Franks (AZ)	Kirk
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	Kline
Camp	Gallegly	Knollenberg
Cannon	Garrett (NJ)	Kolbe
Cantor	Gerlach	Kuhl (NY)
Capito	Gibbons	LaHood
Capps	Gilchrest	Langevin
Cardoza	Gillmor	Larsen (WA)
Carnahan	Gingrey	Latham
Carter	Goode	Leach
Case	Goodlatte	Lewis (CA)
Castle	Gordon	Lewis (KY)
Chabot	Granger	Linder
Chandler	Graves	Lipinski
Chocola	Green (WI)	LoBiondo
Cole (OK)	Gutknecht	Lucas

Lungren, Daniel E.	Peterson (PA)	Shuster
Mack	Peterson (TX)	Simmons
Manzullo	Pickering	Simpson
Marchant	Pitts	Smith (NJ)
Marshall	Platts	Smith (TX)
Matheson	Poe	Smith (WA)
McCarthy	Pombo	Snyder
McCaul (TX)	Pomeroy	Sodrel
McCotter	Porter	Souder
McCrery	Portman	Spratt
McHenry	Price (GA)	Stearns
McHugh	Pryce (OH)	Strickland
McIntyre	Putnam	Stupak
McKeon	Radanovich	Sullivan
McMorris	Ramstad	Sweeney
Melancon	Regula	Tancredo
Mica	Rehberg	Tanner
Michaud	Reichert	Tauscher
Miller (FL)	Renzi	Taylor (MS)
Miller (MI)	Reyes	Taylor (NC)
Miller, Gary	Reynolds	Terry
Mollohan	Rogers (AL)	Thomas
Moore (KS)	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (CA)
Moran (KS)	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Murphy	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
Murtha	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiberi
Musgrave	Ross	Turner
Myrick	Royce	Udall (CO)
Neugebauer	Ryan (WI)	Upton
Ney	Ryun (KS)	Visclosky
Northup	Salazar	Walden (OR)
Norwood	Sanchez, Loretta	Walsh
Nunes	Saxton	Wamp
Nussle	Schiff	Weldon (FL)
Ortiz	Schwartz (PA)	Weldon (PA)
Osborne	Schwartz (MI)	Weller
Otter	Sensenbrenner	Westmoreland
Oxley	Sessions	Whitfield
Paul	Shadegg	Wicker
Pearce	Shaw	Wilson (NM)
Pence	Shays	Wilson (SC)
Peterson (MN)	Sherwood	Wolf
	Shimkus	Young (AK)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—3

Capuano	Davis, Jo Ann	Ford
---------	---------------	------

NOT VOTING—5

Coble	Delahunt	Young (FL)
Cubin	Gohmert	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mrs. BIGGERT) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1328

Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. GRAVES, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. LANGEVIN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. CARDIN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. KAPTUR, and MESSRS. DINGELL, LEVIN and DAVIS of Florida changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion to rise offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 101, noes 313, answered “present” 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

AYES—101

Abercrombie Gonzalez Napolitano
Ackerman Gordon Neal (MA)
Allen Green, Al Oberstar
Andrews Grijalva Owens
Baird Gutierrez Pastor
Baldwin Hastings (FL) Payne
Becerra Higgins Pelosi
Berkley Hinchey Rangel
Berry Holt Rothman
Bishop (NY) Hooley Roybal-Allard
Blumenauer Inslee Rush
Boyd Israel Ryan (OH)
Brown (OH) Jackson (IL) Sabo
Brown, Corrine Johnson, E. B.
Butterfield Jones (OH) Sánchez, Linda
Capuano Kaptur T.
Carnahan Kennedy (RI) Sanders
Carson Kind Schakowsky
Clay Kucinich Serrano
Cleaver Larson (CT) Sherman
Conyers Lee Slaughter
Costello Lewis (GA) Smith (WA)
Crowley Maloney Solis
Davis (AL) Markey Strickland
Davis (FL) Matsui Taylor (MS)
Davis (IL) McGovern Thompson (MS)
DeFazio McKinney Tierney
DeLauro Meehan Towns
Emanuel Meeks (NY) Udall (CO)
Eshoo Millender Van Hollen
Evans McDonald Velázquez
Farr Miller, George Wasserman
Fattah Moore (WI) Schultz
Filner Moran (VA) Waters
Frank (MA) Nadler Watson

NOES—313

Aderholt Cubin Hart
Akin Cuellar Hastings (WA)
Alexander Culberson Hayes
Baca Cunningham Hayworth
Bachus Davis (CA) Hefley
Baker Davis (KY) Hensarling
Barrett (SC) Davis (TN) Herger
Barrow Davis, Jo Ann Herseth
Bartlett (MD) Davis, Tom Hobson
Barton (TX) Deal (GA) Hoekstra
Bass DeGette Holden
Bean DeLay Honda
Beauprez Dent Hostettler
Berman Diaz-Balart, L. Hoyer
Biggert Diaz-Balart, M. Hulshof
Bilirakis Dicks Hunter
Bishop (GA) Dingell Hyde
Bishop (UT) Doggett Ingalls (SC)
Blackburn Doyle Issa
Blunt Drake Istook
Boehlert Dreier Jefferson
Bonilla Duncan Jenkins
Bonner Edwards Jindal
Bono Ehlers Johnson (CT)
Boozman Emerson Johnson (IL)
Boren Engel Johnson, Sam
Boswell English (PA) Jones (NC)
Boucher Etheridge Kanjorski
Boustany Everett Keller
Bradley (NH) Feeney Kelly
Brady (PA) Ferguson Kennedy (MN)
Brady (TX) Fitzpatrick (PA) Kildee
Brown (SC) Flake Kilpatrick (MI)
Brown-Waite, Foley King (IA)
Ginny Forbes King (NY)
Burgess Ford Kingston
Burton (IN) Fortenberry Kirk
Buyer Fossella Kline
Calvert Foxx Knollenberg
Camp Franks (AZ) Kolbe
Cannon Frelinghuysen Kuhl (NY)
Cantor Gallegly LaHood
Capito Garrett (NJ) Langevin
Capps Gerlach Lantos
Cardin Gibbons Latham
Carter Gilchrest LaTourette
Case Gillmor Leach
Castle Gingrey Levin
Chabot Gohmert Lewis (CA)
Chandler Goode Lewis (KY)
Chocola Goodlatte Linder
Clyburn Granger Lipinski
Cole (OK) Graves LoBiondo
Conaway Green (WI) Lofgren, Zoe
Cooper Green, Gene Lowey
Costa Gutknecht Lucas
Cox Hall Lungren, Daniel
Cramer Harman E.
Crenshaw Harris Lynch

Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shinkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Obey

NOT VOTING—19

Boehner Jackson-Lee Stark
Cardoza (TX) Sullivan
Coble Larsen (WA) Watt
Cummings McCotter Waxman
Delahunt McDermott Woolsey
Doolittle Ney Young (FL)
Hinojosa Oliver

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BISHOP of Utah) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1351

Messrs. MARCHANT, POMEROY, BOREN, HONDA and RUPPERSBERGER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to rise was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote No. 86, on the motion that the Committee rise. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall vote No. 86.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 109-19.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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

Amendment No. 4 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SPRATT:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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

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 2015 are set forth.

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 2015:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,487,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,616,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,740,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$1,873,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$1,998,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,112,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,287,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,494,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,629,382,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: \$2,775,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: \$2,927,959,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2005: \$3,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$9,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$20,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$37,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$42,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$46,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$0.
Fiscal year 2012: \$0.
Fiscal year 2013: \$0.
Fiscal year 2014: \$0.
Fiscal year 2015: \$0.

(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: \$2,073,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$2,164,495,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$2,243,088,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,363,415,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,486,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,593,294,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,717,544,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,792,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,923,694,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: \$3,051,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: \$3,187,568,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2005: \$2,055,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$2,170,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$2,239,707,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,340,321,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,450,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,563,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,693,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: \$2,758,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: \$2,893,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: \$3,019,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: \$3,154,637,000,000.

(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: \$554,154,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: \$499,486,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$466,686,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$452,320,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$450,442,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$405,351,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$264,797,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$264,027,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$243,729,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$226,678,000,000.

(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: \$7,958,233,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006: \$8,624,174,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007: \$9,240,066,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$9,830,945,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$10,411,560,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$10,995,340,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$11,531,493,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$11,942,708,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$12,347,979,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$12,734,145,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$13,102,135,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2005: \$4,685,413,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006: \$5,061,151,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007: \$5,364,948,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$5,618,176,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$5,838,595,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$6,040,401,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$6,180,515,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$6,167,267,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$6,142,850,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014: \$6,089,270,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015: \$6,012,424,000,000.

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 2015 for each major functional category are:

(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.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$527,137,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$524,649,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$540,658,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$529,197,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$554,406,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$546,731,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2014:
 (A) New budget authority, \$568,726,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$560,789,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, \$583,342,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$575,262,000,000.
 (2) International Affairs (150):
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,085,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,166,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,718,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,097,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,835,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,359,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,197,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,397,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,237,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,115,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,928,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,643,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,089,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,375,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,251,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,332,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,951,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,770,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,713,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,388,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,377,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,165,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology

(250):

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,413,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,594,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,757,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,164,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,181,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,612,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,704,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,038,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,219,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,525,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,738,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,026,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,005,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,415,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,274,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,711,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,547,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,984,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,822,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,257,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,099,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,529,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,564,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$794,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,308,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,128,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,175,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,643,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,327,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,366,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,225,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,717,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,278,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,927,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,910,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,597,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,942,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,839,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,975,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,764,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,006,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,014,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,041,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,255,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,527,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,168,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,382,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,484,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,548,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,740,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,437,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,072,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,111,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,390,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,946,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,269,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,731,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,790,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,704,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,523,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,572,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,235,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,606,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,039,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,620,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,935,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,151,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,550,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,371,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,078,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,115,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,958,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,829,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,771,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,357,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,450,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,383,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,560,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,209,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,449,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,953,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,237,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,015,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,262,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,134,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,390,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,077,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,354,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,804,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,302,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,452,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,860,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,796,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,226,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,817,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,913,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$5,116,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,565,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$6,394,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$11,914,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,973,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,129,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,130,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$72,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$67,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$74,479,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$71,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$76,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$75,331,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$78,975,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$77,196,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$81,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$76,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$82,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$77,820,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$83,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$79,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$83,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$80,694,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$84,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$82,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$85,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$83,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$86,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$85,917,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,007,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,190,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,884,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,837,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,211,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,777,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,099,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$94,001,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$92,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$100,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$92,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$97,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$95,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$97,765,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$96,341,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$99,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$97,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$102,177,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$99,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$104,062,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$102,156,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$105,630,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$103,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$107,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$105,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$109,127,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$107,224,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$111,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$109,057,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$257,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$252,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$264,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$263,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$279,286,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$277,318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$299,465,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$297,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$322,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$318,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$343,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$341,356,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$368,302,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$365,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$393,878,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$391,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$421,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$418,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$452,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$449,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$485,809,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$482,145,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$292,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$293,587,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$331,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$331,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$371,899,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$372,191,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$395,312,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$395,364,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$420,234,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$419,828,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$448,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$448,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$487,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$487,199,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$511,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$511,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$560,039,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$560,317,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$605,854,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$605,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$656,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$655,599,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$339,184,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$347,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$349,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$355,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$356,831,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$361,653,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$371,394,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$375,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$382,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$384,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$393,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$395,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$408,830,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$410,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$396,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$398,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$412,123,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$412,753,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$423,634,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$422,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$434,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$433,325,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,849,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,849,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,891,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,704,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,704,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$21,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,743,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$24,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$27,837,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,837,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,885,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, \$36,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$36,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, \$39,528,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$39,528,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$68,873,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$70,467,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$69,468,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$68,989,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$68,394,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$72,368,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$72,077,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$74,049,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$73,591,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$75,768,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$75,213,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$80,114,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$79,717,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$77,261,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$76,588,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$82,351,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$81,772,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$84,597,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$84,014,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$86,855,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$86,257,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,817,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,501,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,980,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,148,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,697,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,381,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,786,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,066,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,896,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,723,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,041,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$44,753,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,241,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$45,828,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,455,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$47,032,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,714,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$48,282,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,014,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$49,575,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$54,212,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$53,760,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,748,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,656,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,017,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,308,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,164,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,999,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,024,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,054,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,325,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,296,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,545,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,705,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,929,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,172,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,412,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,890,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,944,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,457,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,890,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,995,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,548,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$267,942,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$267,942,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$310,255,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$310,255,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$358,985,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$358,985,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$395,851,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$395,851,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$424,099,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$424,099,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$450,267,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$450,267,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$474,290,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$474,290,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$494,088,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$494,088,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$508,705,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$508,705,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$524,530,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$524,530,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$538,755,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$538,755,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$11,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$4,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$2,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

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

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

(20) 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, —\$55,351,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$55,351,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, —\$63,253,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$64,378,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, —\$65,171,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$65,983,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, —\$61,868,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$61,243,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, —\$64,440,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$63,815,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, —\$67,045,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$66,545,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, —\$69,168,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$68,980,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, —\$72,566,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$72,566,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, —\$74,924,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$74,924,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, —\$76,984,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$76,984,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS AND CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE**Subtitle A—Reserve Funds****SEC. 201. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR THE UNINSURED.**

In the House, if legislation is reported, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides affordable, comprehensive health insurance to the uninsured and builds upon and strengthens public and private coverage, including preventing the erosion of existing coverage under Medicaid, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations and aggregates to the extent such measure is deficit neutral (whether by changes in revenues or direct spending) in fiscal year 2006 and for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2015.

SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR NEGOTIATION OF LOWER MEDICARE DRUG PRICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Energy and Commerce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides for a reduction in new budget authority and outlays under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act through authority described in subsection (b), insofar as such measure does not provide for new budget authority in the form of a reduction in beneficiary cost-sharing (which may include the partial or complete elimination of the so-called donut hole) under such part, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall revise the appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations of new budget authority and outlays to reflect any resulting new savings from such measure.

(b) AUTHORITY DEFINED.—For purposes of subsection (a), the authority described in this subsection is authority for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate prescription drug prices under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, which may include either or both of the following:

(1) Authority to negotiate prescription drug prices similar to the authority used by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Defense, and the heads of other Federal agencies and departments in the purchase of prescription drugs.

(2) Other methods that lower the price of covered part D drugs under such part D.

Subtitle B—Contingency Procedure**SEC. 211. 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 III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any of the following periods:

- (1) The budget year.
- (2) The period of the budget year and the next 4 fiscal years.
- (3) The period of the 5 fiscal years following the period specified in paragraph (2).

(b) **ON-BUDGET DEFICIT.**—

(1) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, the term “on-budget deficit” means a budget deficit that occurs in any year in which total outlays exceed total revenues, counting Federal revenues and outlays, except those of the old age, survivors and disability insurance trust funds established under title II of the Social Security Act, as provided in subtitle C, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

(c) **DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(d) **EXPIRATION.**—This section shall expire on December 31, 2015.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

SEC. 401. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON DEFENSE PRIORITIES.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) increasing Service members Group Life Insurance (SGLI) coverage to \$400,000 and providing free coverage to those in combat, and increasing the death gratuity to \$100,000, are high priorities which should not have been omitted from the President's budget request;

(2) continuing targeted pay increases for enlisted personnel and increasing reenlistment bonuses are also high priorities which should not have been omitted from the President's budget request because they are critical to the retention of experienced personnel;

(3) increasing funds for family service centers to support families of deploying service members is a high priority, and the President's budget should have requested sufficient funding for this purpose;

(4) increasing funds for community-based health care organizations is a high priority to enable injured service men and women to receive the care they need close to home, and the President's budget should have included sufficient funding for this purpose;

(5) funding cooperative threat reduction and nuclear nonproliferation programs at a level adequate to the task and the risks to our nation is also a high priority and was recommended five years ago by the Baker-Cutler Commission, and the President's budget should have requested sufficient funding in this area;

(6) funding the Missile Defense Agency at a substantial but lower level will ensure a more measured acquisition strategy, yet still support a robust ballistic missile defense program;

(7) funding satellite research, development, and procurement at a level above the amount enacted for 2005 but below the amount requested for 2006, which represents an increase of more than 50 percent, will provide adequate funding for new satellite technologies, while ensuring a more prudent acquisition strategy;

(8) improving financial management at the Department of Defense should identify billions of dollars of obligations and disbursements which the Government Accountability Office has found that the Department of Defense cannot account for, and should result in substantial annual savings;

(9) all savings that accrue from the actions recommended in paragraphs (6) through (8) should be used to fund higher priorities within the national security function of the budget, function 050, and especially those high priorities identified in paragraphs (1) through (5), as well as a strong ship force and defense-related homeland security activities.

SEC. 402. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON EXTENSION OF THE PAY-AS-YOU-GO RULE OF 1997.

It is the sense of the House that in order to reduce the deficit, Congress should extend PAYGO in its original form in the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, making the rule apply both to tax decreases and to mandatory spending increases.

SEC. 403. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING FUNDING FOR THE MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) this resolution provides a total of \$110 million for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership for 2006, \$63 million more than the President's request, and supports adequate funding throughout the period covered by this resolution; and

(2) this funding protects the viability of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership and provides the necessary resources for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership to continue helping small manufacturers reach their optimal performance and create jobs.

SEC. 404. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON EDUCATION.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the resolution rejects the President's cuts to elementary and secondary education, as well as the President's proposals to increase student costs for college loans and to cut or eliminate programs that help students obtain a post-secondary education;

(2) the resolution provides a \$100 annual increase in the maximum Pell Grant award in each of the next ten years, and assumes increased efficiency in the student loan programs; and

(3) the mandatory levels in this resolution provide the \$4.3 billion needed to eliminate the current shortfall in the Pell Grant program, restoring the program to a sound financial basis.

SEC. 405. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) this resolution provides additional homeland security funding above the President's requested level for 2006 and every subsequent year;

(2) this resolution provides \$9,800,000,000 above the President's requested level for 2006, and greater amounts in subsequent years, in the four budget functions (Function 400, Transportation; Function 450, Community and Regional Development; Function 550, Health; and Function 750, Administration of Justice) which fund most nondefense homeland security activities; and

(3) the homeland security funding provided in this resolution will help to strengthen the security of our Nation's transportation system and other critical infrastructure, including our seaports, and help secure our borders, increase the preparedness of our public health system, train and equip our first responders, and otherwise strengthen the Nation's homeland security.

SEC. 406. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING PAY PARITY.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) compensation for civilian and military employees of the United States, without whom we cannot successfully serve and protect our citizens and taxpayers, must be sufficient to support our critical efforts to recruit, retain, and reward quality people effectively and responsibly; and

(2) to achieve this objective, the rate of increase in the compensation of civilian employees should be equal to that proposed for the military in the President's fiscal year 2006 budget.

SEC. 407. POLICY.

It is the policy of this budget resolution to balance long-term deficit reduction with middle-income tax relief. To this end, this resolution assumes tax relief, subject to the PAYGO requirements as imposed in section 301, which includes the following:

- (1) extension of the child tax credit;
- (2) extension of marriage penalty relief;
- (3) extension of the 10 percent individual bracket;
- (4) modification of the alternative minimum tax to minimize its impact on middle-income taxpayers;
- (5) elimination of estate taxes on all but the very largest estates by reforming and substantially increasing the unified credit;
- (6) extension of the research and experimentation tax credit;
- (7) extension of the deduction for State and local sales taxes.

To meet the revenue requirements of this resolution and to comply with the PAYGO requirements imposed in section 301, this budget resolution assumes revenue measures such as: strengthening tax compliance; imposing measures to close corporate tax avoidance devices; and continuing the current limitations on personal exemptions and itemized deductions (so-called “PEP” and

"Pease")—the repeal of which disproportionately benefits taxpayers with annual incomes exceeding \$1 million.

SEC. 408. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION.

It is the sense of the House that the budget should reject the cuts to Amtrak in the President's budget and should provide sufficient resources to allow Amtrak to carry forward its mission.

SEC. 409. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON TAX SIMPLIFICATION AND TAX FAIRNESS.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the current tax system has been made increasingly complex and unfair to the detriment of the vast majority of working Americans;

(2) constant change and manipulation of the tax code have adverse effects on taxpayers understanding and trust in the Nation's tax laws;

(3) these increases in complexity and lack of clarity have made compliance more challenging for the average taxpayer and small business owner; and

(4) this budget resolution contemplates a comprehensive review of recent changes in the tax code, leading to future action to reduce the tax burden and compliance burden for middle-income workers and their families in the context of tax reform that makes the Federal tax code simpler and fairer to all taxpayers, and ensures that this generation of Americans does not force future generations to pay our bills.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 154, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to personally thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) so much for the work that he has done in having the record make it clear that we in the House of Representatives did have an alternative to what was presented to us.

There is a lot of talk about moral values that we hear about politically; but I do not care what your religious background is, there are always these stories about the sick and the poor in need; and on the other side, the option is for the rich and the greedy and the insensitive.

You do not have to be a Republican or a Democrat when you look at the document that was placed before us by the majority and then to take a look at the compassion and the common sense that is involved in the alternative that the gentleman from South Carolina and his team have brought to us. But I am not here to talk about compassion. I am too old to believe that it is going to change.

I am here to talk about national security, national security at a time that we are going through these economic deficits. It would just seem to me that

it would make a lot of sense if we invested in our young people that are going to school, to make them more productive and make them tax-paying. It seems to me it would make a lot of sense to invest in someone's health so that they would not have to go to community centers, which are being cut back, that they would not have to go into the hospitals.

It seems to me that we would have a sense of national security by thanking our veterans who fight the war, keep the spirits up and not tax them for getting sick or having ailments. It seems to me that in the final analysis, what we have done is borrow money and ask that we make these tremendous tax cuts permanent and whatever our kids get and our grandchildren get will be the debt that this body can possibly place on them.

I just hope that somewhere along the line someone would say that if you really care about this country, that you will care about all of its people, you will be concerned about its working people and be concerned in making Social Security something that will be guaranteed for them because we promised them that it would be.

But I do not think that anyone takes this budget seriously, not if you leave out of it the alternative minimum tax, which no one would want to be able to tell their constituents that this \$600 billion tax increase that we are going to place on them, that we did not mean to do it; and no matter how many cities the President goes to, no one would believe that he was sincere about reforming the Social Security system when he knows, Republicans know, Democrats know, that it is going to take money to do this and that is not in the budget. And there are so many other things that are left out. Even the money that is paid into Social Security, that is not counted as a part of our debt.

But one day, just one day, historians or maybe our kids and grandkids are going to ask each and every one of us, when this country was going into this deficit hellhole and when the poor were becoming poorer and the sick, we were cutting their benefits, what were you doing and how were you voting, and I am glad that we will have an opportunity just not to be able to vote against what the majority has given us, but that we have an alternative that the gentleman from South Carolina and the minorities on the Budget Committee and so many others have worked together to say that we are proud to be Americans, we are proud to be Members of Congress, and we are proud that we voted the right way.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), a member of the committee.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in strong opposition to the Spratt amendment. I respect the ranking member and the work that he has

put into the Budget Committee, but I have to clarify a number of points that have been made by the prior speaker.

This budget goes a long way toward laying out priorities for this Nation. We have through this process been afforded the opportunity to see a variety of different sets of priorities. Members have had the opportunity to vote on four different blueprints for this Nation, across the ideological and political spectrum. I think that is a healthy thing. I do not think that happens enough in this House where we have good solid debate like this. The differences amongst those priorities, though, are stark.

Our budget lays out a blueprint that invests in defense and invests in homeland security, two things that we find to be most urgent at a time when our Nation has come under attack recently and where we are engaged in conflict against terrorism around the world. We create in this budget blueprint an opportunity for policies to move forward that create jobs, that allow for continued economic expansion, that allow us to build upon the fact that homeownership is at its highest rate ever, that Americans are enjoying a lower tax burden that allows them to make decisions about their children's higher education, about their small business, about their opportunity to carve out their piece of the American Dream.

It does not raise taxes on those same small business men and women who are taxed at the individual rate because they are an S corporation, because they are a small business, because they are the neighborhood barber or diner or farmer. We lay out a policy that also calls for fiscal restraint, and we balance the approach to fiscal restraint on both the discretionary side of the ledger and the mandatory side of the ledger.

For those who are uninformed about Washingtonese, the mandatory side of the ledger now consumes over half of the Federal budget and soon will consume over two-thirds. It is on automatic pilot. You cannot get your arms around the deficit without tackling mandatory spending. Our side knows that. The other side knows that.

You cannot be serious about budget reform without simultaneously addressing discretionary spending and mandatory spending. We do that. We shave the rate of growth by one-tenth of 1 percent. Yet the New Testament is invoked on a regular basis from the other side's talking points to claim that there will be blood in the streets, that there will be mass pandemonium and starvation because one-tenth of 1 percent of mandatory spending's rate of growth has been shaven off.

On the discretionary side, we bring eight-tenths of a percent cut to programs that have experienced double-digit increases over the last decade. You cannot look at the spending history of this House and this Congress' budget in veterans, in students with disabilities, in HUD, in education, in

homeland security and defense and find anyone who has experienced real pain or real cuts in the last decade. There have been substantial increases. Our budget lays out that priority, investing in defense, creating economic opportunity and beginning that long process of making tough decisions, the decisions we are paid to make to get our arms around the deficit so that future generations are not burdened and that the current generation, current workers, current employers, current small businesses are not seeing their tax burden go up.

Vote for the underlying House budget and defeat the Spratt amendment.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, 5 years ago, the budget was in surplus. Hard to believe, but it was in surplus by \$236 billion. We are here today grappling with a deficit of \$427 billion, the deficit expected this year, basically because of policy choices that were made since 2001, made since President Bush came to office.

□ 1400

The Bush administration bet the budget on a blue sky estimate and went for huge tax cuts that left no margin for error. I stood here in the well of this House in 2001 and warned that those projections of \$5.6 trillion surplus could disappear in a blink of an economist's eye. When the surpluses of \$5.6 trillion failed to materialize, the budget sank into deficit: \$375 billion in 2003, \$412 billion in 2004, and an expected \$427 billion this year and on and on and on.

I know there have been random events that no one foresaw, terrorism, and recession, but that is part of budgeting, reserving for such contingencies. The Bush Republican budgets of the last 4 years not only failed to provide for such contingencies, by budgeting right to the margin, but when deficits replaced surpluses, nevertheless they kept coming with tax cuts, tax cuts after tax cuts. This budget has \$106 billion in additional tax cuts included in it, knowing full well that all of those tax cuts will go straight to the bottom line and will add dollar for dollar to the deficit. That is one reason that the CBO says, in yesterday's production of the President's budget, that the President's budget makes this deficit worse, not better, by \$1.6 trillion. In other words, if we left it on autopilot, at current services, it would be \$1.6 trillion more in implementing the President's budget.

So let us be clear. We are here because of policy choices that Republicans have made, the White House and the Congress, over the last 4 years, and you were forewarned and took the risk. Given the thrust of this budget that is before us, we will be back grappling again for years to come with deficits as far as the eye can see.

Sitting here for the last 2 days I have heard their budget praised warmly by

Members on the other side, and there are features of it, frankly, that I would praise too. For example, it includes \$50 billion, as a rough cost, for our forces in Iraq and Afghanistan for another year, which is more than one can say for the President's budget, which does not include a dime. But this budget excludes the likely cost, according to CBO, in 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, which CBO estimates to be \$384 billion. This budget stops abruptly in 2010, running out 5 years of numbers instead of 10 years of numbers. That is a convenient place to stop because it avoids recognizing the cost of Social Security privatization, which the administration acknowledges will be \$754 billion between 2009 and 2015, but which it omits from the budget altogether. And while it calls for renewal of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, with the revenue impact of \$1.6 trillion, not a dime of that revenue loss is included because it falls after 2010, but it clearly affects the outyears. Add back these omitted items, and it is clear there is no way, no way, that we are going to cut the deficit in half in 4 years, 5 years, 6 years. Indeed if we pass Social Security privatization, as the President proposes, it will add \$4.9 trillion, as this chart shows, to the deficits of the United States over the next 20 years. In that case we will not see the budget balanced again in our lifetime. That is an undeniable fact, but it is a fact that this budget avoids acknowledging.

Sitting here for the last 2 days, I have also heard the claim that this budget takes on entitlements. In fact, the gentleman who was in the well just before me emphasized this as one of the sterling features of this amendment. But let us be clear. It does not take on Social Security. I do not think it should, but it does not. It does not take on Medicare. It does not do anything to the farm program.

The chairman here has made it clear that these are not to be the objects of reconciliation savings. Reconciliation will mainly fall on Medicaid and on other programs like Medicaid, Medicaid being the health care program of last resort for the least among us. The President has proposed cutting Medicaid over 10 years by \$60 billion, but when the Congressional Budget Office scored his savings and said we cannot find \$20 billion of savings here, maybe 13, maybe 14, but not \$20 billion in these proposals, nevertheless, the committee has said to the Committee on Energy and Commerce to cut \$20 billion anyway. Three Governors were here to speak with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and me and to plead with us, "Please do not subject us to an arbitrary budget savings number. This program needs to be reformed. It needs to be restructured, but do not let reform be driven by an arbitrary number."

That is exactly what this budget resolution does. It lets reform be driven by an arbitrary savings number. It cannot tell us what, where, or how those

savings will be achieved. When what is off limits in the \$68 billion of reconciliation is made clear, we can see where the cuts are likely to fall. Medicaid for sure, big-time cuts, but also the earned income tax credit, the child care and development block grant, food stamps, TANF, veterans benefits. In other words, the safety net. These cuts will shred the safety net. They are not intended for the major entitlement programs but for the smaller ones that are for the least of these who need the help, the most vulnerable among us.

It will be argued, I know, that this is necessary to balance the budget, but, in truth, none of the \$68 billion in reconciliation savings goes to balance the budget. That is because it is more than offset by the \$106 billion in additional tax cuts. When we net these out, there is no spending reduction to put on the bottom line. There is no net reduction to the bottom line. The bottom line actually gets worse. Instead of using these mandatory spending cuts in Medicaid to reduce the deficit, as they would have us assume, these cuts actually are used to offset tax cuts. For whom we do not know, but, nevertheless, we do know they do not go to the bottom line and they do not mitigate the deficit.

So there are major problems in this budget, particularly when it comes to the key objective, and that is reduction of the deficit. And I will return to that in a minute.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished whip on the House Democratic side.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this Republican budget conclusively demonstrates one thing: that when it comes to audacity, our friends on the other side of the aisle have an unlimited supply.

Yesterday Republican leaders, including the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), majority leader; and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules, claimed on this floor that the policies adopted by the Republican Party last year reduced last year's budget deficit by \$109 billion. What an extraordinary Lewis Carroll "Alice in Wonderland" representation.

You incurred over \$350 billion of deficit, as you well know. The only thing you reduced was the inflated figure the White House came with at the beginning of the year. A figure that, by the way, was supposed to be zero, as I recall, the 2001 budget.

On the Republican Party's watch, the Federal Government recorded the worst budget deficit in American history, \$412 billion in fiscal year 2004. Four hundred and twelve billion dollars of deficit spending, and that is counting using every nickel of Social Security, which you said you were not going to do, which the President said you were not going to do. And you had a "lockbox." It is a sieve box.

Our Republican friends, it appears, are the only people who believe that a \$412 billion deficit is something to brag about. For years they have preened as fiscal conservatives, but in less than 48 months they have turned the projected 10-year budget surplus, a \$5.6 trillion surplus that they were handed, that President Bush from this rostrum said we had as a result of the 8 years of the Clinton administration, \$5.6 trillion, into a deficit today in 48 months. I will put up 8. Forty-eight months, \$4 trillion dollars. That is a \$9.6 trillion turnaround or \$2 trillion plus a year.

We ought to be ashamed of that. We ought to be ashamed to tell our children that that is what we have done to them. We ought to be ashamed to tell our grandchildren, of which I have three, that that is what we have done to them and their generation. We have added more than \$2.2 trillion to the national debt in 48 months. The entire debt of the United States of America from 1789 to 1981, when I came to Congress, was \$985 billion, cumulative debt. From 1789 to 1981, \$985 billion. Last year we raised the debt \$984 billion in one year. That is the height of fiscal irresponsibility, and I suggest it is also a fiscally immoral act and is the abuse of our children and grandchildren and generations yet to come, who in their time will face a challenge perhaps like Iraq, perhaps like AIDS, perhaps a tsunami or other natural disaster, and they will look around for resources to respond to their crisis in their time and say, oh, my goodness, the resources were spent by this Congress and by the previous Congress. What a shame.

The Democratic budget that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) offers has balance by 2012. It has the PAYGO system, which Mr. Greenspan is for, but you are not for because you do not want to pay. You talk about cutting taxes or raising taxes, but what you are really saying is you do not want to pay for what you are buying. And you buy because all the spending that we have incurred is in your budgets. All of the spending is in budgets. We cannot control the budgets. So all of the spending, but there is very little of the pain. That is fiscally irresponsible.

I would like to see who is going to vote for the bankruptcy bill when it comes on the floor that want responsible borrowers.

I will vote for the Spratt alternative because it is a responsible alternative, and I will enthusiastically and proudly and morally vote against the Republican alternative.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), our distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for his hard work on this budget and for yielding me this time to talk about his budget and this alternative.

Certainly his committee and he under his leadership have worked hard to bring us a fiscally responsible budget. The base bill we are debating today is the most fiscally conservative budget resolution we have considered since we joined the Congress.

The cuts we are hearing about in Medicaid are really a reduction of the growth. The cut in Medicaid, as I read the base budget, is a cut in the growth rate of 7.5 percent to a growth rate of 7.3 percent. Where I live, and I suspect where most of us live, 7.3 percent growth would not be seen as a cut.

The committee's budget permits us to extend recently enacted tax relief so that American families will not see a tax increase. What we have found is that if we trust the American people and American families, our economy grows again and it is growing. Passage of the committee's budget will provide for a real reduction of nearly 1 percent in nonsecurity discretionary spending. After holding the line on that category of spending at almost no growth in the last budget year, we hope to do even better this year and actually have a reduction of 1 percent below last year's spending.

Furthermore, the budget calls for a reduction in the rate of growth of mandatory spending. In addition to reducing spending, this bill will ultimately save taxpayers almost \$69 billion over the next 5 years. Only rarely has the Congress even been willing to discuss looking at mandatory spending. Almost all of our debate about spending is about the increasingly declining percentage of the budget that is discretionary. We are increasingly losing our control over the budget because we have not been willing to tackle mandatory spending.

□ 1415

The chairman's budget, the committee's budget, says that mandatory spending can be, must be, and will be dealt with. It sets the targets for the authorizing committees to do their work and find the places to make this process more efficient and cut the growth in spending in those mandatory categories that the chairman's budget, the committee's budget, sets out. That does put us on a path to cutting the deficit in half within 5 years.

The chairman's budget, the committee's budget, Mr. Chairman, is a good budget. I am proud of the work the Budget Committee and the chairman have done. I urge we move this budget forward today, we do the tough things in discretionary spending and mandatory spending it asks us to do, that we defeat the substitute and get on with our work.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), a member of the committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, we have now come down to two budgets: one offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) and the majority and the most fiscally responsible budget we have seen in quite some time here; and another budget that wants to tax more and spend more, and that is their answer to the Nation's fiscal woes.

Clearly, we agree that this Nation has a deficit and a deficit that is too large. But those on the other side of the aisle seem to act like spending has nothing to do with the equation in the deficit. We have been spending money here at over twice the rate of inflation, 50 percent faster. The Federal budget has been growing 50 percent faster than the family budget. We are on an unsustainable growth path on the growth of Federal Government. We must do something to control the growth of Federal Government.

Now, previous speakers, I believe, have used the term "auto pilot," that this budget puts the Nation on auto pilot. Well, let me tell you about the auto pilot that their budget puts this Nation on. That is an auto pilot that, if we do not do anything about spending, according to the General Accounting Office we are heading to a future where we will have to double Federal taxes or cut Federal spending by 50 percent.

Well, they do not want to cut any Federal spending. So what that means is we are on auto pilot to double Federal taxes on the American family.

Now, frankly, on our side, we have done our part. Tax revenues are up. We listened to the other side, and they talk about all the massive tax cuts. Well, I am sitting here, Mr. Chairman, and I have the latest reports out of the Congressional Budget Office. And guess what? We have cut marginal tax rates on the American family on small businesses. And guess what? Tax revenues have increased. Tax revenues are up. People go out and they save more and they invest more and they start small businesses.

I was in Jacksonville, Texas, a small town in my district, not too long ago and visited with a small business there that does aluminum die casting. Prior to the Bush tax relief package, they were getting ready because of competitive pressures to have to lay off two people. But because of tax relief, they were able to modernize their plant and equipment, and instead of laying off two people, they hired three new people. Now, that is five people that could have been on welfare, five people that could have been on unemployment. But instead, five people who represent part of that over two million new jobs that have been created in America, five people that are paying in taxes, as opposed to taking out. And that is why we see that tax revenues have increased.

And so, frankly, tax relief has been part of the deficit solution. And even if it were not, we are talking about a \$2.6 trillion budget. And if you look at the line item, tax relief is \$17 billion. Now, if you do the math, that means that tax relief is less than 1 percent of this Federal budget. So even if it was not bringing in new revenues to the government, how could tax relief amount to all of this problem?

The challenge has been on the spending side. Just look over the last 15 years: international affairs up 93 percent, agriculture up 165 percent, transportation 78 percent, education 95 percent. And the list goes on and on and on.

Now, often we get good things for our tax expenditures. We can have student loans; we can have Kevlar vests for our soldiers. But, unfortunately, quite often we do not get good things for our tax expenditures. Sometimes we get wheelchairs from Medicare that cost five times as much as those of the VA. Sometimes we get multimillion dollar studies of how college students decorate their dorms.

We are talking about reducing the growth rate of government. And I cannot believe, and no American family would ever believe, that you cannot find seven-tenths of 1 percent, less than 1 percent, of waste or fraud or abuse or duplication. American families would laugh at that.

And if we do not do this, Mr. Chairman, we are looking at this future, this auto pilot future that I believe is fiscally immoral, that will double taxes on our children and grandchildren. We need a budget, not for the next election; we need a budget for the next generation. And that is why I so strongly support the committee budget, the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE's) budget, because it is that fiscally responsible budget for the next generation.

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

Mr. Chairman, before yielding to the gentleman from Texas, I would simply like to say that I have here a copy of the CBO's report on the budget, January 2005, which shows that in the year 2000 we had revenues of \$1,004 trillion under the individual income tax. Last year, in the year 2004, revenues were \$809 billion. That is not an increase. That is a \$200 billion decrease.

One of the big differences between us and them is that we provide more for veterans health care and for veterans benefits. And now on that point, I recognize and yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I just went back to my office after I spoke, and I heard the gentleman speaking just now. And he talked about waste, fraud and abuse. And my question to the gentleman is, you have been

through the budget hearings. Why do you suppose it is that the Bush administration over the last 50 months has not rooted out that waste, fraud, and abuse?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, the opportunity is certainly theirs, having run the government for 4 years and having direct hands-on opportunities to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, that occurred to me as well. I thank the gentleman for his response.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, the American people and America's veterans deserve to know the fact. The fact is that the Republican budget being pushed during a time of war would cut veterans benefits compared to today's services by \$14 billion over 5 years. This bill is inadequate, and it is unconscionable in its treatment of veterans. But do not believe me; that is what America's veterans leaders have said about it.

They have called it "grossly inadequate" and "unconscionable." This came from the Disabled American Veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, two nonpartisan organizations. Maybe Republican leaders do not like it when veterans leaders point out the truth, but it is the truth.

I am deeply disappointed that during a time of war we would have Members of this House pay lip service to the service of our veterans; but yet when it comes to what really counts, supporting medical care, they are going to cut it by \$14 billion. That is 2 million veterans who will not receive health care under this budget.

Vote for the Spratt amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following correspondence for the RECORD:

THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET,
March 17, 2005.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, House Budget Committee, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE NUSSLE: As you know, the President's fiscal year 2006 budget would provide an appropriation for veterans' medical care that is less than one-half of one percent above the FY 2005 appropriation. Because this amount would not begin to cover employee wage increases and other inflationary costs, it amounts to a substantial cut in funding and thus would unavoidably result in a reduction of critical medical care services for our Nation's sick and disabled veterans. Although we appreciate the adoption of the Bradley amendment which added \$229 million to the President's recommendation for veterans' medical care, this is still grossly inadequate.

In addition, we understand that H. Con. Res. 95 includes instructions to cut spending on mandatory veterans' programs, such as disability compensation, by \$798 million. We think cutting veterans' benefit programs is unconscionable, especially at a time when America's sons and daughters are being wounded and killed every day in Iraq.

The four major veterans organizations of The Independent Budget, AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of

America, and Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, therefore strongly urge support for amendments offered by Representatives Spratt and Obey to increase funding for veterans' programs. Passage of these amendments is crucial if the VA is to maintain an adequate level of health care and other services.

Sincerely,

RICK JONES,
National Legislative
Director, AMVETS.

RICHARD B. FULLER,
National Legislative
Director, Paralyzed
Veterans of America.

JOSEPH A. VIOLANTE,
National Legislative
Director, Disabled
American Veterans.

DENNIS CULLINAN,
National Legislative
Director, Veterans of
Foreign Wars of the
United States.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2005.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, Committee on Budget, House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The American Legion is deeply troubled with and cannot support your Committee's proposed budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 95, with regard to funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), especially the reconciliation instructions targeted at earned veterans' benefits. Reducing mandatory appropriations for veterans' disability compensation, pensions, and educational benefits at a time of war is *inconsistent with the thanks of a grateful Nation*.

The American Legion believes VA's own admission that the cost of doing business increases annually about 13-14 percent because of Federal pay increases and inflation in the health care arena. The President's budget request is "scrubbed" by the Office of Management and Budget, so VA's true fiscal requirements to meet the health care needs of America's veterans are somewhat skewed. During the 108th Congress, former VA Secretary Principi reported to your colleagues that The FY 2005 proposed budget was \$1.2 billion short of what he had actually requested. It appears this pattern of short-changing VA medical care continues in the 109th Congress. America's veterans and their families deserve better.

The American Legion recognizes and appreciates the Bradley Amendment adopted by the Committee, but believes it falls well short of the total funding needed in VA medical care. Unfortunately, the Committee rejected the Edwards Amendment that would have provided VA with adequate resources to maintain current services.

The American Legion would encourage adoption of one of the amendments to be offered by Representatives Spratt or Obey with regard to increasing VA funding. Clearly, both of these amendments are in the best interest of veterans and their families. Without adoption of one of these two amendments, The American Legion cannot support this budget resolution.

The American Legion appreciates your leadership and the hard work of your colleagues on behalf of America's veterans and their families.

Sincerely,

THOMAS P. CADMUS,
National Commander.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY), a member of the committee.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, this budget values the service of our veterans. It not only values their service, but it meets the needs of our country, a strong defense, a growing economy, while we also reduce our deficit. I would like to talk about where veterans spending has gone over the last 10 years for just a moment.

As you can see from this chart, this is the overall spending on veterans programs over that period of time, from 1995 to 2005. We talk about veterans health care, perhaps we could bring that chart up, that has increased from about \$16.2 billion to \$29.9 billion. That is substantial progress in honoring the commitment of our Nation's veterans.

We have done a number of other things for veterans over the last several years, and perhaps if I could have the last chart. We have allowed Guard and Reservists to qualify for medical benefits; we have increased the GI education benefit over those years; we have opened up the VA system for all veterans to participate in and have funded it enough so that at least Priorities 1 through 7 are able to participate in that; and we have gone from 2.5 million veterans served under the VA to 4.8 million.

We have increased survivor benefits. We finally dealt with the whole issue of concurrent receipts, so that a disabled veteran is able to collect either his or her disability benefit, as well as their retirement benefit. We have reduced the wait times to get into the VA hospitals, and the VA has maintained its excellent care.

Let me talk about this budget, because under the leadership of the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE), we started at the President's mark, which was about \$30.8 billion for veterans health care, and the chairman's mark increased that to \$31.5 billion. Working with the chairman, I introduced an amendment that raised that by \$229 million. So as a result of the hard work of the veterans and the Committee on the Budget, we have increased from the President's baseline by \$877 million, which in these difficult fiscal times is a 2.8 percent increase.

Further under the leadership of the chairman, we have reduced the reconciliation number to a number I believe is very manageable. If you recall, the President assumed copayments on drugs and an enrollment fee. But the chairman's mark, because it is so much lower, going from \$424 million to \$155 million, I believe working together in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with the Committee on the Budget that we can in fact look for waste, fraud, and abuse and eliminate those types of things, without having to have an enrollment fee, without having to have drug copayments. Let me repeat that. The chairman's budget does not assume either enrollment fees or those drug copayment fees.

I look forward to working to make sure that we honor our commitment to our Nation's veterans. This is an excellent budget. It maintains a strong defense; it allows our economy to grow; and it meets critical needs for those who have defended our liberties, our Nation's veterans.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, if I were voting for a budget that cut veterans benefits by \$14 billion over the next 5 years, I guess I would want to talk about the past rather than the future as well.

The difference is very clear, and it is very simple. Republicans voting for this bill say that it is okay to cut veterans health care benefits by \$14 billion over the next 5 years. Democrats and national veterans organizations say it is wrong. In fact, the DAV, the VFW say it is a grossly inadequate budget, it is an unconscionable budget, especially at a time when America's sons and daughters are being killed and wounded every day in Iraq.

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

Mr. Chairman, before voting on this budget resolution, everyone should ask, what does it do to education, what does it do to the development of our communities, what does it do for veterans health care, and what does it do to the bottom line?

In seeking an answer to those questions, I would recommend that you look no further than a publication which came to your offices yesterday from the CBO, fresh off the press. Read table 1.1, page 2, and look in the far upper right-hand corner, and you will see the amount of debt we will incur over the next 10 years if this budget, which is essentially the President's budget, is adopted and implemented: \$5.135 trillion in additional debt.

□ 1430

But that is without funding the war in Iraq after 2005. It is without fixing the alternative minimum tax estimated to cut revenues by \$640 billion. And it is without reflecting one cent for Social Security privatization which the administration acknowledges to be a cost of \$754 billion between 2009 and 2015.

Adjust for these additional costs and this budget will add \$7 trillion to the national debt over the next 10 years. It will double the debt.

If that is the legacy you want to leave your children and your grandchildren, then vote for this bill. But if you want to put the budget back on a path to balance as it was in the year 2000, if you want to avoid the accumulation of that mountain of debt, then vote for the Spratt or Democratic alternative.

Our budget resolution gets to balance by the year 2012. It accumulates \$1.7 trillion less in debt over the next 10 years than the Republican budget base bill.

Ours also protects priorities, our children's education, our veterans, health care, our communities' development, and it supports defense, fully funds it at the same level as theirs, and it applies a rule proven to work called the pay-as-you-go rule.

This rule rigorously applied will do more for deficit reduction, exponentially more than the Republican resolution for all its huffing and puffing can ever purport to do. The right vote here is for the Spratt amendment or substitute, the Democratic substitute, and against the base bill, the Republican budget resolution.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we are coming to the end of the debate on the final amendment in the way of a substitute. I want to congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the Democrats for coming forward with a substitute. It is never an easy thing to write a budget, as we all know. But I appreciate the fact that so many of our colleagues came forward with a budget.

The prime argument that is being made here today is, first of all, that the Republicans seem to have caused the deficit, number one, and, number two, that the only way to get out of the deficit is to listen to the Democrats and increase taxes and increase spending.

So let me just take those because that is basically what the argument is. First of all, with regard to the deficit. Now, maybe my memory is just fading but I am trying to remember back to before the world changed on September 10 of 2001, and we were running a surplus. We had more money in the Treasury, in the Federal Treasury than we were paying out, but we also discovered something that next morning.

On September 11 of 2001 we discovered that we were running some deficits that we did not know about because the balance sheet did not give us much perspective on it. We were running a deficit in homeland security. We were not protecting the country. We were running a deficit in national defense. We were not able to project our strength around the world and protect freedom. We had a deep recession that we needed to climb out of that got a gut punch that morning and it lasted for quite a while longer.

So we made some very deliberate decisions that next day and days after. In a bipartisan way we said, it is time to reduce taxes, stimulate the economy. It is time to protect the country, do whatever it takes. It is time to fund our national defense. It is time to protect our borders. It is time to do all of these things and let us not ask the question today how we are going to pay for it. Let us do it. And we did it. And you voted for every one of those bills, every single one.

Do not shake your head. I will show you the votes. You voted for every single one of those bills to protect the

country. You protected the country with every single one of your votes.

So instead of coming down here today and blaming the Republicans for partisan purposes, why do you not remember the history you know, that it is Osama bin Laden that had as much to do with this deficit as anybody in this country. And instead of trying to get political points, you ought to just relax and try and figure out a way to get out of it.

So this is how we decided to get out of it. We said, let us control spending. Let us stimulate the economy. And look at what has happened as a result of that. Not only did the tax cuts not get us into that deficit, but because of the work that we have done, we are climbing out of it, because we are protecting the country, because we are stimulating the economy and are creating jobs. Because of all of that we have the opportunity in this budget to reduce the deficit and build on the progress we had from last year.

Last year we cut the deficit 20 percent, 20 percent in one year with a growing economy and controlling spending. And so we are starting on a glidepath, reducing that deficit every year. The deficit was not caused overnight. It is going to take some time to get it down and we have a plan to accomplish that.

Now, I also want to put this deficit in some perspective. You have got to compare the deficit to something. You cannot just say \$500 billion is a lot of money or \$200 billion is a lot of money. Of course it is a lot of money. But compared to what is it a lot of money? Compared to our economy is the measure that every single economist says you have got to compare it to.

And as you look at the deficit as it is compared to our economy, you can see here that this year we are at 3.6 percent of our economy. If we stick to this belt tightening that is responsible over time, we will be able to get down to 1 percent of the economy.

And why is that important? Well, first of all let me show you deficits in the past. This is not even the biggest deficit we have ever run. This is not the biggest deficit. Look back in 1946 after World War II, we were running a deficit that was 7 percent of our economy. Let us look to the year I first came to Congress. It was 3.9 percent of the economy back in 1990 when the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and I came to Congress. Let us look back to the early eighties when we complained. It was 5 percent.

We are talking about an economy that is chugging along and growing. We are talking about a deficit plan that gets us below the rate of growth that we need to get to in order to have a responsible budget, and we need to pass this plan and get on with business. We do not need tax increases and we do not need more spending.

Vote down the Spratt substitute.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, we are here today in this Chamber to consider a fantasy budget.

It is ludicrous for the House leadership to move forward with this budget debate by ignoring the issues of the day merely to lock in huge tax cuts and offer damaging spending cuts to health care, education, veterans' services and much more. We need a better plan. The Democratic alternative that I support would reinstate the pay-as-you-go rule and balance the budget by 2012, just as the Baby Boomers begin their massive retirement, while maintaining significant support for our national defense, veterans programs, education, and health care, which will help grow our economy and create jobs.

I do commend the President for recognizing the importance of the Milk Income Loss Compensation (MLLC) Program as a safety net for America's dairy farmers and including an extension of the program in the Administration's proposed budget. The Republican budget, however, recklessly zeros out this important program, placing struggling family farmers across this nation in peril.

We know that the budget has not included the long-term cost of Iraq, which already cost the country \$275 billion, the estimated \$5 trillion in the next 20 years for privatizing Social Security, and the full costs of the tax cuts. In fact, it does not even include a full ten-year budget report. The report lacks detail and leaves many programs vulnerable to steep cuts. I would expect a complete and full report in a document as important as the United States Budget. As the campaign in Iraq continues, our thoughts and prayers go out to the young men and women in uniform as well as to their families. May they complete their mission quickly and decisively so they can return home soon and safe.

Our veterans are returning home as we speak. These are the fine men and women who fought to help bring democracy to Iraq. The budget plan calls for cuts in veterans' health care benefits and reduces medical personal by more than 3,000, along with cutting \$9 million from other areas in the already overstretched VA. While the budget cuts to veterans' programs, Medicaid grants, and other important programs represent a very small amount of the overall budget, they will make a large difference to the families who depend on them.

The projected budget deficit of \$427 billion for FY06 is revolting. Perhaps the worst aspect of this budget is that it is not paid for. This is the classic recipe for exploding budget deficits as far as the eye can see; it's the height of fiscal irresponsibility occurring at exactly the wrong moment during our Nation's history when 80 million Americans, the so-called baby boomers, are rapidly approaching retirement. This is a demographic time bomb ready to explode. That is why the Republican budget proposal, in effect, constitutes taxation without representation because it will be our children and our grandchildren who will be asked to pay for this fiscal mess. I couldn't think of doing anything more unfair to them. The children are our future, and we owe it to them to give them a stable foundation.

As the father of two little boys, I did not come to this Congress to leave a legacy of debt for them or future generations to climb out of. Our Democratic alternative, however, anticipates this demographic time bomb by achieving balance, while offering an economic stimulus plan now that is fair, quick, and responsible. It supports our troops, but it also

supports our nation's veterans, our seniors, and our children's education programs.

So I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic substitute. I would call on the leadership in the House to pull their budget resolution so that we can have an honest debate with honest figures, factoring in a realistic cost of the Iraq operation.

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

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, yeas 264, answered "present" 1, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

AYES—165

Abercrombie	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz
Ackerman	Higgins	Owens
Allen	Hinchey	Pallone
Andrews	Hinojosa	Pascarell
Baca	Holden	Pastor
Baird	Holt	Payne
Baldwin	Honda	Pelosi
Becerra	Hoolley	Pomeroy
Berkley	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Berman	Inslee	Rahall
Bishop (GA)	Israel	Rangel
Bishop (NY)	Jackson (IL)	Reyes
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee	Rothman
Boucher	(TX)	Roybal-Allard
Brady (PA)	Jefferson	Ruppersberger
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Brown, Corrine	Jones (OH)	Ryan (OH)
Butterfield	Kaptur	Sabo
Capps	Kennedy (RI)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cardin	Kildee	Sanders
Carnahan	Kilpatrick (MI)	Schakowsky
Carson	Kind	Schiff
Clay	Langevin	Schwartz (PA)
Cleaver	Lantos	Scott (GA)
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costello	Levin	Sherman
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
Cummings	Lowey	Smith (WA)
Davis (AL)	Lynch	Snyder
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Solis
Davis (FL)	Markey	Spratt
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Strickland
DeFazio	McCarthy	Stupak
DeGette	McCollum (MN)	Tauscher
DeLauro	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Dicks	McGovern	Tierney
Dingell	McKinney	Towns
Doggett	McNulty	Udall (CO)
Doyle	Meehan	Udall (NM)
Edwards	Meek (FL)	Van Hollen
Emanuel	Meeks (NY)	Velázquez
Engel	Menendez	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	Nadler	Wexler
Green, Al	Napolitano	Wu
Green, Gene	Neal (MA)	Wynn
Grijalva	Oberstar	
Gutierrez	Obey	
Harman	Olver	

NOES—264

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

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

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Capuano

NOT VOTING—4

Coble	Ryun (KS)
Delahunt	Young (FL)

□ 1515

Messrs. GRAVES, CHOCOLA and COX changed their 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.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSSELLA). Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider a period of final debate on the concurrent resolution.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, during much of this debate, as I noted earlier, my Republican colleagues have taken the attitude that today's deficits were unforeseeable, unavoidable, beyond their control. But we warned here in 2001 and in every year thereafter when this resolution came before this House that the other side of the aisle was betting the budget on a blue sky forecast and leaving no margin for error. It is their policy choices made in the face of our objections that have brought us to the point we find ourselves today.

In deficit this year by \$427 billion, last year by \$412 billion, the year before by \$375 billion, each year has broken a record for a bigger and bigger deficit.

□ 1515

You control the House, you control the Senate, you control the White House; but you have not been able to control the budget, and you cannot escape responsibility for its dismal condition.

As we stand here at the threshold of passing another budget resolution, I want to forewarn you, you will not take the deficit away, this resolution will not. You will not move the deficit down. It will only move it up and out, year after year after year to come.

But do not take my word for it. I am partisan. I am the Democratic ranking member on this committee. Read what our neutral, nonpartisan budget shop, the Congressional Budget Office, has to say in a report that we request every year as a matter of law, analysis of the President's budgetary proposals for fiscal year 2006. Every Member has one of these in his or her office. You only have to read to the second page and look in the upper right-hand corner, and you will see there that the Congressional Budget Office says if the President's budget is passed and implemented over the next 10 years, it will accumulate \$5.135 trillion in additional debt of the United States. Table 1.1, it is laid out there.

But as you all know and understand the way CBO does these estimates, they do not include all the costs. Since the President does not have costs in his budget for Afghanistan and Iraq after 2005, this resolution, this estimate does not assume it, even though CBO estimates that the additional costs will be

\$384 billion. It does not include a dime for fixing the alternative minimum tax, even though we are warned that by 2010 there will be 30 million taxpayers paying it rather than the regular tax schedule. And CBO says the cost of fixing it over 10 years is \$640 billion.

It includes nothing for the President's signature initiative, the one he is pushing hardest and first and that is to partially privatize Social Security. The President has indicated himself that the cost of doing that, the additional deficits we will add if we do that between 2009 and 2015 will be \$754 billion.

When you add all of these additional costs into the mix, then the debt incurred through 2016 will be \$7 trillion. We will double the debt of the United States. If indeed we do what the President is proposing and allow workers to peel 4 percentage points off FICA and put those payments into a private account, we will incur \$4.9 trillion in debt over the next 20 years. We will not see the budget balanced again in our lifetime.

CBO is our forecaster, our neutral, nonpartisan budget shop. They are warning us this budget will not bring the deficit down. This budget will not do away with the deficit. It will make the deficit worse. Indeed, they tell us in this report, same page, page 2, that the President's budget, basically your budget, the President's budget, makes the situation \$2 trillion worse than if we just left things on automatic pilot for current services.

I would simply close by saying, vote against this resolution. Let us go back to the drawing board. We can do better.

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

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

If I might take just a brief moment in introducing my first speaker, I would like to just say on behalf of our side in particular but I think on behalf of the entire Congress, we always respect Members who go on to bigger and better things and today the President made a wise announcement in nominating the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) to become our U.S. Trade Representative.

The applause meter made it look pretty good for confirmation there, I say to my very good friend, and he is my friend. He has been the vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget, and he has been a great wing man and personal friend to so many.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I promise I will not talk about trade. But I will talk about this budget. I want to start by saying this budget is not all the details. It is a blueprint. The authorizing committees, the appropriating committees, will fill out those details. But it is a blueprint

that says something about who we are. And the three pillars in this budget, I think, reflect the principles and the priorities of this House.

First, we believe that our country ought to be protected and strength is emphasized. That is our national security and our homeland security. Second is to be sure we have a strong economy. The tax relief has worked: 4.4 percent growth last year; 3 million jobs added to our economy in the last 21 months alone. The economy is strong and growing. We need to be sure that continues and that is why tax increases are not part of this budget.

And, third, to be sure that we do as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) says appropriately, keep our spending under control, we take responsible steps to restrain spending both in domestic discretionary and in the entitlement area.

Those are the three pillars. By doing so, we reduce the deficit in half within 4 years. I commend the chairman for coming up with this budget.

The process by which we got here also says something about who we are. I want to commend the ranking member from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his civility. I want to commend the members of the Committee on the Budget for the great debate that we had over the last month or so, I want to commend the Members on the floor who have had a great debate here, and I want to commend, finally, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget. The gentleman from Iowa has conducted himself in the Committee on the Budget and here on the floor through an open, honest process where people have had the opportunity to say their peace. He has done a great job in listening carefully to the concerns of so many of us in this conference and in the entire Congress to be sure we come up with a document that does indeed reflect the priorities, I believe, of our House, the strength of our country, the growth of our economy, and getting spending under control.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this budget which is, although just a blueprint, the appropriate statement of who we are and does indeed get us to the point where we are reducing our deficit, which is so important, but also funding the key priorities in our country. I urge a "yes" vote on the resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his great leadership in putting together a budget that is a statement of our values, that is balanced in terms of our priorities and balanced fiscally. He has always conducted the process of creating a budget in a way that has informed Members, has done so with great dignity and great fairness and great re-

spect for all points of view. I wish we would all join in acknowledging the great leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina, our ranking member on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, in 1994, the first item in the Republicans' Contract with America was the Fiscal Responsibility Act. Republicans pledged "to restore fiscal responsibility to an out-of-control Congress, requiring them to live under the same budget constraints as families and businesses." More than 10 years later, an out-of-touch Republican majority has taken fiscal responsibility to a new low. It is clear that in the 10 years the Republicans have become addicted to deficits.

The budget deficit for this year is a record \$427 billion. The February budget deficit, my colleagues, of \$114 billion for the month of February, a deficit of \$114 billion, is the highest monthly deficit ever and the first time it ever went over \$100 billion in one month. In 2001, President Clinton left President Bush with a projected \$5.6 trillion in surplus. In just 4 years, President Bush has turned that record surplus into a record deficit of nearly \$4 trillion, a \$10 trillion swing in the wrong direction.

Make no mistake, these deficits are the direct result of Republican policies, huge tax cuts for the wealthy, a refusal to pay as you go, poor planning for a war of choice in Iraq. The list goes on and on and on. America is awash in red ink because of Republican budget irresponsibility.

Tragically, this Republican budget is yet another missed opportunity to return to fiscal discipline. Not only is this budget fiscally irresponsible; the Republican budget is dishonest. It does not cut the deficit in half as Republicans claim. In fact, it makes the deficit worse. Republicans leave out the realistic cost of the war, the cost of expiring tax provisions, the true cost of fixing the alternative minimum tax and the cost of any changes to Social Security. The budget is dishonest in another way: it fails to show any deficit figures at all after 2010.

In our New Partnership for America's Future, Democrats have made a commitment to honor the value of accountability, including eliminating deficit spending and holding those in power accountable for their actions with a high ethical standard. Democrats support honest, accountable budgets that pay as you go. The Democratic alternative offered by the gentleman from South Carolina achieves balance by 2012. The Republican budget never reaches balance. It heaps tons of debt onto our children and grandchildren, and it will eventually lower our standard of living. We cannot let that happen to our country. And on top of all that, the Republican budget undermines the solvency of Social Security.

While Republicans ignore the real crisis of ballooning budget deficits, the President falsely claims there is a crisis in Social Security. But just because the President says it does not make it

so. He is simply wrong. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, Social Security's trust fund will grow every year until a high of \$8.3 trillion in 2032 and continues to be solvent until 2052.

I want to call your attention to this chart, my colleagues. The left bar represents the deficit in the general fund between now and 2035, a staggering \$15 trillion. The Bush administration has taken us onto a trajectory of reckless budgeting that will take us to \$15 trillion in deficit in 2035. From 2006 to 2035, \$15 trillion in deficit.

This bar here, the second bar, Social Security, 2006 to 2080, twice as long, more than twice as long, the Social Security deficit is \$2 trillion. It is clear that there would be plenty of money to deal with the Social Security trust fund if the President were not using the Social Security trust fund as a slush fund to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in America. Instead of doing that, we have a moral and legal obligation to pay back to the trust fund the money the President has taken out. We cannot let the President do this.

By running enormous deficits, the Republicans want to force the government to break its promises to the elderly. How on Earth are they going to pay the Social Security trust fund back if they have gone broke on the other side by running up these deficits in the general fund? Democrats will keep America's promises to our seniors. Democrats have done it before, and we will do it again. When Bill Clinton was President, we had 3 years of surpluses.

□ 1530

And with the surpluses, imagine, think of it. Zero deficits. \$427 billion in deficit for this year, over \$100 billion in deficit for the month of February alone, this year. And when President Clinton was President, the 3 years at the end of his term, we had zero deficits. And with the surpluses that were produced he was able to pay nearly \$400 billion off of our indebtedness, strengthening the solvency of Social Security.

Likewise the Democratic alternative that was offered today included pay-as-you-go rules that would block new tax or spending legislation that is not paid for.

Not only is the Republican budget fiscally reckless and dishonest, it is morally irresponsible. The leaders of five Protestant denominations, the Episcopal Church USA, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the Presbyterian Church USA, the United Church of Christ and the United Methodist Church recently called President Bush's budget unjust. They reminded us of the words of the prophet, Micah, who said, "What does the Lord require of you but to do justice, to love mercy and to walk humbly with your God?" Does this budget do justice for Americans? You be the judge. Is it doing justice to our children to give tax cuts to

people making more than \$500,000 a year, while underfunding Head Start, No Child Left Behind, student loans and grants and other education initiatives by \$2.5 billion? Is that doing justice to our children? Is it doing justice to our communities to give tax cuts to the wealthy while funding for community police and local fire fighters who are vital to our homeland security by cutting them by \$280 million? Is that justice? Is it doing justice to those who serve in uniform to give those tax cuts while underfunding health care benefits for veterans by \$14 billion short of what is needed over the next 5 years? Is that justice for our veterans? And is it doing justice to give tax cuts to the wealthy while launching a shameful attack on the poor? This budget cuts \$20 billion from Medicaid, a cut that Governors, on a bipartisan basis, oppose, and which the other body today has just rejected.

Let us hear it for the other body. It undermines the Community Development Block Grant Initiative with all considered restructuring and a massive 35 percent cut. It makes huge cuts to the earned income tax which takes 2 million children, lifts 2 million children out of poverty. But this budget, the Republican budget, makes cuts there. No. The Republican budget does not do justice, it does great damage to our country. Instead of being a statement of our values, the Republican budget is an assault on our values. And it is a blueprint for financial disaster.

I urge my colleagues to return to fiscal discipline, to honor our values and to oppose this disgraceful Republican budget. Thank you, my colleagues. Vote "no" on this budget.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, for those of you who have read the prophet Micah, I know that he was not speaking to the Congressional Budget Office. He was speaking to the human heart, and that is the biggest difference between the policies that we have before us today. We believe that the individual should be free and should be allowed to determine their destiny. We do not believe that government should make decisions that people can make better for themselves. We do not believe that money equals compassion. We do not believe that money often equals success. Money is not getting us results. And all that is offered on the other side is more money, more spending, higher taxes, more government, more bureaucracy, more regulation, more laws, more politicians making decisions that individuals and families and communities should be making for themselves in the freest nation on the face of the Earth. And that is why our budget calls for strengthening our country, growing our economy, giving power to individuals, and recognizing that if we do not control the size of government, government will take our

freedom, and it will not succeed the way we want to be able to allow people to succeed.

My friends, government is growing out of control. What we are asking for in this budget is something that we should do every day in Washington, and that is look at the results of the programs that we have put in place. Government, we believe, should be there to help people who cannot help themselves. And oftentimes, we have invented more government to try and take the place of families, take the place of neighbors, take the place of communities in order to solve problems. And too often we are not getting the results for all the extra money that we are spending. And too often, in this well of the House, we debate between percentages and dollar increases as if, if I spend \$6 and you spend \$7 you must care \$1 more. And that is not the way our debate should evolve. Our debate should be based on results. We need a results revolution in government. We need to look at the results we are getting from the programs we have put in place. If they are not working, we should reform them, and that is what this budget calls for. It says we are going to slow the rate of growth. It gives instructions to the committees to go through the budget of the Federal Government and look for ways to ensure that programs deliver the results that we require in order to help people who are truly in need and, at the same time, make sure we are defending the country, growing the economy and controlling spending.

Just like last year, the House will lead. We led last year. We led when we got to a balanced budget in the late 1990s, and we will lead again today by passing what I believe is the strongest budget, the best blueprint, to get out of deficits, to make sure that we get results from the programs and the dollars that we are spending and make sure we get back on a path to freedom in this country.

I urge adoption of this budget.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I will oppose this ill-advised budget proposal and I urge my colleagues to join me. Every year, we set our priorities through our budget. The priorities in this budget are all wrong. Our priorities should focus on helping those who need help before we begin to help those who don't. However, although we may not all agree with these concerns, one priority which we can all agree on is that we must reduce the deficit. Incredibly, the proposal before us does absolutely nothing to accomplish this goal. Despite all the assurances I have heard from my colleagues and the Administration, this legislation actually increases the deficit!

With record deficit levels, how is it possible that the majority has completely ignored fiscal responsibility? By passing tax giveaways, over half of which go to households earning over \$1 million—that's 0.2 percent of the population. Although many of us find this appalling, unfortunately, it has become predictable behavior of the majority party.

How can we justify this fiscal recklessness to our children and grandchildren? How can

we justify it to hard-working Americans who live paycheck to paycheck, unable to save money for emergencies or even just to see the doctor? Can we honestly look them in the eye and tell them that we are more concerned with millionaires and billionaires than with struggling middle-class Americans, brave soldiers, the sick, the poor and the hungry? I, for one, dread the thought. Yet, that is the message this budget sends. And, although my colleagues try to cloud its destruction with their transparent gimmicks, the message shines through crystal clear.

The resolution before us provides for total tax giveaways of \$106 billion over five years. Every child in America knows that you must save first before you splurge. They know that they must patiently fill their piggy banks with coins until they have enough to buy that toy they have been eyeing for weeks.

My colleagues do not seem to understand this common notion of balancing income and spending. They continue to splurge on our national credit card, racking up astronomical bills which our children and grandchildren will be obliged to pay. Soon they will ask for their fourth credit increase in four years, to enable the continuation of this reckless abuse of hard-earned taxpayer dollars.

The pay-as-you-go rule, or PAYGO, would solve the issue of unlimited spending by requiring new spending to be offset in other areas of the budget. Again, common sense would dictate that tax giveaways, totaling \$106 billion over five years, would count as new spending. The money is being removed from the country's revenue without replacement. The PAYGO rule would essentially require us to stop and think about how we are going to pay for things before we hastily enact them and end up in this ill-fated fiscal jam. Not surprisingly, however, many of my colleagues have insisted on exempting the billions of dollars in tax giveaways from the PAYGO rule. They do so without an explanation of how they plan to restore the lost revenue. There is no good reason, particularly when we are running record deficits, to reject the very successful practice we used in the 1990's to produce record surpluses.

Unlike the federal government, states are not permitted to spend without restraint. States cannot run up their credit card bills or repeatedly increase their credit limits. Yet, this budget increases the financial burden on the states. The federal government has an agreement with the states—we will help pay for programs which we mandate—programs vital to America, including education, healthcare and job training. And we have been successful in our partnership with the states, ensuring that millions of Americans are able to go to school, to the doctor and to work.

However, in their spending schemes, my Republican colleagues neglect our obligation to the states. More and more, states are picking up the tab for unpaid federal bills.

At a time when states are struggling under the burden of Medicare cost shifts and a growing number of uninsured, I find it particularly disturbing that the Republicans have chosen to cut funding for Medicaid—a critical safety net for our most vulnerable citizens.

The Republicans are specifically proposing to cut an unprecedented \$60 billion from the program, which is the equivalent of completely eliminating the Children's Health Insurance Program over 10 years.

These cuts would roll back health care coverage and protections for millions of Americans including the elderly in nursing homes, individuals with disabilities, infants and working families. Also, hospitals, physicians and other safety net providers will face payment reductions threatening their viability—and these reductions will mean more lost jobs in our communities.

The assault on the environment also continues, including a massive, unjustified cut to the Superfund program. The Inspector General has identified, and senior EPA officials have acknowledged, that in FY2003 there was a funding shortfall of \$174.9 million, and it has been widely reported that the funding shortfall for FY2004 reached approximately \$250 million. This leaves dozens of highly contaminated Superfund sites where cleanups are being delayed due to inadequate funding. Public health is endangered and local economic redevelopment hurt, yet this budget irresponsibly seeks to reduce cleanup funding.

These are just two examples of critical programs this budget neglects and two examples of why I will oppose this legislation and I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Republican budget.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the FY06 budget resolution, and reluctant opposition to the Democratic alternative.

Unfortunately, I do not believe that the choices before us today adequately confront the serious deficiencies in our budget process. The congressional budget process is broken, and badly in need of real reforms that will reinstate fiscal responsibility into Congress. The Blue Dog Coalition, of which I am a member, has introduced a twelve-step plan that takes the necessary first steps toward reforming our budget process.

While I support many of the provisions in the Democratic budget, including a partial restoration of “pay-as-you-go” [PAYGO] rules and level funding for domestic priorities such as education, veterans’ health care, and local law enforcement, I am disappointed that this alternative did not include any of the Blue Dog budget process reforms.

The Blue Dog twelve-step plan would stop Congress’s recent borrow-and-spend practices by reinstating PAYGO rules for the *entire* budget, including spending and revenue measures. Budget enforcement rules that apply to only certain parts of the budget will not have a significant impact on our rising deficits, as Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan mentioned in his recent testimony before the House Budget Committee.

Additionally, the Blue Dog budget process reform plan would: create a “rainy day” fund for emergency spending, which forty-five states currently have; require a roll call vote on any bill calling for more than \$50 million in new spending; repeal the House rule that allows the House to avoid a direct, up-or-down vote on debt limit increases; and require cost estimates by the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] for every bill that Congress votes on.

These reasonable, common-sense reforms are necessary for a functioning budget process and long overdue. The fiscal situation in our country is now out of control, and only tough budget discipline will get us back on track.

On February 17, 2004, the national debt of the United States exceeded \$7 trillion for the

first time in our country’s history. One year later, our national debt is \$7.7 trillion. In the past year, our country has added \$700 billion to our national debt.

The out-of-control rise in our national debt over the last year is just another sign of the astonishing fiscal turnaround that our country has experienced over the last four years, and another sign of the terrible fiscal position that we now find ourselves in.

In 2001, we had ten-year projected surpluses of \$5.6 trillion [2002–2011]. Now, over that same time period, we have likely ten-year deficits of \$3.9 trillion. That’s a \$9.5 trillion reversal in our ten-year fiscal outlook.

Whether intentional or otherwise, our country’s current fiscal policies are depriving the Federal Government of future revenue at a time when we ought to be preparing for an unprecedented demographic shift that will strain Social Security and Medicare. Our current fiscal irresponsibility will eventually land squarely on the shoulders of our children and grandchildren, who will be forced to pay back the debt we are accumulating today with interest.

This “debt tax” that we are imposing on our children and grandchildren cannot be repealed, and can only be reduced if we take responsible steps now to improve our situation.

Both parties need to work together in a bipartisan fashion to bring our budget back into balance so we can avoid the higher long-term interest rates and weakened dollar that are a consequence of rising deficits and a high national debt.

This fiscal year alone, interest on the national debt is expected to rise to \$178 billion, and the administration projects that that figure will increase to \$211 billion during the next fiscal year.

To put that figure in perspective, projected interest on our national debt next year will be \$75 billion more than projected spending on education, public health, health research, and veterans’ benefits combined [\$138 billion].

In addition to assuming an ever-larger share of our annual budgets, the interest on our debt, and the debt itself, is increasing our reliance on foreign borrowers, which will weaken our position in the world and increase the risk that another nation will be able to assert greater leverage over America.

Finally, our deficits and debt threaten the Social Security and Medicare programs that have lifted so many of our seniors out of poverty and helped sustain the strongest middle class in history.

Unfortunately, the administration’s FY06 budget, which was released last month, would spend \$2.6 trillion of the projected Social Security surplus over the next ten years.

With a projected 75 year unfunded liability of \$3.7 trillion, both parties in Congress need to work together to address Social Security’s solvency problem.

It is time for Congress to stop playing games with our national debt, with Social Security, and with our kids and grandkids’ futures and take a commonsense, bipartisan approach to solve our budget problems.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the Republican majority’s ill-sighted budget resolution.

This budget goes beyond bad all the way to dangerous. It’s dangerous for our country, and it’s dangerous for Florida. This budget cuts the COPS program by 96 percent, a program which has put over 7,000 police officers on

Florida streets. Their budget cuts more than \$40 million from homeland security formula grants in the state of Florida alone. The President is clearly unaware there is more to defending our homeland than invading foreign countries.

But the added decision-making in the Republican budget doesn’t stop there. The Majority is proposing to decimate countless invaluable social welfare programs from Medicaid to Head Start and Even Start. It cuts almost \$200 million in funding for Florida housing, employment counseling, transitional assistance, and small business loans. This budget also includes significant cuts to veterans’ health care. What a great message to send to our troops: Thanks for serving your country, but now you’re on your own.

The Republican budget also fails our nation’s youth. The budget cuts TRIO funding by over \$700,000 in my district, and over \$10 million just in the state of Florida. These costs will result in a loss of over 11,000 students to the TRIO program in the state of Florida. Without these programs, these students will not make it to college. This is not a prediction, it’s a fact.

I meet with representatives from various organizations in my district every day. Yesterday, I met with 31 people from different types of organizations. Every one of them told me their programs are being cut, and they don’t know how they are going to survive because it is going to affect their programs ranging from children to the elderly to people without housing.

I’ve met with local officials telling me the same thing. These budget cuts are forcing them to seek alternative means of revenue. In other words, taxes. I don’t know if citizens will be taxed here in Washington or in Ft. Pierce or Riviera Beach, but somewhere along the line we are going to have to learn to share the responsibility for giving our communities the support they need.

Where will all this money supposedly trimmed from the national budget go? Well, clearly not to balance the budget or solve the federal deficit crisis. The Republican budget will result in a spending deficit of \$376 billion in 2006 alone. Unbelievably, this figure does not include the costs of several ill-conceived Republican initiatives such as the costs of privatizing social security or the President’s war in Iraq.

We have all heard President Bush tout his grand scheme to privatize social security, yet not only has he put forth no coherent plan to do so, but he has failed to include the financial requirements of such a plan. Vice President CHENEY has suggested “transition costs” of up to \$2 trillion or more. How can this cost not be included in any budget proposal?

But there are alternatives. Both the Congressional Black Caucus and Representative SPRATT have suggested sane alternatives to the Republican madness. Both of these budgets represent an approach to meeting the needs of regular Americans while maintaining the fiscal responsibility this nation needs.

Mr. Chairman, I was going to stand here and tell you that the Republicans are balancing the budget on the backs of the poor, but they are not balancing this budget on anyone’s backs because this budget doesn’t reach that far! The people that are hurt by this budget are not only the poor but the average American. As Members of Congress, we have

a solemn responsibility to protect the welfare of all our nation's citizens, and the Republican budget fails to meet that responsibility.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this damaging and devastating attack on the social welfare of this country masquerading as a budget.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the Spratt Substitute and in opposition to H. Con. Res. 95, the House Republican budget. A budget is a blueprint of values and priorities—a road map for where we want to move the country. It is no surprise that the Republican budget for fiscal year 2006 is more of the same: continued tax cuts for the wealthy paid for by slashing programs that Rhode Islanders depend on. However, the Spratt Substitute contains thoughtful policies to balance the budget by 2012 without individual tax rate increases or harmful cuts to security, health care, education, veterans' benefits, and other programs that improve the quality of life for Rhode Island's working families.

While the Republicans claim that budget cuts are needed to return to fiscal discipline, they forget their own policies caused today's financial problems. Without the tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans enacted since 2001, our nation's fiscal health would be much rosier, and the neediest and most vulnerable Americans would not be forced to sacrifice. Their fiscal year 2006 budget proposal continues to move in the wrong direction, and next year's deficit will likely be the largest in history, with at least \$400 billion added to the national credit card.

How does this blueprint make us safer? While the Department of Homeland Security receives an overall increase in funding, the budget largely follows the President's request, which cuts needed resources for the first responders who risk their lives every day to protect us. The Spratt Substitute contains \$1.1 billion more than the Republican budget for vital law enforcement programs such as COPS, FIRE grants, and Byrne Grants. These programs provide Rhode Island's police and fire departments with the equipment and training to keep us safe.

How does this blueprint make us healthier? The Republican budget requires \$20 billion in cuts to Medicaid. This reduction will jeopardize a critical health care safety net for seniors, children and people with disabilities and shift more of the burden to states. Medicaid cuts would result in \$80 million less for Rhode Island. The loss of federal funding places an enormous burden on states like Rhode Island, by pressuring them to cut eligibility for Medicaid. My state has successfully leveraged federal Medicaid dollars and currently offers coverage to many vulnerable, low-income pregnant women, parents of young children, and other groups not included in the federal mandate. Without Medicaid, these people would likely join the increasing ranks of the uninsured. Lacking proper preventative care, these patients will be forced to go to emergency rooms, leading to long waits and higher costs for everyone. These cuts will also threaten programs such as Rite Share, an employer buy-in program, funded in part by Medicaid. The Republican Medicaid cuts are restored in the Spratt Substitute.

How does this blueprint prepare children for the future? Again, the Republican budget matches the President's proposal to eliminate 48 education programs that provide assistance

with vocational education, education technology, civic education, and school counselors. In contrast, the Spratt Substitute provides \$4.5 billion in additional funding for No Child Left Behind and other valuable programs such as student loans and school lunches, giving students the resources to succeed.

How does this blueprint honor those who serve our country in uniform? Perhaps most egregiously during this time of war, the Republicans want to cut veterans' health care by \$14 billion over five years, impose new fees, and increase copayments for veterans' health care, adding an undue burden to those who have served their country so bravely. The Spratt Substitute provides \$17 billion over five years to provide veterans the services they have earned through their patriotism and sacrifice.

The Republican blueprint does not make us safer or healthier, prepare children for the future, or honor veterans. By continuing failed tax policies while cutting effective programs that Rhode Islanders depend on, their proposal is a misguided and unjust starting point. As Democrats show, it is possible to create a realistic blueprint that is fiscally responsible and builds on the needs of the American people. I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt Substitute and reject H. Con. Res. 95.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget resolution is a body blow to Oregon and the country. I have heard from constituents, school teachers, local government officials, medical professionals, housing advocates and many others throughout the communities in my district, all with detailed stories about how this budget will have devastating impacts.

The budget cuts both ways. First, by exploding the federal deficit, adding \$376 billion to the national debt and spending every penny of the \$185 billion Social Security trust fund surplus coming in during the year. Then, by eliminating and reducing key domestic priorities, such as cutting \$4.3 billion of education programs, slashing \$1.5 billion for affordable housing and development programs, and underfunding veterans' programs by nearly \$800 million.

How do we face both increased deficits and program cuts? By continuing to focus on tax cuts for those who need them the least. This is unnecessary and, frankly, dangerous as we continue to create an abyss between the haves and have-nots in society, and are putting our financial markets on edge by borrowing trillions from foreign investors. This is not a budget representative of the priorities and values of Oregonians.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget. It's dishonest. It's immoral. It's wrong for America's future.

Republicans dishonestly proclaim their budget is fiscally responsible. The only way their numbers work out is if you use slick accounting gimmicks or fuzzy math.

Let me give you some examples of their clever sleight of hand:

The Republicans' top priority to privatize Social Security through private accounts will cost billions of dollars. You'd think that'd be accounted for in this budget? No.

The billions of dollars that will be needed for the Iraq war. In the budget? No.

The cost to our children of extending the massive Bush tax cuts to the wealthy that will

balloon our massive deficit? You guessed it. Not in the budget.

Even as they leave out all this massive spending, Republicans still claim fiscal responsibility. Don't be fooled. They're lying to the American public. The true costs of this budget are far higher than Republicans claim and our children and grandchildren will pay the tab for this deceit for decades to come.

This budget isn't just dishonest—it's immoral. It imposes deep cuts to vital programs that Americans depend upon.

As our weak economy is forcing more people to rely on Medicaid's health safety net, Republicans are cutting the program by \$20 billion. Income support programs that keep low-income families afloat economically are being axed. Some 48 education programs, vital environmental protections, community development grants and veteran's health care programs are being gutted.

If you're an average American family this will affect you and your economic security. But, while you're tightening your belt watching funding for child's education and your family's health care diminish, billions of dollars are going to big business and special interests. While every other priority is sacrificed in the GOP budget, billions of dollars more are being funneled into the bloated defense contracts or frittered away in corporate tax giveaways.

Mr. Speaker, the federal budget is supposed to be a statement of our nation's priorities. This budget is a punch line to a sick joke being played on the American people.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this dishonest, immoral and irresponsible budget.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about the current state of our Nation's budget woes.

I've been running the family ranch for several years and I know what it means to work within a budget. You may have to count your pennies, but you spend your money where it matters the most to you and your community.

This Administration proposes to cut funding for agricultural programs in addition to denying promised benefits to veterans and military widows. These are the wrong priorities for our country. We cannot pass the burden of the debt onto the backs of our farmers and veterans.

Agriculture is the backbone of this great nation. I have always said that there are only two things that can bring this country down—our dependence on other countries to produce our food and our dependence on foreign oil. Agriculture must become a real part of our renewable energy supply. Research and education are the only way we can grow and develop these new technologies. This is the worst time to cut agriculture research programs.

Desperate times call for desperate measures, but turning our backs on our country's service personnel and veterans isn't desperate, it's crazy. We need to put our resources toward meeting the promises we have made to our veterans, servicemen, and their families—in rural Colorado, that means making sure that veterans don't have to drive five hours to get the health care they were promised.

I will never support breaking the promise to the brave men and women who served our country in the name of freedom and democracy.

BLUE DOG 12 POINT PLAN

I am a proud member of the Congressional Blue Dog Coalition, a group of Democrats that

fight for fiscal responsibility. Fiscal responsibility means spending your money where it matters most. We can do that without increasing taxes.

First off—our Nation's taxpayers deserve an honest budget that gives an account of all future spending. If this Administration wants to privatize Social Security, then the budget should have included the trillions of dollars it would take to change the system.

Secondly—we need to reduce the deficit. As a farmer, I know this firsthand—you can't spend money you don't have. Congress is already facing a \$589 billion dollar deficit—increasing the amount of our national debt to \$1 trillion dollars. The Blue Dog Coalition created a 12 Point Reform Plan to cure the Nation's addiction to deficit spending. For starters, the Blue Dog Plan would require that any new spending would have to be paid for. This common-sense rule, "pay-as-you-go" is mandatory in Colorado. In the 1990's, "pay-as-you-go" brought the budget into surplus and is supported by Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan. Our plan also includes a provision for a "rainy day fund" in case there is a need for emergency spending.

Neither the Administration's budget, nor the Democratic alternative, incorporate a single component of the Blue Dog 12 Point Plan. As Members of Congress, we must discuss a budget that has included input from both parties. It is for that reason, I voted "No" on both budget proposals. I will not vote for an increase in taxes. And I will not vote to cut the programs that matter to our communities.

The Federal Government and this Congress need to take a lesson from small business owners and get back to creating a budget where all the numbers add up.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, the federal budget should be a statement of our country's values. It should reflect the priorities of the American people: good jobs, safe communities, quality education, and access to health care. The Republican budget, H. Con. Res. 95, is not aligned with these priorities; and I, therefore, rise in opposition to its passage.

Like President Bush's budget proposal, the Republican budget calls for sweeping cuts in mandatory and non-defense discretionary spending that could harm the effectiveness of vital Federal programs.

Perhaps in an effort to obfuscate the truth, House Republicans fail to provide the specificity the President does in his budget, so we are left to wonder which programs may get slashed or eliminated.

But we do know this: the Republican budget resolution instructs various House committees to make almost \$69 billion in cuts to mandatory spending programs. The Energy and Commerce Committee, for example, would be forced to find \$20 billion in savings over five years. All indications are that Medicaid, which provides health coverage for more than 52 million low-income Americans, will take the brunt of the cuts.

The proposed budget will also cut veterans' health care by \$14 billion, education programs by \$2.5 billion and clean water programs by \$700 million. It will slash economic development programs by \$1.5 billion, possibly leading to the elimination of the extraordinarily successful Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program. The CDBG provides Federal funding for locally-identified projects, like affordable housing, economic redevelopment, roads and public libraries.

The Republican budget, in fact, neither adequately funds our national priorities, nor does it offer a strategy for achieving fiscal discipline. The resolution calls for a \$376 billion deficit in FY 2006, but the deficit is worse than it appears. In calculating the deficit, House Republicans use surpluses in the Social Security trust funds to offset spending on other programs. If the Social Security surpluses are not counted, the projected deficit for FY 2006 would be \$564.5 billion.

Democrats, on the other hand, will be offering an alternative proposal today that reflects the priorities of the American people. The Democratic budget provides \$4.5 billion more for education and training programs, \$1.6 billion more for veterans programs, \$2 billion more for community and regional development and \$1.1 billion more for law enforcement and justice programs. It does all this while instituting a plan to balance the budget by 2012 and protecting Medicaid and Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the Republicans have chosen to neglect the needs of the many in order to maintain and extend tax cuts for the elite few; it is clear where their priorities lie. I urge my colleagues to align their priorities with those of the American people, and vote against the Republican budget resolution and for the Democratic alternative.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this budget. The budget should encourage fiscal, personal and social responsibility at the same time it moves us further down the road to making opportunity real for people. In that sense, it should reflect the values and priorities of Americans. But by deepening income inequality and raising the barriers for those working to do better, this budget does neither. If anything, it reflects priorities that are out of step with ordinary Americans.

By calling for \$1.8 trillion in tax cuts, primarily to the wealthiest Americans, the president's budget compromises both our ability to face our most pressing challenges and strengthen the social safety net that might rescue those living in poverty. Experts estimate that over the next 75 years, the cost of the tax cuts for the top 1 percent of households alone is nearly equivalent to the shortfall in Social Security—this at a time when another 1.3 million Americans fell into poverty last year.

And with this budget's cuts to Medicaid, job training, veterans health care, and child care will only exacerbate those startling figures. The decision to eviscerate Medicaid by as much as \$20 billion will leave many low-income families with nowhere to turn for medical care, and many seniors with no way to afford long-term care. Its growth in recent years is simply a reflection of its success in providing care for the thousands of Americans who would otherwise have joined the ranks of the uninsured during the economic downturn.

And states are already struggling to keep up. This year, the governor in my state of Connecticut proposed increased co-payments and premiums for families receiving SCHIP. If the president succeeds in cutting Medicaid, there will be no way for states to make up the shortfall. We cannot let Medicaid fall victim to its own success.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of this Administration's poor decisions should not be borne by those least able to afford it. Budgets are moral documents. They should promote, first and foremost, the common good of the Nation.

And turning our backs on that now as this budget does is not only bad policy—it is immoral.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I cannot vote for this budget resolution. It does reflect the priorities of the Republican leadership, but I do not think those are the right priorities for our country.

Over the last five years the federal budget has gone from projected surpluses to undeniable deficits. The result has been to reverse a decade of progress that saw the budget go from the \$290 billion deficit when President Clinton took office to a surplus of \$236 billion in 2000, which was where things stood when the current President Bush came to office.

Unfortunately, the combination of recession, the need to increase spending for defense and homeland security, and excessive and unbalanced tax cuts have taken us to the largest deficits in our Nation's history—a \$375 billion deficit two years ago, a deficit of \$412 billion last year, and for this year, according to the Bush Administration itself, a deficit of \$427 billion. That is three record-setting years in a row.

And, regrettably, the budget resolution before us reflects the proposals of the Bush Administration—and we know, or should know, what that means.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, following the path suggested by the Bush Administration and this budget resolution will add \$5.135 trillion to our national debt over the next 10 years. I do not think this is the right way to go.

That is why I voted for the more responsible and better balanced alternative offered by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT.

That alternative budget combined a balanced budget, real budget discipline, and protection for Social Security while still providing the same resources for Defense and Homeland Security as the Republican budget.

The alternative also would have provided more resources for important priorities and would have laid the basis for more responsible tax policy. It was better fiscally and better in terms of the education of our children, the health care of our veterans, the development of our communities, and the quality of our environment.

It would have brought spending in the domestic discretionary accounts back to baseline, that is, to current services, enough to prevent them from being eroded away by inflation, but not any significant increase.

Unfortunately, that alternative was not adopted, and the only remaining choice is to vote for or against the Republican leadership's proposal. Because I am convinced that it is not right for our communities or our country, I must vote against it.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the Republican's 2006 budget resolution makes the wrong choices for our Nation. It reflects skewed priorities and runs counter to our deepest held beliefs. The budget embraces disastrous economic policies while at the same time failing to put forward a vision of what the United States should be. What America needs instead is responsible policies that reflect our values, help bring our Nation together, and invests in the future by expanding opportunity. Many programs important to Georgia are cut, including \$800 million from the Centers for Disease Control, funding for

firefighters by 30 percent and \$26.7 million in Homeland Security Funding for Georgia. These programs provide front-line protections to Georgia communities. Further, this budget hurts my state's military installations and veterans by cutting \$60 million from last year's spending for military construction projects and cutting healthcare for 2 million Georgian veterans.

Communities are harmed by cutting Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) by \$211.9 million over the next four years. Representatives from the cities of Riverdale and Powder Springs told me this week that their plans for building community centers depend on funding of CDBG. The budget will also eliminate the HOPE VI program, which is revitalizing public housing in Georgia. The Section 8 housing vouchers cut would remove 8,700 families from the program in Georgia.

This budget proposes to cut vital domestic investments and services for the middle class and poor, while continuing to accumulate huge budget deficits. Education is cut by \$366.8 million affecting 91,050 Georgia children by under funding the No Child Left Behind Act. TRIO programs by almost \$13 million for Georgia, affecting 13,000 students and vocational and adult education in Georgia would be reduced by \$173.7 million from 2006–2010. Healthcare would be affected by an estimated \$7.9 million cut to Southern Regional Hospital. These Medicaid cuts hurt Clayton County where 24.2 percent of the population in 2003 utilized Medicaid. About 10 percent of Clayton County is below the Federal Poverty Level.

Despite these cuts, every Georgia family's share of the national debt has been increased by \$38,281.

The federal budget should be an honest blueprint for the spending priorities of the government. However, this budget is not honest. It is passing our obligations, responsibilities and challenges to our children and grandchildren, while cutting programs that benefit the poorest among us.

We need not accept a federal budget that singles out hard-working middle-class families, those who have served our Nation, and our society's most vulnerable citizens. Americans deserve an honest budget that reflects their priorities and that honors their hard work. I urge my colleagues to reject these unnecessary cuts and work to improve the capacity of programs to address critical community needs.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition of H. Con. Res. 95, the Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2006.

This budget contains painful spending cuts to critical programs, continued large deficits, and a spiraling debt.

It is fiscally reckless, morally irresponsible and is a clear failure of leadership.

This budget is a sham. It fails to include funding for many of the President's key programs—such as Social Security privatization, the war in Iraq, and the cost of the Alternative Minimum Tax. It does not cut the deficit in half, as the Administration claims. When all omitted costs are included, it will raise the deficit by \$2 trillion over five years.

This growing debt will be passed on to our children and grandchildren, leaving them to shoulder the burden of our fiscal irresponsibility.

This budget cuts critical programs that working families depend on, like Medicaid, education, community development and veterans' health care.

We have soldiers fighting for us in Iraq, and this budget doesn't even provide enough funding to pay for their health care when they return.

The budget will also endanger the health of millions of Americans, by proposing a \$1.1 billion cut to food stamps, the Nation's number one investment in nutrition and defense against hunger.

If this budget passes, we will be forcing working families to make hard choices between buying groceries and paying their bills.

The budget also spends every single penny of the \$1.1 trillion Social Security trust fund. We need to return to pay as you go budget rules, so that we can provide a solid source of funding for Social Security.

What is most disturbing, is that the resolution before us today is even more dangerous than the version the President sent to Congress.

The budget fails to offer the specifics of the President's budget. It proposes large cuts in funding, but without targeting specific programs, it leaves a myriad of programs vulnerable to cuts.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no." We need a plan that is fiscally responsible and will fund the programs working families depend on.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, the proposed reductions in Medicaid under this Budget Resolution plan are unacceptable. For 40 years Medicaid has always been a crucial support system for low-income individuals. Medicaid has made health care available to millions of Americans who have no other access to health care.

The Budget Resolution will require \$14–\$20 billion in cuts from the program over the next five years and it will almost certainly lead to changes to state funding rules, administrative payment cuts, and prescription drug payment changes. This comes at a time when poverty is up, wages are down, and the number of uninsured Americans is at a record in our nation's history.

The Medicaid program serves nearly 50 million Americans. As people lost jobs and income during the recent economic downturn, Medicaid enrollment increased by nearly one-third. The decreasing number of those who receive health care benefits through employment adds additional burdens to the Medicaid system. States and local governments rely on federal assistance to help provide a safety-net to these individuals. Any cuts to the Medicaid program will shift the burden entirely onto state and local governments that are already straining to meet increasing demands on the program and severe budget pressures of their own. In many states, Medicaid costs exceed education costs.

In California, our Medicaid program, Medi-Cal, matches every dollar of federal funding with a dollar in state funding. This shared commitment is critical since the state receives \$20 billion in federal funding. Reducing federal Medicaid funding to states at a time of rising health care costs, increased numbers of uninsured, and states' increasing difficulties in paying their share of Medicaid costs, is bound to force states to reduce coverage and increase the numbers of uninsured. Uninsured patients without access to care will instead seek treatment in emergency rooms, further burdening an already overtaxed system.

The Medicaid program is not only critical for low-income individuals, but it's also funda-

mental to the operation of California's safety-net hospitals. The President's budget calls for eliminating the use of intergovernmental transfers for hospital funding. This means there will be at least \$11.9 billion in direct cuts to safety-net providers nationwide. Many states rely on IGTs to fund their Medicaid budgets. The low-income and uninsured rely on these hospitals to receive access to needed health care services. Without the continuation of federal Medicaid funds targeted to safety net hospitals, millions of Californians will not have access to necessary health care services. This budget resolution advances this march to folly for so many Americans and that's why 242 national groups and 785 state groups, including the National Governors Association and the National Association of Counties oppose changes in Medicaid.

We have an obligation to care for the less fortunate, and the Congress should not be cutting critical health care and other services from those in need. Rather, we should maintain our partnership with the states to ensure that Medicaid benefits remain available for the most vulnerable in our society.

I urge all my colleagues in the House to oppose the Budget Resolution.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget of mass destruction and in support of the Democratic and Congressional Black Caucus alternative budgets which recognize the true needs and values of our Nation.

We do not need to call in weapons inspectors to find the threat to the majority of Americans in this budget, nor do we need a warning system. We know exactly what, when, and where the damage will be because the Republican budget, once again, puts the tax cuts of the few above the needs of the many.

Under the Republican budget, the vast majority of Americans are asked to sacrifice, with one exception: the wealthy who can most afford to give something up. Their tax cuts—the same tax cuts that brought us unprecedented deficits—are protected and even extended under this proposal. They will cost our country an additional \$106 billion, of which 75 percent will go to people making over \$200,000 a year.

In order to pay for those tax cuts, the Republicans are literally proposing to take away food and health care from low-income families, kill 48 education programs by eliminating the \$4.3 billion that funds them, slash veterans' health care—including cutting \$9 million from medical and prosthetic research, and undermine community development in struggling neighborhoods by cutting \$1.5 billion in grant programs. Despite Republican claims, these cuts will do nothing to help our country's bottom line, but they will be devastating for the children, working families, veterans and seniors who will be asked to go without. This is not only irresponsible, but immoral.

In the that state of Illinois, we could see the Earned Income Tax Credit—the most effective anti-poverty program—cut by \$164.2 million, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families and child care grants lose \$84.3 million, and Supplemental Security Income—which helps poor seniors and people with disabilities—slashed by \$174 million. Thousands of vulnerable people's lives will be destroyed if the Republican budget passes.

The House Republican budget is even worse than the President's proposal. For instance, they propose even greater cuts to

Medicaid than under his plan. The \$20 billion in Medicaid cuts included in this budget resolution are unwise, unjustifiable and almost certainly lethal. As health care costs continue to rise, the number of uninsured Americans exceeds 45 million, and employers continue to cut back on coverage, Medicaid has provided a guarantee of support for pregnant women and children, persons with disabilities, persons living with AIDS or mental illnesses, and senior citizens needing medical care or long term care services. Without those services, millions of Americans will no longer be able to get the physical health, mental health, and long term care services they need to remain healthy and productive.

In my state of Illinois, Medicaid covers 40 percent of all births, 30 percent of all children, and 65 percent of all nursing home residents. In Illinois, under the leadership of our governor, we are working to expand Medicaid to cover more children and more families in face of a growing crisis in health care. This is not just the right thing to do, it is the cost-effective course to take. Medicaid costs less than private health insurance and its per capita costs are growing more slowly than private insurance premiums. But, if the Republican budget cuts re enacted, it may no longer be there for the millions of Americans who have no other source of care—other than bankrupting their families or mortgaging their futures to pay for their parents' long term care needs or their children's medical services.

Budgets are not just about numbers, they are about values and priorities. Based on the Republicans' proposal, maintaining and making permanent tax cuts for millionaires has been and continues to be a higher priority than meeting the needs of the majority of Americans. And, they are shifting the responsibility of their fiscal mess onto the backs of our children who will see decreased services and will be asked to deal with deficits for years to come.

The Democratic and CBC budgets recognize that this is the wrong thing to do and a great threat to our nation's future well-being and prosperity. It is time to reverse course so that we do not continue to mortgage our country's future and our children's prosperity in order to pay for tax cuts for the rich that we cannot afford and that they do not need. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Republican WMD and for the Democratic and CBC budgets.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the House of Representatives' budget plan and thank Chairman NUSSLE and his committee for their dedicated work on this legislation.

I think many of us agree that a federal budget of more than \$2.5 trillion dollars provides enough resources for the government. As I tell my constituents, we don't have an income problem herein Washington; we have a spending problem. Even as our economy has grown and revenues have increased in the past year, we continue to spend more than we take in. Our House budget takes important steps to address this spending problem while ensuring that our nation's most pressing needs are being met.

We are at war, so defense and security funding remain a priority. Much of the increased spending in the past few years has gone toward national defense and security, including \$258 billion in extra funding since Sep-

tember 11, 2001. Our House budget matches President Bush's commitment to our national defense needs with a 4.8 percent increase.

Beyond national security, this budget provides sufficient funds to meet our priorities, but it also take important steps to begin addressing Congress' spending problem.

First, our budget does not raise taxes in order to pay for more spending, as some are proposing in their alternatives. Second, our budget actually reduces non-defense and non-homeland security discretionary spending by .8 percent. Third, this budget will set us on course to reduce the growth in mandatory spending, which is growing far faster than our economy and comprises nearly two-thirds of all federal spending.

By maintaining the tax relief and not allowing for tax increases, our House budget ensures that the economy will continue to grow and create jobs. Sustained economic growth resulting from sustained lower taxes also narrows the budget deficit.

While non-defense discretionary spending is only about 20 percent of federal spending, it is the area in which Congress exercises the most direct annual control. We know there are programs that are wasteful, duplicative or unnecessary. By reducing spending in this area by .8 percent, we force ourselves to do better at finding the waste and consolidating or eliminating the programs we don't need in order to make the best use of the resources available.

For the first time in eight years, Congress is finally dealing with the unchecked growth of mandatory spending in this budget. Let's be clear—despite what we are hearing from some on the other side, this budget does not "cut" any programs that help those in need. More will still be spent this year than was spent last year, and by my West Texas definition, that is not a cut. What this budget does is set on the track to slow the rate of growth on the mandatory side, which is currently unsustainable. In the last ten years, federal Medicaid spending has nearly doubled, growing at an average of 8 percent each year. Even with the savings called for in this budget, Medicaid will still grow by 7.3 percent over the next 10 years, as opposed to increasing by 7.6 percent.

With regard to the mandatory spending reduction set for agriculture, I am concerned that the target in this bill is more than agriculture's total share of mandatory spending. As we conference with the Senate, I ask that the Budget Committee work toward a number that is more in line with agriculture's 4.7 percent share of mandatory spending.

What we are doing here with respect to agriculture is allowing the Agriculture Committee to look at all mandatory spending at USDA and have full discretion on how we reach our savings total. We can do this without "reopening" the Farm Bill. All USDA mandatory spending, including nutrition programs, must be considered.

During the first three years of the 2002 Farm Bill, farm programs have cost \$14 billion less than the Congressional Budget Office predicted when the legislation passed. The 2002 Farm Bill has proven to be a very effective safety net for our producers, providing support in times of lower prices, and reducing support when it is not needed. And even though spending will increase somewhat this year due to lower prices, total spending over the life of this Farm Bill is still projected to be less than was predicted.

Changing the rules of the game now, and then again in two years, is not sound policy. Budget decisions we make in agriculture today will not only affect the 2007 Farm Bill, but they will also affect our negotiating position in the World Trade Organization. If we take all of our chips off the table now, we will not have anything left to negotiate with as our trade representatives continue efforts to open new markets and reduce other barriers to U.S. products.

During meetings with constituents throughout my district, farmers understood the importance of balancing the budget, and they are willing to do their part to reduce the deficit. However, they do not support agriculture bearing a disproportionate share of the burden. Neither do I, and I am committed to working in conference to ensure our final budget outline for the year treats agriculture fairly.

Our constituents are looking to us to make responsible decisions about the use of their hard-earned tax dollars. They are counting on us to set the right priorities and follow through on past commitments. I believe our House budget sets us on the right path toward reducing spending, keeping our economy growing and protecting our nation.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, a federal budget is a statement of values. It says more about our values than any speeches, any rhetoric, any time.

Sadly, this partisan budget reflects the failed values of fiscal irresponsibility. And misplaced priorities. It locks in massive deficits for as far as the eye can see, adding hundreds of billions of dollars to a huge national debt that will slow our Nation's economic growth, put Social Security benefits at risk and bury your children in a sea of red ink for the rest of their lives.

Large deficits and underinvestment in education, research and health care are not prescriptions for a healthy economic future—they are prescriptions for economic stagnation and decline.

In my opinion, this budget is immoral. It asks the most from those who have the least and asks the least from those who have the most. That fails the values test of every major religious faith in our society.

This budget makes it harder for millions of students to attend college by increasing the gap between college costs vs student financial aid.

This budget says to veterans, including Iraqi war veterans that pensions for disabilities, compensation checks and G.I. education benefits will be cut by \$795 million over five years, thus making a mockery of the American principle of shared sacrifice during time of war. 14 billion over 5 years. I would imagine that budget item won't be discussed by supporters of this bill in their Veterans Day speeches this November.

This budget says to thousands of seniors who need nursing home care under the Medicaid program that you'll just have to go without that care. In my book, that's not a very respectful way of honoring thy father and mother.

To the working woman I met yesterday who works hard to help troubled youth in my hometown in Texas, this budget says your housing program will be cut, making it more difficult for her to find decent housing on a limited income.

Yet, to the fortunate person who makes one million dollars this year on dividend income,

this budget says you can keep every dime of the \$220,000 tax break you have received recently.

Asking seniors, students, veterans and hard-working families to sacrifice so those in the top one-tenth of one percent of income in America can keep all of their recent tax cuts does not pass the fairness test.

If this is a faith-based initiative, I would like to know on which faith it is based.

By refusing once again to require tax cuts to be paid for, my House Republican colleagues are endorsing the largest deficits in American history for the third year in a row. They have preached to us for five years the all gain, no pain budget built on the free lunch philosophy.

Unfortunately, the bill collector is now calling and the deficits caused by that failed philosophy have been financed by the Japanese and Communist Chinese who own tens of billions of our national debt and with it, the ability to wreck our American economy.

If House Republican leaders want to preach fiscal responsibility to individuals by toughening our bankruptcy law, then they had better start practicing what they preach. It is ironic that those who are condemning the personal debt of citizens have been the architects of three consecutive years of the largest federal deficits in American history.

Burdening America's middle class with greater debt and under investing in education and health care for working families is neither fair nor fiscally responsible.

Vote no on this budget. We can do much better, and the American people and our children deserve much better.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I would like the RECORD to reflect my views on the horrendous and deliberate deficits our Nation faces—these articles appeared today in Roll Call and last week in the New York Times.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 11, 2005]

RESCISSION TIME IN CONGRESS

(By Jim Cooper)

President Bush regularly calls on Congress to restrain spending. But he has yet to put his pen where his mouth is by using his veto—a blunt instrument, to be sure, but one that very few American presidents have failed to wield, especially during times of high deficits. Mr. Bush says he prefers a sharper veto power; the ability to cut spending programs within larger bills. He called for line-item veto power in his first press conference after his re-election and in his 2006 budget.

But such a statute is not only out of reach—it would probably require a constitutional amendment—it is also unnecessary. Why? Because Mr. Bush can already cut individual programs out of larger legislation with a scalpel that's almost as sharp as the line-item veto. An obscure law passed during the Nixon administration gives the president extraordinary power to stop any discretionary spending. All he has to do is persuade Republicans on Capitol Hill to go along.

It's called rescission. Under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, the president can select any appropriated Federal program for reduction or elimination by sending a message to Congress, which then has 45 days to approve his decision with a simple majority in each house. If Congress agrees, the president can reshape Federal government to his liking. If Congress disagrees, or fails to act, the cut disappears.

This law gives Mr. Bush more power than he has sought for his battles on trade pro-

motion or new Federal judges. With it, he can pick his targets, put fast-track pressure on Congress to respond, and win by gaining a simple majority approval—in other words, rescission is filibuster-proof.

So why haven't presidents been vigorously using the Impoundment Act to manage the budget in the last 31 years? The reason is that different parties usually controlled the White House and Congress, making large cuts impossible. For example, President Clinton won 111 of the 163 rescissions he requested from a divided Congress, but was able to save only several billion dollars.

Although Republicans now control both the House and Senate, Mr. Bush has not asked for any rescissions, large or small. Why has Mr. Bush kept this knife in a dusty drawer, especially given the staggering deficit, his public stance on the need to curb spending and his close ties with the Republican Congressional leadership? Surely he knows how often Mr. Clinton resorted to it.

Perhaps his unwillingness stems from the knowledge that, with rescission, Americans know who wielded the knife and what programs were cut or kept. But to govern is to choose. If Republicans really want to cut spending and reduce the deficit, they have more weapons than any political party has had in decades.

Jim Cooper, Democrat of Tennessee, is a member of the House Budget Committee.

[From the Rollcall, Mar. 17, 2005]

THE MISSING-IN-ACTION PRESIDENT

Today Congress will vote on a 5-year budget for the Nation. Usually contentious, this year's debate is relatively quiet as the richest nation in the world begs foreigners to finance our lifestyle.

Most Americans can name the President's top four policy priorities—tax cuts, war in Iraq, Social Security reform, and Medicare drug legislation. What Americans don't know is that these were either omitted from, or low-balled in, the President's own budget and his \$82 billion supplemental request. It's as if Bush budgeted for someone else's presidency.

The President's budget pays for only six months of the war in Iraq and completely overlooks the transition costs of Social Security reform. The Administration always lied about the cost of the Medicare drug bill. Extending the tax cuts will produce a sea of red ink just beyond the Bush budget's five-year window.

The House Republican budget is based largely on the President's, adding a tiny bit of compassion and \$50 billion for the war. Its deficits are still so large that, by the last year of the Bush administration, we will be paying more money to our Nation's creditors than to our own citizens in non-defense domestic discretionary spending. According to the GAO, by 2040 our current policies will result in creditors getting all of our defense, Social Security, Medicare, veterans' benefits, or any other program to help Americans.

Republican control of the executive and legislative branches means that they have the power to budget honestly for our Nation and reduce our deficits. President Clinton was able to achieve budget surpluses despite a divided government.

Take the veto. Bush is the first president since James Garfield in 1881 not to veto a single bill. Garfield only had six months in office; Bush has had over 4 years.

Bush did threaten to veto any effort to repeal the 2003 Medicare drug law that added \$8.1 trillion in unfunded liabilities to our Nation. This one entitlement program will twice as hard for future generations to afford as the alleged "crisis" in Social Security.

Bush brandished his veto pen to force Congress to spend money we do not have.

Take the rescission power. Few people realize that Bush could slash any program in Federal government with the approval of a simple majority in the Senate and the House. He has "fast-track" authority and no worries about filibusters. In other words, Republicans already have the "nuclear option" top cut spending, they've never used it. They don't even want you to know they have it.

President Clinton was able to pass 111 of his 163 rescission requests, saving taxpayers billions of dollars. President Bush has requested no rescissions.

Bush himself repeatedly calls for line-item veto power in order to tame spending. But why wait years for a constitutional amendment when he has never used the power he already has? Every second counts. Delay costs us over a billion dollars a day in additional borrowing.

Bush may be a strong leader in the war on terrorism, but on budget deficits he is missing-in-action. Conservative think tanks like the Heritage Foundation and Cato Institute have criticized Bush for his big increases in spending, which far exceed those of the Clinton era. Meanwhile tax revenues as a percent of GNP are the lowest since Eisenhower days.

Democrats are accustomed to Republicans routinely violating their term-limits pledges, and forgetting their Contract-with-America idealism (including the Balanced Budget Amendment), but Republicans are doing serious damage to the Nation with their irresponsibility on budget issues. As Head of State and Party, the President is being particularly irresponsible.

Is government spending the problem, as Republicans claim? If so, they have all the tools to stop it—more tools than any political party in modern times. Why won't Bush use his budget, his veto, his rescission, or simple restraint? Could it be that Republicans have fallen in love with "big government"? They are just refusing to pay her expenses.

Jim Cooper, a Democrat from Tennessee, serves on the House Budget Committee and as Co-Chair of the Blue Dog Coalition, a group of Democratic fiscal and defense hawks.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments to the concurrent resolution, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. FOSSELLA, 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, pursuant to House Resolution 154, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 214, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—218

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

NAYS—214

Abercrombie	Brady (PA)	Crowley
Ackerman	Brown (OH)	Cuellar
Allen	Brown, Corrine	Cummings
Andrews	Butterfield	Davis (AL)
Baca	Capps	Davis (CA)
Baird	Capuano	Davis (FL)
Baldwin	Cardin	Davis (IL)
Barrow	Cardoza	Davis (TN)
Bean	Carnahan	DeFazio
Becerra	Carson	DeGette
Berkley	Case	DeLauro
Berman	Chandler	Dicks
Berry	Clay	Dingell
Bishop (GA)	Cleaver	Doggett
Bishop (NY)	Clyburn	Doyle
Blumenauer	Conyers	Edwards
Boren	Cooper	Emanuel
Boswell	Costa	Emerson
Boucher	Costello	Engel
Boyd	Cramer	Eshoo

Etheridge	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Evans	Lofgren, Zoe	Ruppersberger
Farr	Lowey	Rush
Fattah	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Filner	Maloney	Sabo
Ford	Markey	Salazar
Frank (MA)	Marshall	Sánchez, Linda
Gerlach	Matheson	T.
Gonzalez	Matsui	Sanchez, Loretta
Goode	McCarthy	Sanders
Gordon	McCollum (MN)	Schakowsky
Green (WI)	McDermott	Schiff
Green, Al	McGovern	Schwartz (PA)
Green, Gene	McIntyre	Scott (GA)
Grijalva	McKinney	Scott (VA)
Gutierrez	McNulty	Serrano
Gutknecht	Meehan	Shays
Harman	Meek (FL)	Sherman
Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Simmons
Hereth	Melancon	Skelton
Higgins	Menendez	Slaughter
Hinchey	Michaud	Smith (NJ)
Hinojosa	Millender-	Smith (WA)
Holden	McDonald	Smith (WA)
Holt	Miller (NC)	Snyder
Honda	Miller, George	Solis
Hooley	Mollohan	Spratt
Hostettler	Moore (KS)	Stark
Hoyer	Moore (WI)	Strickland
Inslee	Moran (VA)	Stupak
Israel	Murtha	Tanner
Jackson (IL)	Nadler	Tauscher
Jackson-Lee	Napolitano	Taylor (MS)
(TX)	Neal (MA)	Thompson (CA)
Jefferson	Oberstar	Thompson (MS)
Johnson (IL)	Obey	Tierney
Johnson, E. B.	Olver	Towns
Jones (NC)	Ortiz	Udall (CO)
Jones (OH)	Owens	Udall (NM)
Kanjorski	Pallone	Van Hollen
Kaptur	Pascarell	Velázquez
Kennedy (RI)	Pastor	Visclosky
Kildee	Paul	Wasserman
Kilpatrick (MI)	Payne	Schultz
Kind	Pelosi	Waters
Kucinich	Peterson (MN)	Watson
Langevin	Pomeroy	Watt
Lantos	Price (NC)	Waxman
Larsen (WA)	Rahall	Weiner
Larson (CT)	Rangel	Wexler
Lee	Reyes	Woolsey
Levin	Ross	Wu
Lewis (GA)	Rothman	Wynn

NOT VOTING—3

Coble Delahunt Young (FL)

□ 1603

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. DOGGETT changed their vote from “yea” to “nay”.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio changed her vote from “nay” to “yea”.

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXPRESSING CONCERN REGARDING VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS BY SYRIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 18, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 18, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 3, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—402

Abercrombie	Doolittle	Kind
Ackerman	Doyle	King (IA)
Aderholt	Drake	King (NY)
Akin	Dreier	Kingston
Alexander	Duncan	Kirk
Allen	Edwards	Kline
Andrews	Ehlers	Knollenberg
Bachus	Emanuel	Kolbe
Baird	Emerson	Kuhl (NY)
Baker	Engel	LaHood
Baldwin	English (PA)	Langevin
Barrett (SC)	Eshoo	Lantos
Barrow	Etheridge	Larsen (WA)
Bartlett (MD)	Everett	Larson (CT)
Barton (TX)	Farr	Latham
Bass	Fattah	LaTourette
Bean	Feeney	Lee
Beauprez	Ferguson	Levin
Berkley	Filner	Lewis (CA)
Berry	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lewis (GA)
Biggart	Flake	Lewis (KY)
Bilirakis	Foley	Linder
Bishop (GA)	Forbes	Lipinski
Bishop (NY)	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Bishop (UT)	Fossella	Lowey
Blackburn	Fox	Lucas
Blumenauer	Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel
Blunt	Franks (AZ)	E.
Boehlert	Gerlach	Lynch
Boehner	Gibbons	Mack
Bonilla	Gilchrest	Maloney
Bonner	Gillmor	Manzullo
Boozman	Gingrey	Marchant
Boren	Gohmert	Marshall
Boswell	Hobson	Matheson
Boustany	Goode	Matsui
Boyd	Goodlatte	McCarthy
Bradley (NH)	Gordon	McCauley (TX)
Brady (PA)	Granger	McCollum (MN)
Brady (TX)	Graves	McCotter
Brown (OH)	Green (WI)	McCrery
Brown (SC)	Green, Al	McDermott
Brown, Corrine	Green, Gene	McGovern
Burgess	Grijalva	McHenry
Burton (IN)	Gutierrez	McHugh
Butterfield	Gutknecht	McIntyre
Buyer	Hall	McKeon
Camp	Harman	McMorris
Cannon	Hart	McNulty
Cantor	Hastings (FL)	Meehan
Capito	Hastings (WA)	Meek (FL)
Capuano	Hayes	Meeks (NY)
Cardin	Hayworth	Melancon
Cardoza	Hefley	Menendez
Carnahan	Hensarling	Michaud
Carson	Herger	Millender-
Carter	Hereth	McDonald
Case	Higgins	Miller (FL)
Castle	Hinojosa	Miller (MI)
Chabot	Hobson	Miller (NC)
Chandler	Hoekstra	Miller, George
Chocola	Holden	Mollohan
Clay	Holt	Moore (KS)
Cleaver	Honda	Moore (WI)
Clyburn	Hooley	Moran (KS)
Cole (OK)	Hostettler	Moran (VA)
Conaway	Hoyer	Murphy
Conyers	Hulshof	Murtha
Cooper	Hunter	Musgrave
Costa	Hyde	Myrick
Costello	Inglis (SC)	Neal (MA)
Cox	Inslee	Neugebauer
Cramer	Israel	Ney
Crenshaw	Issa	Northup
Crowley	Istook	Norwood
Cubin	Jackson (IL)	Nunes
Cuellar	Jackson-Lee	Nussle
Culberson	(TX)	Oberstar
Cummings	Jefferson	Obey
Cunningham	Jenkins	Olver
Davis (AL)	Jindal	Ortiz
Davis (CA)	Johnson (CT)	Osborne
Davis (FL)	Johnson (IL)	Otter
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Owens
Davis (TN)	Johnson, Sam	Oxley
DeFazio	Jones (NC)	Pallone
DeGette	Jones (OH)	Pascarell
DeLauro	Jones (OH)	Pastor
Dicks	Kanjorski	Payne
Dingell	Kaptur	Pearce
Doggett	Keller	Pelosi
Doyle	Kelly	Pence
Edwards	Kennedy (MN)	Peterson (MN)
Emanuel	Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (PA)
Emerson	Kildee	Petri
Engel	Kilpatrick (MI)	
Eshoo		