

hearing on Iraq on June 23. Secretary Rumsfeld's prepared testimony contained these words:

In every war, there are individuals who commit wrongdoing. And there are mistakes, setbacks, and hardships.

He repeated those words to the committee with a notable exception. He left out the word "mistake."

Accepting the resignation of Donald Rumsfeld is the most important first step the President can take toward a new and more successful policy in Iraq.

Reality is difficult to swallow. Facts, as John Adams once said, are stubborn things. President Bush should face the facts and accept them.

I say this with deep sorrow and regret for our service men and women, their families, and friends. They deserve better and they deserve it now.

**BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT**

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of Section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for 1986.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the 2005 budget through June 28, 2005. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 2006 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, H. Con. Res. 95.

The estimates show that current level spending is under the budget resolution by \$5.062 billion in budget authority and by \$72 million in outlays in 2005. Current level for revenues is \$407 million above the budget resolution in 2005.

Since my last report dated May 26, 2005, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-14), which changed budget authority. In addition, the Congress has cleared for the President's signature S. 714, the Junk Fax Prevention Act of 2005, which had a negligible effect on revenues.

I ask unanimous consent the report and accompanying letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, June 29, 2005.

Hon. JUDD GREGG,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed tables show the effects of Congressional action on the 2005 budget and are current through June 28, 2005. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the

technical and economic assumptions for fiscal year 2005 that underlie H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006.

Since my last letter, dated May 26, 2005, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-14), which changed budget authority. In addition, the Congress cleared for the President's signature S. 714, the Junk Fax Prevention Act of 2005.

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

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT-LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005, AS OF JUNE 28, 2005

(In billions of dollars)

	Budget Resolution <sup>1</sup>	Current Level <sup>2</sup>	Current level over/under (–) resolution
<b>ON-BUDGET</b>			
Budget Authority .....	1,996.6	1,991.5	– 5.1
Outlays .....	2,023.9	2,023.8	– 0.1
Revenues .....	1,483.7	1,484.1	0.4
<b>OFF-BUDGET</b>			
Social Security Outlays .....	398.1	398.1	0
Social Security Revenues .....	573.5	573.5	0

<sup>1</sup> H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, assumed the enactment of emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2005, in the amount of \$81,811 million in budget authority and \$32,121 million in outlays, which would be exempt from the enforcement of the budget resolution. Since current level excludes the emergency appropriations in P.L. 109-13 (see footnote 2 of Table 2), the amounts specified in the budget resolution have also been reduced for purposes of comparison.

<sup>2</sup> Current level is the estimated effect on revenue and spending of all legislation that the Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT-LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005, AS OF JUNE 28, 2005

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in Previous Sessions: <sup>1</sup>			
Revenues .....	n.a.	n.a.	1,484,024
Permanents and other spending legislation .....	1,109,476	1,070,500	n.a.
Appropriation legislation .....	1,298,963	1,369,221	n.a.
Offsetting receipts .....	– 415,912	– 415,912	n.a.
Total, enacted in previous sessions: .....	1,992,527	2,023,809	1,484,024
Enacted This Session:			
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (P.L. 109-13) <sup>2</sup> .....	– 1,058	4	41
Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-14) .....	44	0	0
Total, enacted this session: ...	– 1,014	4	41
Passed Pending Signature:			
Junk Fax Prevention Act of 2005 (S. 714) .....	0	0	*
Total Current Level <sup>2,3</sup> .....	1,991,513	2,023,813	1,484,065
Total Budget Resolution .....	2,078,456	2,056,006	1,483,658
Adjustment to budget resolution for emergency requirements <sup>4</sup> .....	– 81,881	– 32,121	n.a.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT-LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005, AS OF JUNE 28, 2005—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Adjusted Budget Resolution .....	1,996,575	2,023,885	1,483,658
Current Level Over Adjusted Budget Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	407
Current Level Under Adjusted Budget Resolution .....	5,062	72	n.a.

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

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

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

<sup>4</sup> H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, assumed the enactment of emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2005, in the amount of \$81,811 million in budget authority and \$32,121 million in outlays, which would be exempt from the enforcement of the budget resolution. Since current level excludes the emergency appropriations in P.L. 109-13 (see footnote 2), the amounts specified in the budget resolution have also been reduced for purposes of comparison.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.  
Notes.—n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law; \* = less than \$500,000.

**FIFTY CALIBER SNIPER RIFLES AND TERRORISTS**

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the .50 caliber sniper rifle is employed by militaries around the world because of its powerful and destructive capabilities. Fifty caliber sniper rifles in the hands of terrorists pose a significant threat to our homeland security. Unfortunately we have not done enough to help keep terrorists from acquiring these dangerous weapons.

Published reports indicate that .50 caliber sniper rifles are capable of accurately hitting a target more than 1,500-yards away with a bullet measuring a half-inch in diameter. In addition, these thumb-size bullets come in armor-piercing, incendiary, and explosive varieties that can easily punch through aircraft fuselages, fuel tanks, and engines.

One leading manufacturer of the .50 caliber sniper rifle, Barrett Firearms, posts a variety of news and magazine articles to promote the capabilities of its product on its website. One such article, titled "Practical to Tactical" originally appeared in the April 2004 issue of American Rifleman, a publication of the National Rifle Association. The article details how Ronnie Barrett, founder of Barrett Firearms, originally designed his .50 caliber rifle to be a "long-range target gun" but was later able to sell it to the U.S. military for use during the first Iraq war to "destroy hard targets, such as radar sites, bunkers, and light armored vehicles." The U.S. military has also used the Barrett .50 caliber sniper rifle during the current war in Iraq. According to the article, a U.S. Army report regarding operations in Iraq said: "The Barrett .50-cal Sniper Rifle may have been the most useful piece of equipment in

the urban fight” and “was used to engage both vehicular and personnel targets out to 1,400 meters.” It continued, “Soldiers not only appreciated the range and accuracy but also the target effect. Leaders and scouts viewed the effect of the .50-cal. round as a combat multiplier due to the psychological impact on other combatants that viewed the destruction of the target.”

Fifty caliber sniper rifles are sold not only to military buyers, they are also available to private individuals in the United States. Under current law, .50 caliber sniper rifles nearly identical to those described in the Army’s report can be purchased by private individuals with only minimal Federal regulation. In fact, these dangerous weapons are treated the same as other long rifles including shotguns, hunting rifles, and smaller target rifles.

I am a cosponsor of the Fifty-Caliber Sniper Weapon Regulation Act introduced by Senator FEINSTEIN, D-CA. This bill would reclassify .50 caliber rifles under the National Firearms Act, NFA, treating them the same as other high powered or especially lethal firearms like machine guns and sawed off shotguns. Among other things, reclassification of .50 caliber sniper rifles under the NFA would subject them to new registration requirements. Future transfers or sales of .50 caliber sniper rifles would have to be conducted through a licensed dealer with an accompanying background check. In addition, the rifle being sold would have to be registered with Federal authorities.

Adoption of the common sense Fifty-Caliber Sniper Weapon Regulation Act would help to ensure that these dangerous weapons are not obtained by terrorists and used against innocent Americans. We can, and must, do more to help keep military style firearms out of the hands of potential terrorists.

#### RURAL WATER SUPPLY ACT OF 2005

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, today, I join my colleagues Senator DOMENICI, BENNETT, DORGAN, MURKOWSKI, BINGAMAN, JOHNSON, and SALAZAR, in support of S. 895, the Rural Water Supply Act of 2005.

The Rural Water Supply Act directs the Secretary of the Interior to develop a program that ensures that a basic need—the need for a clean, safe, affordable, and reliable water supply—is not neglected. Overall, the bill will guarantee that the Bureau of Reclamation has sufficient authority to address the unique needs of rural and small communities in the West, and it will do so in a manner that respects the States’ primary role in water resources management.

The U.S. Census Bureau cites that 46 percent of Montanans lived in rural areas in 2000. These people and others in Western States deserve a safe, affordable, and reliable water supply—an essential component of a healthy life.

I look forward to working with my Senate colleagues to pass this important piece of legislation for not only Montanans but for all rural citizens in Western States.

#### LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. Each Congress, Senator KENNEDY and I introduce hate crimes legislation that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society. Likewise, each Congress I have come to the floor to highlight a separate hate crime that has occurred in our country.

A gay man reported that an unknown man began to choke him and verbally harass him using antigay slurs while riding a train in Brooklyn. The assailant ran out of the train at the next station following the attack.

I believe that the Government’s first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

#### EASING THE CRISIS IN HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr. ENZI. President, I rise today to speak to the ever worsening crisis of cost, coverage, and confidence in our health insurance system, but, more importantly, to outline what I believe to be several positive steps we can take in the near term toward relieving an impasse that has long stalled progress toward relief.

As I speak today, we are nearing almost 5 years of double-digit growth in health insurance premiums—increases that have repeatedly exceeded more than five times the rate of inflation. Since 2000, for example, group premiums for family coverage have grown nearly 60 percent, compared to an underlying inflation rate of 9.7 percent over the same period.

Not surprisingly, those hardest hit are America’s small businesses and those individuals outside of employer-provided insurance. These are the ones with the least market leverage and the weakest ability to pool risk. Already, among the very smallest of our businesses, those with fewer than 10 employees, only 52 percent offer coverage to their employees.

Mr. President, I am a realist. The most fundamental drivers of health care costs are ones that defy near-term solutions. These drivers include advances in costly medical treatments, Americans’ continuing appetite for such treatments, lack of transparency in pricing, and an antiquated third-party payment system that insulates

consumers from seeing the true cost of care they receive.

To take just one example, I—like many of my colleagues—would strongly support shifting much of our current tax subsidy of health insurance away from the employer and toward the individual. However, I fully recognize that any change on such a scale is, at best, years away.

And yet, like most Members in this body, I am hearing an ever growing chorus of concern from my constituents about health insurance—and most especially from small businesses.

America’s families and small businesses don’t want us to wait for the perfect solution or the perfect moment. They need real help, and they need it now.

Recognizing this increasing concern, and as the new Chairman of the Senate’s Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, I have made it a priority in recent months to seek the counsel of stakeholders, citizens, experts, and fellow Members of Congress on how we might come together on a package of insurance reforms we can realistically hope to enact in this Congress.

The most visible proposal now on the table—at least for the small group market—is the approach known as association health plans, or AHPs. Under this proposal, which was introduced in this Congress by Senators SNOWE and TALENT, qualifying trade associations would be permitted to band together their members for purposes of offering health coverage.

Association health plans hold significant promise—particularly in the pooling of risk, economies of scale, and market clout they could lend to thousands of small businesses.

At the same time, however, the AHP bills in their current form may also go too far in allowing some association plans to play by a separate set of rules than those governing the rest of the small group insurance marketplace, thereby tempting adverse selection and market disruption. Another concern is the fact that the current AHP proposals would shift primary oversight over many association plans away from States and move it to the Federal Government.

Regrettably, debate over these AHP pros and cons has hardened into a political and stakeholder stalemate—a stalemate that has helped block constructive action on new insurance reform for nearly a decade.

It is time we reached an end to this impasse.

Toward this end, I appreciate the hard work of Senators SNOWE and TALENT and other AHP proponents in working with me on possible compromise approaches. And similarly, I am encouraged by what appears to be a growing pragmatic spirit among traditional AHP critics such as insurers and State regulators.

Meanwhile, other of my colleagues, such as Senator DEMINT and Senators