

Congress can help. H.R. 2106 gives the airline carriers greater flexibility in funding their pensions. It provides more security for employees and will ensure that taxpayers will not be held liable for these underfunded pensions. A government bailout should not be a financial planning tool for the airlines.

Mr. Speaker, employees should receive the pensions they have worked for their entire lives, and taxpayers should not be left holding the bag. The Employment Pension Preservation and Tax Prepare Protection Act, H.R. 2106, is the winning formula.

#### TITLE IX'S 33RD ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, 33 years ago, Title IX, written by our dear friend, Patsy Mink, became law. Title IX recognizes that only when all Americans have opportunity to reach their potential can our country reach its potential.

Recently, the Bush administration said that if a school's women students do not respond to an e-mail from the school asking if they are interested in sports, then the school would be in compliance with Title IX.

That is ridiculous. There are acceptable standards to measure compliance that are accurate and must be used.

The lesson of Title IX is that interest flows from opportunity. That is why women's participation in sports has increased 800 percent in high school and 400 percent in college since 1972.

Moreover, if we are going to make policy based on how many people ignore one of the dozens of e-mails in their in-box, we will be in huge trouble with Title IX.

I hope that the President will heed the letter from the gentlewoman from California (Leader PELOSI), the gentleman from California (Ranking Member MILLER), and myself and 140 other Members, and rescind this clarification.

#### FLAWED POLICY DENIES CUBAN-AMERICANS REGULAR FAMILY VISITS

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the case of Sergeant Carlos Lazo. Sergeant Lazo is a Cuban American, a proud Cuban American who is serving in our military. He recently did a tour in Iraq and came home, wanting to visit his two children in Cuba. He was prevented from doing so, stopped at the airport, because we have a policy that only allows Cuban American families to visit each other once every 3 years. Here is a man serving in our military, proudly; we trust him in Iraq, but we do not trust him to visit his own family in Cuba.

It seems to me this policy is flawed. We will have amendments next week on the Treasury-Postal bill.

I urge my colleagues to look at this case, to meet with Sergeant Lazo who is on Capitol Hill today, and to rethink this policy of ours that denies Cuban Americans the ability to visit their families.

#### IN SUPPORT OF TITLE IX

(Ms. BORDALLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Title IX program which created equality, equality for young men and women in our Nation's schools.

As Title IX celebrates its 33rd anniversary today, I am concerned with recent attempts to undermine the program that will reverse the progress Title IX has made in enabling young women to participate in sports.

The Department of Education recently issued its "Additional Clarification of Intercollegiate Athletics Policy: Three-Part Test, Part Three" which changes the way schools determine female interest in athletics by making an e-mail survey the sole interest indicator.

This new policy harms the Title IX program because it prevents schools from using a multi-method approach to assess female sports programs. By deciding to base the future of women's athletic programs on e-mail surveys, the Department of Education is denying women the same opportunities as men to participate in sports.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to continue to support equal rights for men and women in every arena of public life, including sports. I strongly urge the Department of Education to rescind its policy. Title IX opened the doors for women; let us not close them now.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3010, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 337 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 337

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3010) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General

debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except for section 511. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the Committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 337 is a fair, open rule that provides for the consideration of the Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill for fiscal year 2006.

I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ranking Member OBEY) for their efforts in moving this important piece of legislation to the floor.

This appropriation bill funds health and education programs that are vitally important to our children and families. The Committee on Appropriations has met the need for these programs, while living within the parameters set by the House and the budget resolution.

The bill provides an \$118 million increase to the Department of Education, including a \$100 million increase for Title I State grants. My colleagues across the aisle decry what they call a lack of funding for education, and nothing could be further from the truth.

Since Republicans took control of Congress, funding for the Department of Education has more than doubled. In the last 5 years alone, total education expenditures have increased by nearly 50 percent.

I am particularly pleased that the committee provided resources to key college prep programs. The TRIO program is funded at last year's level of \$837 million, and GEAR-UP will receive \$306 million, also equal to last year's allocation. These two programs are very successful in helping low-income students in making the transition to college. Many TRIO and GEAR-UP participants from high schools and colleges across West Virginia took the

time to write me about their successes in the programs. I appreciate these students' efforts and wish them every success as they continue their education.

The bill also provides money for the Perkins Vocational Education and Tech Prep programs at last year's level. These programs provide job skills to students, some of whom will go to college, and many others will have the necessary training to enter the work force. Many West Virginia students take advantage of vocational education, so I appreciate that funding for those programs was maintained.

The maximum Pell grant award is increased to \$4,100, the highest level in the program's history. This increase is the beginning of a series of proposed increases in Pell grants that will help more students across the country afford the growing cost of a college education.

The committee provides \$569.6 million, the same as fiscal year 2005, for the Adult Education State Grant program. This money will be used to help fund literacy programs for adults and enable them to complete a secondary education. Reading skills are a necessity for our adults as well as our youth, and for adults in the employment market and in everyday life, so I am pleased this bill restores adult education to last year's level.

The legislation before us also addresses the many health care needs of our Nation. The bill contains a \$145 million increase for the National Institutes of Health, demonstrating our commitment to finding cures for deadly diseases. Funds for community health centers that provide primary care for many patients in counties across my district and others across the country are increased by \$100 million to \$1.8 billion. These health centers are important, because they offer health care to people in rural communities who have few other options for quality care. Health centers are cost effective because they cut down on unnecessary emergency room visits and expensive, serious ailments that come when minor illnesses go untreated.

I am also glad that the bill provides \$890 million to begin the implementation of Medicare Part D, the long-awaited prescription drug benefit that will be especially helpful for our Nation's poorest seniors.

Job training activities, especially the successful Job Corps program, are also well provided for in this legislation. The Job Corps Centers in Charleston and Harper's Ferry in my district do an outstanding job of training students not only to be productive workers, but to be active members of their community as well. I am pleased that Job Corps will see an increase to \$1.44 billion this year.

As with any appropriation legislation, we had to make tough choices in this legislation. These choices are particularly difficult when dealing with the sensitive health and education issues like the ones in this bill. The

Committee on Appropriations allocated the available resources in this bill in a manner that emphasizes those programs most important to our Nation. I urge my colleagues to join me in support for the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me start with a quote from Lyndon Johnson: Today we rededicate a part of the airwaves which belong to all the people," a thing we should always remember, "and we dedicate them for the enlightenment of all the people."

President Lyndon Johnson spoke these words at the White House ceremony which marked the official creation of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in 1967. Much has changed in the 37 years since then, but in the realm of television, Mr. Speaker, a PBS program that reaches millions of families every day has been the only constant.

PBS programming is first and foremost about children. At a time when so many television networks are wary of producing educational programming because it will not be cost-effective as they define it, PBS stands alone. They are proud to present wonderful programs that teach children how to read, how to share, and how to be tolerant of others. But PBS is not just for children, it is for minds of all ages that seek to question and learn about our world.

PBS has the best documentaries, the best programs about American history and about the new scientific discoveries which are constantly changing our world. There is a reason that Peggy Noonan of The Wall Street Journal, an unabashed conservative, has written that "At its best, at its most thoughtful and intellectually honest and curious, PBS does the kind of work that no other network in America does or will do." Ms. Noonan wrote this because it is true. And what is most important, PBS programming is free to all.

Big Bird reaches all the children in America, regardless of whether they are in urban or rural areas, regardless of their economic class or whether or not their parents can afford 500 channels of cable, but the majority leadership is speaking out against Big Bird here today and the other great children's programming. They are speaking out against quality news and arts and entertaining programs that have no other place to call home on television today.

The Labor-HHS appropriations bill we will consider today offers cuts of more than \$100 million from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting fund-

ing. And, all told, this bill imposes a staggering 42 percent cut in funding for PBS this year.

□ 1045

Now, why would the Congress do this? There is only one reason, Mr. Speaker, and that reason is the leadership of this body does not like PBS. In fact, Republicans have been after PBS for years. Ronald Reagan tried to slash CPB funding, so did Newt Gingrich. And now the conservatives have redoubled their efforts.

They claim that PBS is the lapdog of the left. But the notion that PBS is partisan runs against the very grain of what PBS is and what the Corporation for Public Broadcasting was designed to accomplish.

President Johnson stated that CPB was intended to be carefully guarded from government and party control. It will be free, it will be independent, and it will belong to all of our people.

PBS and CPB, therefore, should be neither liberal nor conservative and should instead be honest and objective; and it always has been. The real problem with our friends on the right seems to be confusing intellectually honest and independent programming with so-called liberal bias, simply because they are not espousing their own narrow conservative world view 24 hours a day.

Most Americans, no matter their political persuasion, understood the benefits of hearing views from different perspectives; and they like the idea of truly independent, stimulating public programming. They understand that Big Bird cannot be replaced by 500 channels of cable.

That is why Roper polls taken in 2004 and 2005 found that the people of our country thought that spending money on PBS was the second best use of their tax dollars, right behind the funding of our military.

But the independence of PBS and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is somehow a threat to this Republican leadership. Why else would Kenneth Tomlinson, the new Republican chairman of CPB, attempt to appoint Patricia Harrison as the new head of the Corporation For Public Broadcasting?

Ms. Harrison is a strange choice for the leader of a broadcasting corporation in as much as she has never even worked in broadcasting. On the other hand, she was at one time the cochair of the Republican National Committee, and so perhaps her qualifications for the position speak for themselves.

Mr. Tomlinson also felt that such prominent PBS programs such as "NOW," with Bill Moyers, were liberal in their orientation. He therefore did the honorable thing and hired several ombudsmen to secretly spy on the programs and report on their activity.

And just last week, we learned that in 2004 the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, now firmly under partisan Republican leadership, gave two Republican lobbyists \$15,000 and did not tell anybody they had done so.

By the way, Mr. Tomlinson was head of Voice of America, and we understand that Voice of America is to be outsourced to Asia. How do you like that, America? Is this what we have come to, spying on the network that brings us "Sesame Street," "The Electric Company," "Captain Kangaroo"? And if so, what is next?

Will we have satellite surveillance of the "Antiques Road Show"? Wire taps in Oscar's trash can? Are the American people going to allow these same individuals who actively manipulate the media, who have allowed political operatives to pose as journalists in the White House, who have paid commentators and pundits to falsely pose as journalists, to manipulate public opinion?

Are we going to allow them to tell us that now Public Broadcasting is the enemy? I certainly hope and pray not. If there is any doubt that this is their true intention, my fellow Americans, we need look no further than this very bill, approved in a subcommittee where the Republican leadership successfully eliminated funding for PBS and the Corporation For Public Broadcasting.

As with so many other things in this Congress, they were shamed by the American people into reversing course, but I imagine that the right wing assault on PBS will continue.

President Johnson feared that if placed "in weak or even in irresponsible hands," public television could generate controversy without understanding, could mislead as well as teach.

It could appeal to passions rather than to reason. That was very far-seeing for President Johnson. Let us not succumb to the misguided partisan passions of the leadership which threaten to destroy this cherished American institution. Let us preserve public networks across our country.

Mr. Speaker, Sesame Street teaches children to be fair and just. And we learned that from Sesame Street, our children learned it from Sesame Street, let us practice it today, and we expect no less from Members of this Congress.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill contains quite a bit on education. I think the wonderful thing about America is that every child in America is afforded a public education through our public schools. I am very proud to say that I have three children who are very fine graduates of West Virginia public schools. And there are tough choices to be made in this bill. I acknowledged that in my opening statement. And I acknowledge that as well.

But I would like to go through some of the things, the public education things, in this bill that will help every child in America no matter what channel they turn to on the television. There is a \$118 million increase to the

Department of Education. Increases in Pell grants to the highest ever, \$4,100 availability. Special Ed grants are funded at \$10.7 billion, \$150 million above last year's funding.

Title I grants, which help the underprivileged and our lower-economic students, \$100 million over last year's funding. Reading programs. Reading is an essential art; I hope it never becomes a lost art. It is an essential art for our future, not only to bring much joy into people's lives but also to see that they are able to secure fruitful employment and raise a family and have the best things in America. Reading is absolutely essential.

Reading programs are funded at \$1.2 billion. The Reading First program is funded at over \$1 billion. The Even Start program is funded at \$200 million. Math and science. We have heard a lot about the loss of math and science abilities in our students coming out of high school. We recognize that in this bill, and we have increased by over \$11 million for a total of \$190 million to enhance the number of teachers trained to teach in the fields of math and science.

I think there is much to be proud of in this bill in terms of the way we have addressed problems in our public education, and the way we have addressed something that is near and dear to every American's heart, that is, a good solid quality education for our children.

We have also worked to improve teacher quality. This provides \$2.94 billion to help teachers with professional development programs. So I think that this year's bill, while the tough decisions were made, and as I said, I congratulate the chairman and ranking member for making those tough choices, there is a lot in here that will help enhance the education, enrich the lives of our children, and help improve the quality of our public education.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House is on schedule to pass all 10 appropriations bills necessary to fund the Federal Government. But the challenge we face is to do so under the tight constraints dictated by the budget resolution put forth by the Republican majority.

I believe a budget is a moral blueprint for the priorities of the Federal Government. But, sadly, this year's budget fails to address our Nation's most basic priorities and fails to plan for our Nation's future. And now, to the detriment of our appropriations bills and ultimately our country, we

have become chained to its misguided priorities.

The long-term health of our Nation is being threatened at a time when we should be investing in it. Within 15 years, America's supply of nurses will fall almost 30 percent below the Nation's needs. Filling the registered nurse pipeline with new recruits requires sustained, aggressive funding over the long term. And I am disappointed to say that level funding in the bill for nursing programs will not do enough to reverse this demographic reality.

If we fail to support the backbone of this Nation's health care industry and ask our nurses to spread themselves even thinner, we risk everything that comes with it, including decreased patient safety and poor quality of care.

And we are failing in this bill to meet the needs of those individuals who most need the access to health care professionals. This bill guts critical funding from title VII programs which encourage health professionals to serve in underrepresented populations. I have seen the positive effects of this funding in my hometown of Sacramento. The UC Davis Medical Center uses title VII funds to train medical students to work through significant language or economic barriers in communities that have a host of otherwise treatable medical conditions.

And medical center fellows trained with these monies conduct cutting-edge research in health care disparities and how to improve cancer screening. Sacramentoans have been well served because of this investment in the health of the community.

But, again, title VII funding is eliminated in this bill without regard for these long-term impacts. And so, again, we see yet one more example of the misguided priorities contained in this year's budget.

Let me close by talking about this commitment to the future in a slightly different way. Growing up, I never doubted that I would have the opportunity to go to college. And never once did I doubt a doctor would be there when I fell ill.

But, Mr. Speaker, not all Americans are lucky enough to have these assurances. The way in which we as a Nation meet the gap between the world we want to raise our children in and the challenges of life speaks directly to the values we hold. This bill absolutely fails in that vision.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to talk a little bit about community health centers. I visited all of the community health centers in my district of West Virginia. They go a long way towards enhancing access and quality in the rural areas. It has been a great initiative that has worked very successfully in a State that sometimes has difficult areas to get to.

And I am pleased that this bill enhances that funding by \$100,000 million.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, and I rise in opposition to the Labor-HHS Education appropriations bill.

My reason is simple: This bill shortchanges the American people in so many ways that it is difficult to keep track of them all. Just last month, when the House was considering H.R. 366, the Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act, I raised the question of where the Appropriations Committee was going to find the \$1.3 billion to fund these programs without making deep cuts in other critical programs.

I raised this question, because the Republican majority had just passed a budget resolution in lock step with the President's request to zero out vocational education programs.

So while I am pleased that the committee has restored \$1.3 billion for vocational education, my worse fears have come to pass. This bill eliminates half a billion dollars' worth of other education programs. It eliminates half a billion dollars' worth of important health programs. It eliminates \$56 million of Labor Department programs.

These critical programs include early learning opportunities for early childhood development, the Community Food and Nutrition program, comprehensive school reform, student alcohol abuse reduction, and dozens of others.

This bill practically eliminates funding for health professions training and professional development programs at a time when our Nation is facing a severe shortage of health care professionals. Primary care physician training programs in Massachusetts would be cut by \$12 million.

These programs stand to be cut by over \$2 million alone at the University of Massachusetts Health Care Center, the largest employer in my district. These cuts will further strain an already fragile health care system in my home State and around the country.

And I have not even begun to touch upon programs that have seen their funding sharply reduced or frozen for the second, third, or fourth year in a row. My colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), talked about the senseless cuts to PBS.

Essential programs such as community service block grants, the child block grant, after-school programs, the investment and professional training and development of our teachers have all been cut or level funded. In the end, thousands and thousands of families, children and elderly, the sick and the poor in our communities will lose the help and services that are critical to reducing the vulnerability of their daily lives.

□ 1100

Hospitals, health care centers, schools, and community centers will

lose the ability to provide quality classes, programs and services.

Mr. Speaker, I was not sent to Washington to hurt the poor and the elderly. I was not sent here to shortchange our schools and health care providers or to undercut State and local efforts by starving them of needed resources.

As I have said on many occasions, and it is important to repeat today as we move on this legislation, the Republican majority is fast creating a government, that lacks compassion and has no conscience. My friends on the other side of the aisle fought ferociously for tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires. They had to have those tax cuts, and guess what, they have diverted billions and billions of dollars from programs that benefit our kids, our senior citizens, and the most vulnerable in our society.

I suppose that highlights the real difference between the two political parties. But, Mr. Speaker, what they are doing is wrong, it is so wrong and it is why I oppose this bill today, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to note in this bill another program that is very important to every State across the Nation, and that is the Head Start program. The Head Start program has been funded \$56 million over last year's level, and this will help towards the readiness of our preschoolers to be able to be ready to handle the challenges of school.

Another program highlighted in this bill is funding of \$100 million for a new pilot program to develop and implement innovative ways to provide financial incentives for teachers and principals who raise student achievement and close the achievement gap.

And back to community health centers, I think this is one of the best ways to cover children's health care. Many young families cannot travel far to access hospitals for preventative care. This will go towards managing health care for children with another \$100 million for that program.

My colleague talked about senior programs. I note in this bill there are several senior programs. There is the National Senior Volunteer Corps and the Foster Grandparents program. Foster Grandparents always come to visit me in Washington and tell me about their program. I am in awe at their dedication to not only seniors but to the youth of America. The Senior Companion Program and the Retired Senior Volunteer program, these programs are funded at the highest levels ever, and I think it will go a long way towards giving our seniors a way to volunteer and give back to the Nation, to the young people and families. I am pleased that the chairman recognized the value of these programs in his bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sad to say that I think this bill is a prescrip-

tion for a second-rate economy for the American people because it declines to make the long-term investments that are necessary in education, in health care, in job training, in worker protection and the like.

I will be voting against the previous question on the rule and the rule itself because the Committee on Rules did not make in order the amendment that I had asked them to make in order which would have done one very simple thing: it would have provided an additional \$11.8 million in funding for high-priority education, health and worker protection programs. It would have provided that same amount, \$11.8 million, in deficit reduction; and it would have paid for that by reducing the supersize tax cuts for people who make over a million dollars a year. Right now they are expected to get on average a \$140,000 tax cut this year. We would have limited their tax cut to only \$36,000, the poor devils. They would have to get along with only \$36,000.

I make no apology about wanting to make these investments. We are the greatest country in the world. We have the greatest economy in the world. We are the world's leader in technology. We are the world's leader in almost everything, but we did not get there by not making crucial investments year after year after year. We got there by investing in our people by way of education, by making the right capital investments, by making the right investments in science and technology; and that grew the economy for everybody. This bill walks away from that responsibility.

This bill, in real-dollar terms, after you adjust for inflation, will deliver on a per-person basis about \$5.9 billion less in these critical areas than it delivered last year.

There is one other element of the amendment I would like to talk about for just a moment. We talk a lot in this country about preventing abortions. It has been my experience that lectures from your local friendly politician or your local clergyman are not nearly as helpful to young women who are pregnant and trying to decide if they are going to carry a baby to term or not as is a helping hand. The amendment we wanted to offer would have provided that helping hand.

It would have taken critical programs that would make it economically easier for low-income and vulnerable women to choose to carry pregnancies to term. We would have had \$175 million for maternal and infant health care, returning it to the fiscal year 2002 level. We would have added \$300 million to child care, returning that to the fiscal year 2002 level. We would have added \$418 million to the community service block grant to provide people with an opportunity for education, training and work, and to live with decency and dignity. And we would have provided \$126 million for domestic violence prevention, effectively doubling that program. We

would have doubled the Healthy Start program for newborn babies, and we would have increased job training for young women by \$212 million.

If we are concerned about life, our concern cannot end with the check-book's edge. We need to recognize that if we are going to provide real-life, real-world opportunities for women to help convince them not to have abortions, we need to be funding programs like this. These are a whole lot more important to the spirit of the country, to the economy of the country, than providing a \$140,000 tax cut to somebody who makes a million bucks a year.

Mr. Speaker, I regret the Committee on Rules did not make this amendment in order. That is why I will be voting against the previous question and voting against the rule.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman of the subcommittee.

(Mr. REGULA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has done a great job of describing the bill as part of the rule debate. The bill covers many items of great importance to people. The bill is a balanced bill. It is a recognition, of course, that we have limited resources. But within the framework of what was available and what was given to us by way of an allocation, I think we have done an excellent job, as was described by the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), in making priority choices.

I was interested this morning when I read the Post that David Broder in his column says, "As for the value of education, when asked to identify from a list of five options the single greatest source of U.S. success in the world, the public education system edged out our democratic system of government for first place, with our entrepreneurial culture, military strength and advantages of geography and natural resources far behind."

Number one in public opinion was education. We will talk about this in the general debate, and the gentlewoman likewise pointed this out, that this bill emphasizes education and some new areas, putting emphasis on teachers and principals, because the people are what make a school system a success.

Also in Roll Call today, an article by Morton Kondracke, the editor, the caption is: "Avian Flu Could Become Top '08 Issue. Seriously." He goes on to point out in here how the Senate leader, a physician, made a speech and declared infectious disease and bioterrorism are "the single greatest threat to our safety and security today." He went on to say fighting them will be

the overriding purpose of his political future. That, again, we address in this bill.

I just want to point out that the bill does as much as possible within the constraints of limiting spending, addressing two major issues that are both in the news today, education and the threat of bioterrorism. We will discuss that more in the general debate on the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, of the many reasons to vote against this measure, one of the most significant is its failure to address the "opportunity deficit." Yes, this administration's many failures are reflected in the budget deficit and the trade deficit, but I am even more concerned about the "opportunity deficit."

When students cannot develop their God-given potential to its fullest extent, we have an "opportunity deficit." When our community cannot benefit from the talents of those students unable to get a higher education, we have an "opportunity deficit." By failing to increase the amount of federal financial assistance to let all students get the full extent of educational opportunity, this measure today deepens the "opportunity deficit."

Freezing Perkins loans, freezing work-study financing for all of those students who want to work, freezing Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants, and virtually freezing Pell grants demonstrate that these Republicans are putting higher education on ice for too many students. This administration gives students a cold shoulder, as they have by freezing Pell grants in the past, in not addressing the rising tuition rates across the country.

Our students at UT-Pan American, South Texas College, Austin Community College, and Huston-Tillotson University depend on Pell grants, but the purchasing power of Pell grants has shrunk to historic lows. The purchasing power of Pell grants, which once covered half of tuition and fees, is down to a historic low, now only covering a fourth of tuition and fees.

In his budget President Bush proposed a Pell Grant increase of, finally, a pittance, \$100: enough to buy a chemistry textbook, almost. But this bill cuts that pittance in half. That is not enough for a textbook. It is not even enough to pay for the increased cost of gas, another failure of this administration, to get to class for a week.

I believe we need to do more to support our young people, to support our future by giving them the financial assistance that they need; and this bill, like the entire approach of this administration, from pre-kindergarten to postgraduate education, fails to address that "opportunity deficit."

For those who can still afford to attend school, we are saddling that generation with a burden of debt, much

like the burden of debt in the public sector. We are not investing adequately in our future or in our students. Students are facing a mountain of debt after graduation that this bill does not address. Let us close the "opportunity deficit" and reject this measure.

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

I would like to comment on Pell grants because this bill contains the largest amount for Pell grants ever in the history of the United States, \$4,100 per student. That is a lot of opportunity for a lot of different students.

I would also like to say that the TRIO program, the GEAR-UP program, the Job Corps program, these are all programs designed to help students who might not have an opportunity get an opportunity through those programs. They are well-funded, successful programs; and they are recognized in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a champion of education.

□ 1115

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I came on this committee after I had been on the authorizing committee for education. Then the chairman was Congressman JON PORTER, probably one of the best chairmen that have ever chaired that particular committee. I was concerned that because of the delicacies of the programs that this particular bill offers, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has quite often spoken of it as the caring committee because it involves such things as education, health care, medical research and so on, I was concerned about who was going to replace JON PORTER. The leadership came up and gave the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) the chair, and I watched and watched. Members on both sides of the aisle would agree that the gentleman from Ohio has done every single thing that he can to enhance the properties of this bill.

Now, many will use each of these bills for propaganda against the administration, against Republicans. I would tell you that most of the things that we fight for in this bill are done in a bipartisan way. There are other things that other people would like, but when it comes down to it, education and the different aspects of this bill, we do work together. The House bill is only the start. We have the other body to go through and we have a conference to go through. What we are talking about here today will not be in effect.

I would also like to recognize, Mr. Speaker, that only 7 percent of education is funded by the Federal Government; 93 percent of education is funded by the State. California has had a particular problem with a \$12 billion debt left by a different Governor and they are trying to pay that back. In most States, Leave No Child Behind has worked successfully. In California, we

need more flexibility. Many of the State laws do not apply or correspond to the Federal laws and we are having problems, especially in IDEA, attendance and testing. But I will tell you that the items in which this bill are important, Impact Aid that takes care of our military troops and Native Americans, is increased in this bill.

If you look at title I, what is title I? Title I is for the most disadvantaged children we have in our Nation. California has to fight for its fair share. About 1 in 9 Americans live there. But yet title I is in this bill is increased.

Pell grants, as has been mentioned, is the highest level ever. No child should be denied a secondary or a college education if they meet the standards, and Pell grants help that. But, remember, the State pays for 93 percent.

IDEA, there is some reform I think we can work on together in the Individuals With Disabilities Act. There are some students that take over \$100,000 a year out of the school system under IDEA because of special needs, and the school has to pay. We need to embrace that because in many areas those costs are impacting the schools themselves.

There is one amendment that I think is a good amendment that I may have to go against my chairman in this today and that is Easy Start, authored by former member Bill Goodling of the authorizing committee, a program in which parents are actually involved with their children at an early age in education, and I think that that should somehow be restored, hopefully in conference or maybe even with this amendment.

But I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio and I want to thank the Members on the other side of the aisle. I am sad to hear the partisan rhetoric when many times we work so closely together.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can say is that I rise with enthusiasm to support the Obey/Slaughter/Leach amendment that recognizes the need and the reason for survival of public broadcasting. I only say one sentence. If Afghan citizens can gather yesterday in Washington to welcome Big Bird to Afghanistan, then it really is a shame that we are closing the door and turning off the lights and turning off the television for the children of America who learn and are inspired by Big Bird and Sesame Street and PBS.

But then I want to support the Obey amendment that will be coming up that adds \$11.8 billion to a bill that has been called America's umbrella. I am very sad to say that even though I have the greatest respect for the chairman and, of course, the ranking member of this subcommittee, we have not done our job. From the billions of dollars

that have been cut from education, it is evident that we need a reform of this bill. No Child Left Behind, \$806 million has been cut. The bill cuts \$603 million from Title I. The Republican majority again breaks their promise on the funding of IDEA, provisions that help those with special needs. The bill freezes dollars in the after-school centers. It slashes education technology dollars by \$196 million. It eliminates comprehensive school reform grants to 1,000 high-poverty schools by eliminating the program. This is not the umbrella that the American people need.

When we begin to talk about investment in America, this is the bill we do it in, and we have traditionally done it in a bipartisan way. I have heard my good friend from California say this is a House bill, we are not finished, but this is a bill that makes a statement to America. We have cut moneys from the most vulnerable. I would ask my colleagues to look at this closely, defeat this bill and go back to the American people and work on their behalf.

Support the Obey amendment.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy. I rise in opposition to the rule and to the bill. I have many concerns, but one of the most fundamental deals with the treatment of public broadcasting. Public broadcasting, is America's voice. It is our window on public affairs, culture, children's programming and education, enjoyed by 80 million viewers a week and over 30 million listeners on NPR, and one of the last locally owned media voices in America. I worked hard over the last couple of weeks to avoid a partisan showdown over this bill, but here we are.

What does it say about America's priorities that we are cutting public broadcasting over 40 percent from the current year's spending level to help achieve the overall 1 percent target reduction in the bill of over \$140 billion, a self-imposed straitjacket by the Republican majority? The committee actually tried at first to eliminate altogether future funding which has luckily been beaten back, at least for the time being. But I would urge each of my colleagues to look at the committee report, at the estimated allocations for public television and radio stations that are listed on pages 315 to 327 to look at the damage.

Ironically, in States that are rural like mine that have large rural areas, small towns, this damage is understated, because the big cities will always have public broadcasting, although it will be hurt under this bill; but small town America, rural America, that do not have the resources to make up for it and are much more expensive to receive broadcasting, they face elimination, and it is outrageous.

I am pleased that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is coming

forward with an amendment. I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get real about what America wants and America needs. This is one thing we ought to come together and fix.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately this appropriations bill fails the values test of equal opportunity and fairness that the American people would expect of us. The bill's failure is rooted in the flawed priorities of the House leadership, which has said in its budget resolution that it is okay to cut education, job training, and health programs so that someone making \$1 million a year can receive every dime of his or her \$220,000 annual tax cut. That is not okay. It is wrong.

These flawed priorities not only offend Americans' sense of fairness, they undercut our constitutional promise of equal opportunity for all Americans. It makes no sense. There are 7.6 million unemployed Americans, but this bill cuts job training programs. It makes no sense. Our Nation faces an ever more competitive world, but this bill does not allow college student loans and grants to even keep up with the inflationary cost of higher education. The result, millions of hardworking students who have earned the right to go to college will not be able to afford to do so, thus undermining their future and our Nation's future. It makes no sense.

Over 43 million Americans, most of them from working families, have no health insurance, but this bill cuts services from maternal and child health along with rural health programs. It makes no sense.

Parents yearning to have more commercial-free quality television programming for their small children will be deeply disappointed to learn that this bill guts funding for public broadcasting.

Our labor, health and human service programs are about helping people help themselves. Yet this bill, after inflation and population growth, cuts \$5.9 billion from these important programs. That is a lot of bootstraps that decent, hardworking people will not have to pull themselves up and their family's future up.

Cutting programs that help millions of hardworking middle- and low-income American families make a better life for themselves in order to pay for a \$220,000 annual tax cut for a privileged few reflects neither faith-based nor pro-family values. The bottom line is this bill fails the American family values test of equal opportunity and fairness. This bill fails American children, seniors, and families. It fails our Nation's future. We can do better and American families deserve better.

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

I would like to point out in this bill in terms of America's seniors that there is implementation funding in here for the very historic prescription drug plan that will help many, many, many seniors across this country and particularly those lower-income seniors who really are making those tough choices. I am proud to say that is a bill I was proud to have voted for. I cannot wait for the implementation. This bill provides for the good education materials and the implementation materials that our seniors are going to need to move forward with this program.

I would like to dispute also in terms of cutting education, that is inherently false. There are 118 million more dollars in this bill for public education than there was last year. I think that looks at the programs that are successful and enhances them. Tough choices have been made, no question about it.

There are other things in here. I talked about Job Corps, but there is also a dislocated workers program which is a rapid response for layoffs and plant closures or natural disasters, something, unfortunately, a State like West Virginia, we seem to have our share of natural disasters in flooding. This gives us the ability to have that rapid response. I think there is much to be proud of in this bill. There is lots in here for education, for our families, for our seniors, for our workers and for the health of our Nation.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I will be calling for a "no" vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule so that we can consider the Obey amendment that was rejected in the Rules Committee on a straight party-line vote.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately prior to the vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the Obey amendment would give \$11.8 billion in needed funding for the priority job training, education and health programs which have been underfunded in this bill. A \$50 increase in a Pell grant, let me state, is not going to help anybody get a college education. The cost of this amendment will not add one dollar to the deficit. It is fully offset by reducing the substantial six-digit tax cuts for those making more than \$1 million from about \$140,000 to \$36,500 for the coming year. That cannot hurt too much. That means that America's millionaires will only be getting \$36,000 in special tax breaks so that we may properly fund education for our children and provide adequate health care for working Americans, a sacrifice, I believe, that is well worth the cost.

□ 1130

In addition, the Obey amendment would reduce the deficit by \$11.8 billion while at the same time protecting these valuable social programs for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the activities included in this bill fund many of the government's most important social services and touch almost every American in some way. Most of the programs and services in the bill are considerably underfunded, many funded at last year's levels or below. And those that have received increases have generally not received enough to keep pace with inflation. Most education programs are cut or frozen at fiscal year 2005 levels. Job training is funded below last year. NIH funding, though slightly increased from last year, still is receiving the lowest increase in 36 years. The Centers for Disease Control is funded at \$293 million below last year.

The list goes on and on, and the amendment will help reverse these serious shortfalls in our Nation's top education, health care, and job training programs. Members should know that a "no" vote will not prevent us from considering the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill under an open rule, but a "no" vote will allow Members to vote on the Obey amendment to restore funding shortfalls in the bill, and a "yes" vote will block consideration of the amendment.

Please vote "no" on the previous question.

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, just the facts: in 1996 the maximum Pell grant was \$2,470. In this bill it is \$4,100, almost a doubling in the past 10 years. One other fact: in 1997 the total funding for this bill was \$75 billion. Today in this bill it is \$142.5 billion, almost double.

So, I think it is important for people to realize that we have in the majority party's tenure of the last 10 years almost doubled the total.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, with respect to Pell grants, the College Board has indicated that the cost of attending a 4-year public university has increased by \$2,300 since the President became President. The President decided to fix that problem by raising Pell grants by \$100, thus taking care of 4 percent of the problem. The committee cut that to \$50. That means that the committee is taking care of 2 percent of the problem.

In addition to that, the new IRS regulations out of the administration have cost students in my State over \$170 per person. So the fact is that right now

any student going to a 4-year university is dragging behind. He is not doing nearly as well as he was 4 years ago.

To suggest that a \$50 increase in the Pell grant is going to take care of a \$2,300 program is a joke.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has expired.

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

I would like to close this debate by again thanking the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman Regula), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the ranking member and for their efforts on this important piece of legislation.

The debate on this rule has shown some of the difficulties that we have faced when appropriating funds for areas as important as education and health care. From community health centers to TRIO and title I, this bill addresses our Nation's critical health and education funding needs.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support for the rule and underlying legislation.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, what we are hearing today is that there isn't enough money to fund any of these important programs like the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, education, or health research.

But, let's be honest. The real reason that we do not have the money to put towards these programs is because of the reckless tax cuts for the wealthiest of the wealthy that the White House and the majority party have insisted on passing.

Yesterday, I met with some of my young constituents representing the Migrant Education Program. I would like to read their requests to you.

We the constituents of the Migrant Education Program regions II and XXIII of California are here today to address constant issues that challenge the quality of our lives. In order to achieve this we propose the following.

#### EDUCATION

We propose to the Congress to allocate funds to use in the implementations of programs that will benefit learning through buying proper equipment that will permit students to succeed. Proper equipment includes: textbooks, sports, uniforms, and computers.

#### IMMIGRATION

We propose that Congress pass the Dream Act and Student Adjustment Act, which could allow undocumented students to pursue higher education. We propose better working conditions for agricultural workers. Better working conditions such as health care, breaks and better pay.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

In order to secure our Social Security benefits we propose to reject President Bush's Social Security Reforms and accept to continue the current Social Security Program without the government tapping into our resources. In order to reimburse the lost money the Government must repay the deficit that was caused by the Governor's decisions.

#### HEALTH CARE

We propose to the Congress that in order to have healthier citizens a universal program should be established with an equal

payment for insurance coverage regardless of their status in California.

The result of this will be a healthier public thus reducing the burden on taxpayers.

A small tax increase, which will be offset by the thousands or even million of dollars saved in the urgent care facilities.

All families will be able to live their lives knowing that their tax payments are in return to their health care leaving them with a satisfaction that their insurance bill will not increase. We ask that the Government intervene to help maintain a set price.

#### LABOR

**Minimum wages:** The average person lives below the poverty line and in order to improve the quality of life a higher minimum wage needs to be issued.

**Pesticides:** Pesticides present a hazard towards the health of workers and their families.

**Benefits:** Equal health benefits should be issued to all employees as a result of hazardous working conditions.

#### FIELD WORKER PERMIT

Permits should be issued for workers of foreign countries to work in the United States under fair conditions.

#### SAME SEX

**Acknowledging the couple:** Same sex couples deserve equal unalienable rights as heterosexual couples.

**Support Adoption:** Same sex couples deserve the opportunity to give a loving home to a child in need.

**Separating state and religion:** An individual deserves the right to do as one pleases without the intervention of theocracy, while respecting civil rights.

#### VIOLENCE IN THE MEDIA

We propose to the Congress that violence in TV should be controlled to a substantial level of awareness; such level could include showing violence media in the after hours and avoid presentation of inappropriate material. We the delegates of California propose to the Congress that there will be more funds for community activities for the youth, so that they get involved and occupy their time in something useful other than gangs, such as, sports, music, dancing groups, karate, etc.

Children and adolescents are the most affected audience through the contents of violence. We strongly recommend that such material be diminished; such contents include music, alcohol, sex, drugs, gun control, and homicide. We propose to the Congress that programs should be developed in local communities in order to educate parents about violence and how to keep it away from today's youth.

These are some of the requests that we could have fulfilled had it not been for these reckless tax cuts. We should not forget about the needs of our children and the elderly. It is time to turn back some of these reckless tax cuts and put the money into education, health care, and all of the services that the most vulnerable in our society need to survive.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with grave concern about the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2006 and the direction in which our country's priorities are going. I find it amazing that we don't have the money to continue funding critical programs in this bill because we continue to fund outlandish tax cuts for millionaires.

We don't have the money to continue funding a sickle cell demonstration program which received \$198,000 in fiscal year 2005 because we continue to fund ridiculous tax cuts for millionaires.

We don't have the money to continue funding trauma care and emergency medical services which received more than \$3.4 million in fiscal year 2005 because we continue to fund outrageous tax cuts for millionaires.

We don't have the money to continue funding early learning opportunities which received almost \$36 million in fiscal year 2005 because we continue to fund morally reprehensible tax cuts for millionaires.

We don't have the money to continue funding arts in education programs which received \$35.6 million in fiscal year 2005 because we continue to fund unconscionable tax cuts for millionaires.

We don't have the money to continue funding alcohol abuse reduction programs which received \$32.7 million in fiscal year 2005 because we continue to fund self-serving tax cuts for millionaires.

Mr. Speaker, the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2006 provides us with a perfect example of what we are left with due to the irresponsible and reckless economic policies of the President and Republican Majority. It is a clear indication of the different approaches that Republicans and Democrats take toward ensuring the domestic security and well-being of our country.

The drastic cuts in the Labor-HHS-Education bill are also clear examples of the very different philosophical approach toward government that our two parties take. Democrats, on one hand, believe that the role of government is to serve the masses, especially those who have the least and need the most. We do not demonize and slash funding for federally sponsored programs that help individuals stay in school, assist the unemployed find work, help pay for college, and further improve rural health care. Democrats believe that government exists not only to protect the people, but to provide services that, as our framers put it, "promote the general welfare" of all.

Republicans, on the other hand, believe that government is intrusive. They believe that shared responsibility should not be a priority of our government, and the responsibility that we have to others is limited only to the unselfish and altruistic. Republicans are willing to sacrifice the greater good of the masses to further pad the pockets of the wealthy.

I'm tired of hearing the Appropriations Committee say, 'We did the best that we could with what we were given,' because ultimately, we aren't doing the best that we can. Congress is failing the American people when we slash funding for programs that millions depend on.

Mr. Speaker, am I the only one who is offended that we don't have the money to continue funding foreign language assistance programs which received almost \$18 million in fiscal year 2005 because we continue to fund odious tax cuts for millionaires?

Am I the only one who is appalled that we don't have the money to continue funding literacy programs for prisoners which received just under \$5 million in fiscal year 2005 because we continue to fund irresponsible tax cuts for millionaires?

Where's the outrage from my Republican colleagues that we don't have the money to continue funding programs on America's Underground Railroad which received \$2 million in fiscal year 2005 because we continue to fund offensive tax cuts for millionaires?

Where's the infuriation from Members that we don't have the money to continue funding

drop-out prevention programs, mental health integration programs in schools, and women's educational equity programs which received a combined \$12.6 million in fiscal year 2006 because we continue to fund appalling tax cuts to millionaires?

Just once, Mr. Speaker, just once, I would like to come to this floor with Republicans in the Majority and President Bush in the White House and say, we don't have money for tax cuts for millionaires because we have to fund programs that benefit the other 99 percent of this country.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION ON H. RES. 337—RULE FOR H.R. 3010—LABOR/HHS/EDUCATION FY06 APPROPRIATIONS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 3 shall be in order without intervention of any point of order and before any other amendment if offered by Representative Obey of Wisconsin or a designee. The amendment is not subject to amendment except for pro forma amendments or to a demand for a division of the question in the committee of the whole or in the House.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. R. 3010, AS REPORTED

OFFERED BY MR. OBEY OF WISCONSIN

Page 2, line 12, strike "\$2,658,792,000" and insert "\$2,900,792,000".

Page 2, line 13, strike "\$1,708,792,000" and insert "\$1,950,792,000".

Page 2, line 18, strike "\$950,000,000" and insert "\$986,000,000".

Page 2, line 24, strike "\$1,193,264,000" and insert "\$1,243,264,000".

Page 3, line 1, strike "\$125,000,000" and insert "\$250,000,000".

Page 5, line 18, strike "\$3,299,381,000" and insert "\$3,414,381,000".

Page 6, line 16, strike "\$672,700,000" and insert "\$757,700,000".

Page 21, line 13, strike "\$244,112,000" and insert the following:

and including the management or operation, through contracts, grants or arrangements of Departmental activities conducted by or through the Bureau of International Labor Affairs, including bilateral and multilateral technical assistance and other international labor activities, \$325,112,000

Page 25, line 16, strike "\$6,446,357,000" and insert "\$7,587,357,000".

Page 26, line 18, strike "\$285,963,000" and insert "\$295,963,000".

Page 27, line 3, strike "\$797,521,000" and insert "\$817,521,000".

Page 29, line 1, strike "\$5,945,991,000" and insert "\$6,207,991,000".

Page 31, line 18, strike "\$4,841,774,000" and insert "\$4,969,526,000".

Page 32, line 2, strike "\$2,951,270,000" and insert "\$3,029,140,000".

Page 32, line 7, strike "\$393,269,000" and insert "\$403,646,000".

Page 32, line 12, strike "\$1,722,146,000" and insert "\$1,767,585,000".

Page 32, line 17, strike "\$1,550,260,000" and insert "\$1,591,164,000".

Page 32, line 22, strike "\$4,359,395,000" and insert "\$4,574,419,000".

Page 32, line 25, insert the following before the period:

: Provided further, That \$100,000,000 may be made available to International Assistance Programs, "Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Malaria, and Tuberculosis", to remain available until expended

Page 33, line 4, strike "\$1,955,170,000" and insert "\$2,006,758,000".

Page 33, line 9, strike "\$1,277,544,000" and insert "\$1,311,252,000".

Page 33, line 13, strike "\$673,491,000" and insert "\$691,261,000".

Page 33, line 18, strike "\$647,608,000" and insert "\$664,695,000".

Page 33, line 22, strike "\$1,057,203,000" and insert "\$1,085,098,000".

Page 34, line 5, strike "\$513,063,000" and insert "\$526,600,000".

Page 34, line 10, strike "\$397,432,000" and insert "\$407,918,000".

Page 34, line 14, strike "\$138,729, 000" and insert "\$142,389,000".

Page 34, line 19, strike "\$440,333, 000" and insert "\$451,951,000".

Page 34, line 23, strike "\$1,010,130,000" and insert "\$1,036,783,000".

Page 35, line 4, strike "\$1,417,692,000" and insert "\$1,455,098,000".

Page 35, line 8, strike "\$490,959,000" and insert "\$503,913,000".

Page 35, line 13, strike "\$299,808,000" and insert "\$307,719,000".

Page 35, line 17, strike "\$1,100,232,000" and insert "\$1,129,323,000".

Page 36, line 5, strike "\$122,692,000" and insert "\$125,929,000".

Page 36, line 10, strike "\$197,379,000" and insert "\$202,587,000".

Page 36, line 13, strike "\$67,048,000" and insert "\$68,817,000".

Page 36, line 17, strike "\$318,091,000" and insert "\$326,484,000".

Page 37, line 7, strike "\$482,216,000" and insert "\$494,939,000".

Page 39, line 11, strike "\$3,230,744,000" and insert "\$3,262,744,000".

Page 45, line 10, strike "\$1,984,799,000" and insert "\$2,199,799,000".

Page 45, after line 10, insert the following new paragraph:

For making payments under title XXVI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, \$215,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That these funds are for the unanticipated home energy assistance needs of one or more States, as authorized by section 2604(e) of the Act, and notwithstanding the designation requirement of section 2602(e).

Page 45, line 20, strike "\$560,919,000" and insert "\$601,919,000".

Page 46, line 9, strike "\$2,082,910,000" and insert "\$2,382,910,000".

Page 48, line 7, strike "\$8,688,707,000" and insert "\$9,283,707,000".

Page 48, line 13, strike "\$6,899,000,000" and insert "\$7,038,000,000".

Page 48, line 17, strike "\$384,672,000" and insert "\$714,672,000".

Page 52, line 6, strike "\$1,376,217,000" and insert "\$1,419,217,000".

Page 65, line 8, strike "\$14,728,735,000" and insert "\$17,923,735,000".

Page 65, line 8, strike "\$7,144,426,000" and insert "\$10,339,426,000".

Page 65, line 22, strike "\$2,269,843,000" and insert "\$3,769,843,000".

Page 65, line 24, strike "\$2,269,843,000" and insert "\$3,769,843,000".

Page 66, line 2, strike "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$205,000,000".

Page 66, line 9, strike "\$1,240,862,000" and insert "\$1,340,862,000".

Page 66, line 9, strike "\$1,102,896,000" and insert "\$1,202,896,000".

Page 67, line 18, strike "\$5,393,765,000" and insert "\$6,343,765,000".

Page 67, line 18, strike "\$3,805,882,000" and insert "\$4,755,882,000".

Page 70, line 23, strike "\$11,813,783,000" and insert "\$13,373,783,000".

Page 70, line 24, strike "\$6,202,804,000" and insert "\$7,762,804,000".

Page 75, line 4, strike "\$15,283,752,000" and insert "\$17,183,752,000".

Page 75, line 7, strike "\$4,100" and insert "\$4,550".

Page 88, strike line 11.

Page 88, line 14, strike "\$100,000,000 is rescinded";.

Page 96, line 13, strike "\$9,159,700,000" and insert "\$9,268,700,000".

Insert at the end of title V (before the short title) the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . In the case of taxpayers with adjusted gross income in excess of \$1,000,000, for the tax year beginning in 2005 the amount of tax reduction resulting from enactment of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 and the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 shall be reduced by 74 percent.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 194, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]  
YEAS—225

- Aderholt
- Akin
- Alexander
- Bachus
- Baker
- Barrett (SC)
- Bartlett (MD)
- Barton (TX)
- Bass
- Beauprez
- Biggett
- Bilirakis
- Bishop (UT)
- Blackburn
- Blunt
- Boehmert
- Boehner
- Bonilla
- Bonner
- Bono
- Boozman
- Boustany
- Bradley (NH)
- Brady (TX)
- Brown (SC)
- Brown-Waite,
- Ginny
- Burgess
- Burton (IN)
- Calvert
- Camp
- Cannon
- Cantor
- Capito
- Carter
- Castle
- Chabot
- Chocola
- Coble
- Cole (OK)
- Conaway
- Cox
- Crenshaw
- Cubin
- Culberson
- Cunningham
- Davis (KY)
- Davis, Jo Ann
- Deal (GA)
- DeLay
- Dent
- Diaz-Balart, L.
- Diaz-Balart, M.
- Doolittle
- Drake
- Dreier
- Duncan
- Ehlers
- Emerson
- English (PA)
- Everett
- Feeney
- Ferguson
- Fitzpatrick (PA)
- Flake
- Foley
- Forbes
- Fortenberry
- Fossella
- Foxx
- Franks (AZ)
- Frelinghuysen
- Garrett (NJ)
- Gerlach
- Gibbons
- Gilchrest
- Gillmor
- Gingrey
- Gohmert
- Goode
- Goodlatte
- Granger
- Graves
- Green (WI)
- Gutknecht
- Hall
- Harris
- Hart
- Hastings (WA)
- Hayes
- Hayworth
- Hefley
- Hensarling
- Henger
- Hobson
- Hoekstra
- Hostettler
- Hulshof
- Inglis (SC)
- Issa
- Istook
- Jenkins
- Jindal
- Johnson (CT)
- Johnson (IL)
- Johnson, Sam
- Jones (NC)
- Keller
- Kelly
- Kennedy (MN)
- King (IA)
- King (NY)
- Kingston
- Kirk
- Kline
- Knollenberg
- Kolbe
- Kuhl (NY)
- LaHood
- Latham
- Leach
- Lewis (CA)
- Lewis (KY)
- Linder
- LoBiondo

- Lucas
- Lungren, Daniel E.
- Mack
- Manzullo
- Marchant
- Marshall
- McCaul (TX)
- McCotter
- McCrery
- McHenry
- McHugh
- McKeon
- McMorris
- Mica
- Miller (FL)
- Miller (MI)
- Miller, Gary
- Moran (KS)
- Murphy
- Musgrave
- Myrick
- Neugebauer
- Ney
- Northrup
- Norwood
- Nunes
- Nussle
- Osborne
- Otter
- Oxley
- Paul
- Pearce
- Pence
- Peterson (PA)
- Petri
- Pickering
- Pitts
- Poe
- Pombo
- Porter
- Price (GA)
- Pryce (OH)
- Putnam
- Radanovich
- Ramstad
- Regula
- Rehberg
- Reichert
- Renzi
- Reynolds
- Rogers (AL)
- Rogers (KY)
- Rogers (MI)
- Rohrabacher
- Ros-Lehtinen
- Royce
- Ryan (WI)
- Ryun (KS)
- Saxton
- Schwarz (MI)
- Sensenbrenner
- Sessions
- Shadegg
- Shaw
- Shays
- Sherwood
- Shimkus
- Shuster
- Simmons
- Simpson
- Smith (NJ)
- Smith (TX)
- Sodrel
- Souder
- Stearns
- Sullivan
- Sweeney
- Tancredo
- Taylor (NC)
- Terry
- Thomas
- Thornberry
- Tiahrt
- Tiberi
- Turner
- Upton
- Walden (OR)
- Walsh
- Wamp
- Weldon (FL)
- Weldon (PA)
- Weller
- Westmoreland
- Whitfield
- Wicker
- Wilson (NM)
- Wilson (SC)
- Wolf
- Young (AK)
- Young (FL)

NAYS—194

- Abercrombie
- Ackerman
- Allen
- Andrews
- Baca
- Baird
- Baldwin
- Barrow
- Bean
- Becerra
- Berkley
- Berman
- Berry
- Bishop (GA)
- Bishop (NY)
- Blumenauer
- Boren
- Boswell
- Boucher
- Brady (PA)
- Brown (OH)
- Brown, Corrine
- Butterfield
- Capps
- Capuano
- Cardin
- Cardoza
- Carnahan
- Carson
- Case
- Chandler
- Clay
- Cleaver
- Clyburn
- Conyers
- Cooper
- Costa
- Costello
- Cramer
- Crowley
- Cuellar
- Cummings
- Davis (AL)
- Davis (CA)
- Davis (FL)
- Davis (IL)
- Davis (TN)
- DeFazio
- DeGette
- Delahunt
- DeLauro
- Dicks
- Dingell
- Doggett
- Doyle
- Edwards
- Emanuel
- Engel
- Eshoo
- Etheridge
- Evans
- Farr
- Fattah
- Filner
- Ford
- Frank (MA)
- Gonzalez
- Gordon
- Green, Al
- Green, Gene
- Grijalva
- Gutierrez
- Harman
- Hastings (FL)
- Herseth
- Higgins
- Hinchee
- Hinojosa
- Holden
- Holt
- Honda
- Hooley
- Hoyer
- Inslie
- Israel
- Jackson (IL)
- Jackson-Lee
- (TX)
- Jefferson
- Johnson, E. B.
- Kanjorski
- Kaptur
- Kennedy (RI)
- Kildee
- Kilpatrick (MI)
- Kind
- Langevin
- Lantos
- Larsen (WA)
- Larson (CT)
- Lee
- Levin
- Lipinski
- Lofgren, Zoe
- Lowey
- Lynch
- Maloney
- Markey
- Matheson
- Matsui
- McCarthy
- McCollum (MN)
- McDermott
- McGovern
- McIntyre
- McKinney
- McNulty
- Meehan
- Meek (FL)
- Meeks (NY)
- Melancon
- Menendez
- Michaud
- Millender
- McDonald
- Miller (NC)
- Miller, George
- Mollohan
- Moore (KS)
- Moran (VA)
- Murtha
- Nadler
- Napolitano
- Neal (MA)
- Oberstar
- Obey
- Olver
- Ortiz
- Owens
- Pallone
- Pascarell
- Pastor
- Payne
- Pelosi
- Price (NC)
- Rahall
- Rangel
- Reyes
- Ross
- Rothman
- Roybal-Allard
- Ruppersberger
- Rush
- Sabo
- Salazar
- Sánchez, Linda T.
- Sanchez, Loretta
- Sanders
- Schakowsky
- Schiff
- Schwartz (PA)
- Scott (GA)
- Scott (VA)
- Serrano
- Sherman
- Skelton
- Slaughter
- Smith (WA)
- Snyder
- Solis
- Spratt
- Stark
- Strickland
- Stupak
- Tanner
- Tauscher
- Taylor (MS)
- Thompson (CA)
- Thompson (MS)
- Tierney
- Towns
- Udall (CO)
- Udall (NM)
- Van Hollen
- Velázquez
- Visclosky
- Wasserman
- Schultz

Waters	Waxman	Woolsey
Watson	Weiner	Wu
Watt	Wexler	Wynn

## NOT VOTING—14

Boyd	Jones (OH)	Peterson (MN)
Buyer	Kucinich	Platts
Davis, Tom	LaTourette	Pomeroy
Hunter	Lewis (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Hyde	Moore (WI)	

□ 1200

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3010 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,  
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,  
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS  
ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 337 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3010.

□ 1203

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3010) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mr. PUTNAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset here that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I have had a discussion about the possibility of trying to finish this bill today. We want to make every effort to do so. And that will depend, of course, on what kind of

cooperation we can get on amendments.

Also, I am going to ask unanimous consent to move the issue of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to come up as the first issue as there is a lot of interest in this. We will try to limit time on both sides and give people a chance to vote on this.

So all of that is an effort to expedite today's proceedings.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize, as the subcommittee chairman says, we are trying to help Members get out of here today. We cannot do that unless we get cooperation from Members on amendments and on time.

Frankly, if I had my way, there would be one speech for this bill, one speech against it, and we would vote, because we are not going to make any significant changes in this bill given what the budget has done to us.

So we might as well get on with it. I would ask Members to give us their cooperation. I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for bringing it to the House's attention.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, I am pleased to present before the House today the fiscal year 2006 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

By taking into consideration the priorities of the President and the Members of this House, we have produced a bill that meets the needs of all Americans. We are appreciative of the efforts of the leader of the House and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), in providing a workable allocation for this bill.

I would also like to acknowledge the hard work, dedication, and expertise of my subcommittee staff, as well as the minority staff, in putting together this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we have made a commitment to reduce Federal deficits. With the reduction in the budget from last year, support for Pell grants required by the budget resolution, and that was money that has been spent in years past that we had to pay in this bill, and new implementation and processing costs of the Medicare Modernization Act, we had nearly \$2 billion less to spend on programs that were funded in fiscal year 2005.

We made some tough decisions. We eliminated four programs and did not initiate eight new programs proposed by the President. But when looked at as a whole, this bill provides \$142.5 billion to over 500 discretionary programs. It is a lot of money, and it does a lot of good.

It is a responsible, fair, and balanced bill. I believe it does a good job in

meeting the needs of the American people. Let me start with education. Earlier on the rule, I quoted from an editorial piece by David Broder today that in polling the American people, they said education was the number one reason for the success of this Nation. Education is essential to the preservation of democracy, and an investment in education is an investment in people.

Mr. Chairman, Federal education spending has more than doubled since 1996, from \$23 billion to \$56.7 billion, as contained in this bill. Education funding in this bill for fiscal year 2006 is \$476 million above the President's request. We added to his request. This is a significant commitment to the future of our Nation.

However, we must be prudent in our funding priorities to ensure that these dollars are targeted to programs that most directly improve the education of our Nation's students.

We have focused spending in this bill on the key areas that directly impact our children's education. First, and foremost, I believe that no child will be left behind if he or she has a quality teacher. Almost every teacher in our Nation's classrooms today is there for one reason: they care about children and want to help them reach their full potential.

We applaud their hard work and dedication and support them in this bill by providing funding to encourage people to enter the field of teaching, and provide incentives for quality teachers to remain in the classrooms. This bill supports teachers and students by increasing funding for title I by \$100 million. Title I provides additional resources to low-income schools, to help principals, teachers, and students close education achievement gaps.

At the school level, Title I helps provide additional staffing, ongoing training, and the latest research, computer equipment, books or new curricula. That, coupled with strong accountability measures, helps disadvantaged children meet the same high standards as their more advantaged peers.

I want to say that this bill really tries to help every individual to be sensitive to the needs of all people. We, this morning, and every morning when we meet, give the Pledge of Allegiance. We close by saying "with liberty and justice for all." That is what we have tried to do here, because education does give people liberty, it does give them justice, and the same thing with medical research.

Mr. Chairman, many of my colleagues spoke with me about the financial demands of special education on their local school districts. We also hear from parents about the need to support adequate special education funding to ensure their special needs children receive a quality education.

In this bill, funding for special education is increased by \$150 million, which brings its total to over \$11 billion, a nearly 378 percent increase since the fiscal year 1996.