

they had work on schedule that would allow them to keep that date. I think it is reasonable to assume that some of the work we have to do jointly will stretch out to meet the time frame that they are here rather than the time frame that we are here, and we need to be aware of that. We are still hoping for November 18.

The week after Thanksgiving, the week that starts on November 28 and ends on December 2, if we are still in session at the end of the month of November, we would not plan to work that week. Clearly, we do not plan to work Thanksgiving or the day after. If, in finishing this process up, November 19, November 20, November 21 would finish the process up, I would hate to suggest that we would not finish and get our work done, but certainly the November 28 to December 2 would be a date that I think he and I could right now announce to the Members that if they are planning family activities after Thanksgiving that even if we are still in session, we would not intend for that week to be a workweek.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his answer. I think that is very helpful for Members who are trying to plan.

Mr. Speaker, the PATRIOT Act, we were told that we might go to conference on that bill this week. That did not happen. Does the gentleman know when we anticipate perhaps going to conference on the PATRIOT Act?

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, we are continuing to do work on getting ready for that conference. I would hope that that conference would occur at any time. I am confident that we will appoint conferees and have that conference completed before the law expires. So I think that in itself sets a fairly short deadline but would expect to see that happen in the near future as we thought it might even happen this week.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate his answer.

Reclaiming my time, on appropriations conference reports, prior to the Thanksgiving recess, can he tell us how many he anticipates might be ready, obviously realizing that the other body's actions are difficult to determine, but does he have any thoughts on what appropriations conference reports we might be considering prior to the November 18 date?

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and would say that it is still our goal to get out of here, to get the session completed by the Thanksgiving recess. In that case we would have all the bills completed.

The Senate seems to have really gotten their appropriations process energized in a way that means a number of bills will soon be ready for conference. As the gentleman knows, three of the

bills have already been signed into law by the President. It is possible that we would have other additional conference reports next week.

I am not trying to anticipate too much here, but I think the most likely conference that might be completed next week would be the conference that we just appointed conferees to, the agriculture conference, and have that bill as a fourth bill that was completed. But the Senate work that allows us to address these bills one at a time, which I know we all believe is the best way to do this work, has finally reached a point that bears some likelihood that all of that could happen and hopefully will happen by November 18.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his answer.

Lastly, we were expecting today to have a budget amendment, or an amended budget, on the floor today. That did not happen. He referenced it in his opening discussion of the schedule.

Does he expect that bill to come to the floor next week, and if so, does he expect it to call for reconciliation cuts above and beyond the \$35 billion that was in the original budget?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think I announced earlier that I did expect that bill to be on the floor next week. And in addition, the change in the approach to that measure would be that it would include not only a higher goal for savings in the mandatory programs, an issue we do not take up very often in the House. I think this would be the second time in 10 years we have looked at mandatory savings, but also to include a commitment to revisit the discretionary part of the budget sometime between now and the end of the process and to work with the administration on reconciliation as well as looking at the authority for programs that we did not fund in this Congress and in several cases have not funded for some time and eliminate the authority for perhaps as many as 95 or more programs that are receiving no funding.

□ 1230

All four of those items would be in the budget resolution that the Committee on the Budget would bring to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2005, AND HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2005

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, October 25, 2005, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

DEMOCRAT IRRESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, with the recent hurricanes on the gulf coast, it is heartwarming to witness the unity and the outpouring of support from all Americans.

It is a unity of purpose from all, except one group: Democrats in the House of Representatives. That is right.

Our Republican leadership is working valiantly to find resources to provide help for the displaced residents. The way to do that is to reopen the budget and identify savings elsewhere to pay for those new costs, and the Democrat leadership says, They won't get one Democrat vote.

Now, that is leadership. How sad.

Mr. Speaker, the American people expect us to work together to solve problems. Democrats are stuck practicing the tired, old, petty, partisan politics of the past; and this is disappointing and irresponsible. America deserves more than obstruction from a once-proud party.

BUDGET AMENDMENT

(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, the Republicans' misplaced budget priorities are actually shameful. They continue to be a reverse Robin Hood, slashing funds to safety net programs only to give more tax cuts to the wealthiest of Americans.

The budget reconciliation that we will talk about next week or the next week, whenever you guys can get your stuff together, proposes huge cuts in important programs that the poor and the working poor depend on day in and day out, such as \$15 billion in cuts in Medicaid programs; \$12.5 billion for student loans; and almost \$1 billion in cuts for food stamps. All of this while, and you would allow the richer to get even richer at the expense of helping those who need it the most, doing

nothing to offset Katrina expenses or to reduce our Nation's deficit.

Using Hurricane Katrina as an excuse to extend tax cuts, while taking from the programs that the victims of the hurricane need most, is an embarrassment. I hope you will fix it.

REPUBLICANS OFFER A COMMON-SENSE BUDGET PROPOSAL

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, when American families face financial crises, they make important sacrifices and responsible decisions to get their family budget back on track.

As the Federal Government continues to pay for the rising cost of hurricanes Katrina and Rita, Congress must also make necessary sacrifices and follow a strict budget. House Republicans are leading the effort to reduce spending and have recently proposed commonsense reforms to eliminate 98 Federal programs, saving more than \$4.3 billion.

Democrats' opposition to this proposal is, unfortunately, not surprising. Led by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), Democratic leader, they have tried to increase Federal spending by tens of billions of dollars at every stage of the legislative process. Earlier this year, not a single Democratic House Member supported the lean budget that passed the Congress. Democrats seem to view the budget as a credit card, and when the bill gets too high, they pay for the bill by simply raising taxes on the American people.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

CUTS IN THE BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, there was a phrase they used to use around here during the Reagan years called "take from the needy and give to the greedy." Well, we are back in session with that same thought going.

These cuts in this budget amendment we just heard about, the gentleman from South Carolina said we were not willing to make the cuts. Let me tell my colleagues just what one of those cuts was so we get a feeling for what they are up to.

There was a rule in many States that if you were from a poor family and you went to a rich family as a foster kid you did not get any money. If you went to a poor family, you would get some money. They went into court, and the court said it did not make any difference what kind of a family you were living in; it was what the child had access to and every child ought to receive

foster child payments in the United States, no matter where they were or what situation they were in.

What the Republicans want to do in this bill is repeal a court decision. They do not like what the courts did. The same thing is true about kinship care. If a child is picked up by a foster home, they get money; but if they are picked up by their grandmother, they are not entitled to it, no matter what the circumstances are. That is the family friendly Republican budget cuts.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMANN of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

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

There was no objection.

TAXING AND SPENDING

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we heard some earlier interesting statements from the Republican side of the aisle, and one gentleman talked about a once-proud party. I guess he was referring to the Republicans and the fact that they used to have a commitment to protecting Federal taxpayers and for fiscal responsibility, but no longer.

Now, they keep talking about the Democrats taxing and spending. Excuse me? Who runs the White House, the United States House of Representatives with an iron hand, and the United States Senate? The Republicans. They are in charge of everything. It is the President who is submitting budgets that are being approved by Republicans that are running up huge and growing deficits.

They are trying to say, oh, this year was great; it was only \$312 billion, only the third largest deficit in history. Except they forget to tell people they borrowed the whole \$180 billion surplus out of Social Security and spent that, too; and, in fact, some of it went to tax cuts for rich people that was paid for

by working people with their Social Security money that is supposed to pay for the future of that program.

They say, well, it is the darn Democrats. No, it is not the darn Democrats. It is the Republicans who control everything who have brought up \$8 trillion of debt, a 60 percent increase in the 5 years George Bush has been in the White House; and, no, it was not all spent on the war in Iraq and homeland security. A lot of it came from huge tax cuts to the wealthiest among us, immensely expensive tax cuts that go predominantly to people who earn over \$311,000 a year; and they want to give permanent exemption of estate tax to estates over \$6 million. They consider \$100 million, \$200 million, that is a small family farm or small business in Republicanland over here.

Unfortunately, those tax cuts are immensely expensive, and they are borrowing the money to finance them and the government.

The entire general fund of government of the United States, everything that government does outside of the military is paid for with borrowed money, \$1.2 billion a day, some of it from Social Security. Yeah, we are borrowing some of it from ourselves. We are borrowing a heck of a lot of it from China, Japan, and other foreign interests; and we are adding this mountain of debt and we are pushing it forward to our kids and our grandkids. In their vision, the wealthy would not share in the burden. They will not help pay that debt because they will be the beneficiary of massive tax cuts.

What they were going to bring to the floor today was so embarrassing they could not quite do it. They were actually going to increase the deficit. Under the guise of paying for Katrina, they were going to cut programs like student loans, \$9 billion; Medicare for seniors; Medicaid for needy people and seniors and other essential programs. But they were actually going to cut those programs to pay for more, guess what, tax cuts for the wealthiest among us.

Are the wealthy really hurting that much? Well, actually no. IRS data that came out last week say that 99 percent of the people in America saw their real incomes decline last year; but 1 percent, those who earned over \$311,000, saw a real increase. But that is not even the real thing.

The real thing was one-tenth of 1 percent, those who earned over \$1.3 million a year, saw a phenomenal increase in their incomes, mostly due to tax cuts that are being paid for by borrowing on the backs of working people and Social Security. They have the gall to come to the floor and say it is the Democrats who want to tax working people.

The only working people they are concerned about are people who earn over \$311,000 a year, the investor class; but the investor class also happens to be the contributor class, the people who can write out those \$2,100 checks