

So they are saying this is possible. But the initial success of the Verlinsky Group's effort, and this is a group that says they have done this, that needs to be corroborated by other scientists, and our research would determine whether or not that is feasible through animal experimentation; but it raises the future possibility that pluripotent stem cells could be derived from single blastomeres removed from early human embryos without apparently harming them.

They do a really good job of talking about the potential opportunities, and I want to note the asterisk; and a similar idea was proposed by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) as far back as 2001. This was a suggestion that I made to the people at NIH and then to the President, and that was well before the President came down with his executive order on the stem cell lines that could be used for further experimentation with Federal money.

They do a really good job in the body of this text. They talk about all of the potential benefits. They talk about developing the repair kit and taking cells in the repair kit to produce the stem cell line. And they said here at the beginning of it that all of this may be possible. But then it almost looks to me like somebody else wrote their recommendation section because going to the back to the recommendation section, they said the second proposal, blastomere extraction from living embryos, we find this proposal to be ethically unacceptable in humans owing to the reasons given. We would not impose risk on living embryos destined to become children for the sake of getting stem cells for research.

Mr. Speaker, that is not what they said in the first part of it. They said they were getting the stem cells to do preimplantation genetic diagnosis and getting the stem cells to develop a repair kit. I, too, have some concern about getting cells if the only reason for getting the cells is for research, but that is not the reason that the parents decide to do preimplantation genetic diagnosis; they do that because they want to have a baby that does not have a genetic defect.

That is not the reason that they have the cells cultured to produce a repair kit, because they want their baby to have the potential miracle of embryonic stem cells for the rest of their life. It is only at that time, after successful animal experimentation, as outlined in our bill, it is only at that time you would ask the parents, if you have surplus cells from your repair kit, might we start a stem cell line with them.

So although they do a very good job of discussing in the body of the text, please go back to the body of the text and read what they said there because they really short circuit the whole thing in their recommendations because the presumption in the recommendation is that we are taking the cells only for research. That was never the presumption, that we were taking the cells only for research.

In closing, I would like to look again, and this is a different chart, but it shows the same sequence of events, come back to what we are proposing so there is no misunderstanding of what we are proposing.

Again, I will go through what happens in normal fertilization, and then you have to imagine this is not occurring in the body of the mother, but it is occurring in a petri dish in a laboratory, in a fertility clinic.

This is the ovary and this is the funnel end called the infundibulum and this is the fallopian tube, and we come down to the uterus. This is half of the uterus, and there is a mirror image on this on the other side. It takes about 10 days until the egg implants in the uterus.

This is occurring now in the petri dish. We know at the 8-cell stage here that you can take a cell or two out, they have done it more than a thousand times, and get a perfectly normal baby after taking that cell or two out for preimplantation genetic diagnosis.

There is the possibility, although the authors of the "Alternative Sources of Pluripotent Stem Cells" argue that it is probably not possible, but there is a faint possibility, perhaps, if you put this in the proper environment you might have another embryo. Therefore, you start the ethical argument all over again.

But if you can wait, and I believe you can, if you wait until the inner cell mass to take that cell, now you have completely avoided that argument because at the inner cell mass there has already been enough differentiation that the cells in the inner cell mass will become the baby, but they can only become the baby if there are the cells in the trophoblast which will produce the decidua which is the amnion and the chorion, and they have not yet done this because there is no reason to do this. The inner cell mass stage is the stage at which the embryos are ordinarily taken to produce stem cell lines.

Again, our bill deals only with animal experimentation in nonhuman primates, and those are the great apes which I emphasized previously were genetically very similar, and they are widely used in research that would affect humans to determine the efficacy and the safety of those procedures on humans.

I would like to return for just a moment to the fundamentals of this debate: Christopher Reeves, Ronald Reagan, ever so many people out there that have diseases that one can imagine could be cured with applications of stem cell research. The real challenge is to be able to do that without what I think is a morally unacceptable procedure of destroying another potential human being in doing that. I know that there are 400,000 embryos out there. I know that not all of them will probably be implanted; but for any one of those embryos, Mr. Speaker, it could be implanted. It could be tomorrow's

Albert Einstein; it could be tomorrow's Ronald Reagan.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be in the position of making the decision that it is okay to take this potential baby, it is a life, to take this potential baby and destroy it because in doing so I might help some other people. We do not have to do that because as Dr. Coburn said in the Senate and as this letter from NIH says, it is completely feasible that we can reach these objectives by taking cells from an early embryo for the benefit of the embryo. Let me stress again that these cells would be taken at the parents' request to benefit their baby, to do a preimplantation genetic diagnosis to develop a repair kit.

Mr. Speaker, it would be wonderful if the 6.5 million people in the world today had repair kits. How much human suffering could be alleviated by that. The parents would have made these three decisions: in vitro fertilization because they cannot have a baby otherwise; to do a preimplantation genetic diagnosis because they want a baby that is going to have the highest possible quality of life; and to develop a repair kit. It is only at that time that we would ask them if you have surplus cells from your repair kit, might we not start another stem cell line with them.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to emphasize that our bill is just preparatory to all of this because it deals with none of this. It deals only with the animal experimentation that would determine the efficacy of developing repair kits and stem cell lines from this early embryo.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I have now cosponsors on both sides of the aisle, hopefully we will have a large number of cosponsors because this bill meets both the objectives and the objections of any Member who is concerned with the potential for embryonic stem cell application to medicine.

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

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2005 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act. This status report is current through May 23, 2005.

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

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays,

and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 95, the conference report on the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2005 because those years are not considered for enforcement of spending aggregates.

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

The third table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discre-

tionary appropriations for fiscal year 2005 with the total of "section 302(b)" suballocations among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures reported by the Appropriations Committee that would breach its section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2005 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 95

(Reflecting action completed as of May 23, 2005—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year—2005	Fiscal years 2005–2009
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority .....	2,078,456	(1)
Outlays .....	2,056,006	(1)
Revenues .....	1,483,658	8,519,748
Current Level:		
Budget Authority .....	2,073,350	(1)
Outlays .....	2,055,934	(1)
Revenues .....	1,484,065	8,603,391
Current Level over (+) / under (–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority .....	–5,106	(1)
Outlays .....	–72	(1)
Revenues .....	407	83,643

<sup>1</sup> Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2006 through 2009 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2005 in excess of \$5,106,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2005 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2005 in excess of \$72,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2005 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would reduce revenue for FY 2005 in excess of \$407,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009 in excess of \$83,643,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 95.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF MAY 23, 2005

(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

House committee	2005		2005–2009 total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
<b>Agriculture:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
<b>Armed Services:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
<b>Education and the Workforce:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	400	400
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	–400	–400
<b>Energy and Commerce:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	1,525	1,525
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	–1,525	–1,525
<b>Financial Services:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
<b>Government Reform:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	50	50
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	–50	–50
<b>House Administration:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
<b>Homeland Security:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
<b>International Relations:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
<b>Judiciary:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	6	6
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	–6	–6
<b>Resources:</b>				
Allocation .....	6	6	45	45
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	–6	–6	–45	–45
<b>Science:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
<b>Small Business:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
<b>Transportation and Infrastructure:</b>				
Allocation .....	3,488	0	12,238	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	–3,488	0	–12,238	0
<b>Veterans' Affairs:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
<b>Ways and Means:</b>				
Allocation .....	554	64	1,800	1,558
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	–554	–64	–1,800	–1,558

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations subcommittee	302(b) suballocations <sup>1</sup>		Current level reflecting action completed as of May 23, 2005		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	n.a.	n.a.	18,689	18,844	n.a.	n.a.
Defense	n.a.	n.a.	352,127	398,270	n.a.	n.a.
Energy & Water Development	n.a.	n.a.	30,533	30,107	n.a.	n.a.
Foreign Operations	n.a.	n.a.	18,892	25,898	n.a.	n.a.
Homeland Security	n.a.	n.a.	38,469	31,925	n.a.	n.a.
Interior-Environment	n.a.	n.a.	26,969	26,874	n.a.	n.a.
Labor, HHS & Education	n.a.	n.a.	143,180	141,773	n.a.	n.a.
Legislative Branch	n.a.	n.a.	3,545	3,785	n.a.	n.a.
Military Quality of Life-Veterans Affairs	n.a.	n.a.	80,263	76,417	n.a.	n.a.
Science-State-Justice-Commerce	n.a.	n.a.	58,438	57,956	n.a.	n.a.
Transportation-Treasury-HUD-Judiciary-DC	n.a.	n.a.	67,873	117,669	n.a.	n.a.
<b>Total (Section 302(a) Allocation)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>840,036</b>	<b>929,520</b>	<b>838,978</b>	<b>929,518</b>	<b>-1,058</b>	<b>-2</b>

<sup>1</sup> Appropriations Committee has not submitted the subcommittee allocations since the restructuring of the committee.

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, May 26, 2005.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2005 budget and is current through May 23, 2005. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions for fiscal year 2005 that underlie H. Con. Res. 95,

the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006. Pursuant to section 402 of that resolution, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the enclosed current level report excludes these amounts (see footnote 2 of the report).

Since my last letter, dated January 24, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that changed budget authority, outlays, or revenues for fiscal year 2005:

An act to provide for the proper tax treatment of certain disaster mitigation payments (Pub. L. 109-7);

The Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 (Pub. L.

109-8); and The Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Pub. L. 109-13).

The effects of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 are identified separately on the enclosed report. The effects of all other laws are included in the "previously enacted" section of the report, consistent with the budget resolution assumptions.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH M. ROBINSON  
(For Douglas Holtz-Eakin, Director).

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2005 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF MAY 23, 2005  
[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions: <sup>1</sup>			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	1,484,024
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,191,357	1,102,621	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	1,298,963	1,369,221	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-415,912	-415,912	n.a.
<b>Total, enacted in previous sessions:</b>	<b>2,074,408</b>	<b>2,055,930</b>	<b>1,484,024</b>
Enacted this session:			
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Pub. L. 109-13) <sup>2</sup>	-1,058	4	41
<b>Total Current Level<sup>2-3</sup></b>	<b>2,073,350</b>	<b>2,055,934</b>	<b>1,484,065</b>
<b>Total Budget Resolution</b>	<b>2,078,456</b>	<b>2,056,006</b>	<b>1,483,658</b>
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	407
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	5,106	72	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2005-2009:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	8,603,391
House Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	8,519,748
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	83,643
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P. L. = Public Law.

<sup>1</sup> The effects of an act to provide for the proper tax treatment of certain disaster mitigation payments (Pub. L. 109-7) and the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 (Pub. L. 109-8) are included in this section of the table, consistent with the budget resolution assumptions.

<sup>2</sup> Pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the current level excludes \$83,140 million in budget authority and \$33,034 million in outlays from the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Pub. L. 109-13).

<sup>3</sup> Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2006 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2006 THROUGH FY 2010

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2006 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 401 of the conference report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006 (H. Con. Res. 95). This status report is current through May 23, 2005.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated

for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 95. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2006 because those years are not considered for enforcement of spending aggregates.

The second table compares, by authorizing committee, the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H.

Con. Res. 95 for fiscal year 2006 and fiscal years 2006 through 2010. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2006 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The

comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation as well as the 302(a) allocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for 2007 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 401 of H. Con. Res. 95. This list is needed to enforce section 401 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills or amendments thereto that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2006 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONGRESSIONAL RESOLUTION 95

(Reflecting action completed as of May 23, 2005—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 2006	Fiscal years 2006—2010
<b>Appropriate Level:</b>		
Budget Authority .....	2,144,384	(1)
Outlays .....	2,161,420	(1)
Revenues .....	1,589,892	9,080,006
<b>Current Level:</b>		
Budget Authority .....	1,320,811	(1)
Outlays .....	1,644,899	(1)
Revenues .....	1,607,661	9,185,688
<b>Current Level over (+)/under (-) Appropriate Level:</b>		
Budget Authority .....	-823,573	(1)
Outlays .....	-516,521	(1)
Revenues .....	17,769	105,682

<sup>1</sup>Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2007 through 2010 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2006 in excess of \$823,573,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate)

would cause FY 2006 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2006 in excess of \$516,521,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2006 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would reduce revenue for FY 2006 in excess of \$17,769,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010 in excess of \$105,682,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 95.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF MAY 23, 2005  
(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

House committee	2006		2006–2010 total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
<b>Agriculture:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
<b>Armed Services:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
<b>Education and the Workforce:</b>				
Allocation .....	100	100	500	500
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	-100	-100	-500	-500
<b>Energy and Commerce:</b>				
Allocation .....	100	100	2,000	2,000
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	-100	-100	-2,000	-2,000
<b>Financial Services:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
<b>Government Reform:</b>				
Allocation .....	50	50	50	50
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	-50	-50	-50	-50
<b>House Administration:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
<b>Homeland Security:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
<b>International Relations:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
<b>Judiciary:</b>				
Allocation .....	6	6	6	6
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	-6	-6	-6	-6
<b>Resources:</b>				
Allocation .....	8	8	50	50
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	-8	-8	-50	-50
<b>Science:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
<b>Small Business:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
<b>Transportation and Infrastructure:</b>				
Allocation .....	3,027	0	4,107	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	-3,027	0	-4,107	0
<b>Veterans' Affairs:</b>				
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0
<b>Ways and Means:</b>				
Allocation .....	350	346	1,537	1,914
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	-350	-346	-1,537	-1,914

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations subcommittee	302(b) Suballocations as of May 18, 2005 (H. Rpt. 109-85)		Current level reflecting action completed as of May 23, 2005		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	16,832	18,691	7	5,399	-16,825	-13,292
Defense	363,440	372,696	27	126,306	-363,413	-246,390
Energy & Water Development	29,746	30,273	36	11,092	-29,710	-19,181
Foreign Operations	20,270	25,380	0	17,091	-20,270	-8,289
Homeland Security	30,846	33,233	0	14,762	-30,846	-18,471
Interior-Environment	26,107	27,500	0	11,504	-26,107	-15,996
Labor, HHS & Education	142,514	143,802	19,166	98,279	-123,348	-45,523
Legislative Branch	3,719	3,804	0	624	-3,719	-3,180
Military Quality of Life-Veterans Affairs	85,158	81,634	-2,170	16,515	-87,328	-65,119
Science-State-Justice-Commerce	57,453	58,856	0	23,080	-57,453	-35,776
Transportation-Treasury-HUD-Judiciary-DC	66,935	120,908	4,223	70,800	-62,712	-50,108
Unassigned	0	59	0	0	0	-59
<b>Total (Section 302(a) Allocation)</b>	<b>843,020</b>	<b>916,836</b>	<b>21,289</b>	<b>395,452</b>	<b>-821,731</b>	<b>-521,384</b>

STATEMENT OF FY2007 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS UNDER SECTION 401 OF H. CON. RES. 95, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF MAY 23, 2005

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority
Appropriate Level	23,158
Current Level:	
Elk Hills	0
Employment and Training Administration	0
Education for the Disadvantaged	0
School Improvement	0
Children and Family Services (Head Start)	0
Special Education	0
Vocational and Adult Education	0
Payment to Postal Service	0
Section 8 Renewals	0
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>

STATEMENT OF FY2007 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS UNDER SECTION 401 OF H. CON. RES. 95, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF MAY 23, 2005—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority
Current Level over (+) / under (-) Appropriate Level	-23,158
U.S. CONGRESS, CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE, Washington, DC, May 26, 2005. Hon. JIM NUSSLE, Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC. DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: the enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2006 budget and is current through May 23, 2005. This report is sub-	

mitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006. Pursuant to section 402 of that resolution, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the enclosed current level report excludes these amounts (see footnote 2 of the report). This is my first report for fiscal year 2006.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH M. ROBINSON

(For DOUGLAS HOLTZ-EAKIN, Director).

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2006 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF MAY 23, 2005

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions: <sup>1</sup>			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	1,607,650
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,351,021	1,318,426	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	382,272	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-479,872	-479,872	n.a.
<b>Total, enacted in previous sessions:</b>	<b>871,149</b>	<b>1,220,826</b>	<b>1,607,650</b>
Enacted this session:			
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Pub. L. 109-13) <sup>2</sup>	-39	-21	-11
Entitlements and mandatories:			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	449,701	424,094	n.a.
<b>Total Current Level<sup>2,3</sup></b>	<b>1,320,811</b>	<b>1,644,899</b>	<b>1,607,661</b>
<b>Total Budget Resolution</b>	<b>2,144,384</b>	<b>2,161,420</b>	<b>1,589,892</b>
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	17,769
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	823,573	516,521	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2006-2010:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	9,185,688
House Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	9,080,006
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	105,682
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable, P.L. = Public Law.

<sup>1</sup> The effects of an act to provide for the proper tax treatment of certain disaster mitigation payments (P.L. 109-7) and the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-8) are included in this section of the table, consistent with the budget resolution assumptions.

<sup>2</sup> Pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, provision designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the current level excludes \$30,790 million in outlays from funds provided in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (P.L. 109-13).

<sup>3</sup> Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

COLORADO TORPEDO PROGRAM REALIZES COST SAVINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to speak to my colleagues and those watching these proceedings about something that is occurring in Colorado's 7th Congressional District which is directly benefiting the Department of the Navy and the U.S. taxpayer.

I am so honored to have met the great folks in Arvada, Colorado, my home State, who work for Barber-Nichols, Incorporated, and to hear their story about what they have been able to do so far for the Navy's Surface Ship Torpedo Defense, SSTD, program.

□ 1800

This program uses a torpedo, or more particularly an anti-torpedo torpedo to protect our ships.

I know it sounds a bit off center, a landlocked State such as Colorado with such expertise in torpedo programs. In fact, Barber-Nichols possesses both ad-

vanced engineering and manufacturing prowess that are ideal for reducing the high cost of technology equipment such as the ATT, a very complicated weapon which has approximately 700 separate parts.

Barber-Nichols has used their expertise to help the Navy and the American taxpayer reduce the cost of the torpedo and provide tremendous cost savings in the program. To date, for every \$1 we have spent on the ATT affordability program, the Navy has realized future production cost savings of \$15. Barber-Nichols approached the Navy and their design agent, the Applied Research