

It has approved approximately \$1 billion in loans to businesses surviving the destructive attacks by hurricanes in 2005.

In my district of Houston: 55 disaster home loans approved for \$727,000; 27 disaster business loans approved for \$1,750,800; 17 disaster economic injury loans approved for \$750,100; and 99 total disaster loans approved for \$3,227,900.

If one just looks at the agency's performance on the surface it would appear that agency is performing well. However, upon closer inspection, citing Louisiana as a case study, reports indicate that of the roughly 185,000 applications made on behalf of homeowners, a shocking 60,000 were denied. The SBA is distributing a large amount of aid, but that aid is not reaching all of those in serious need. This is evident by the House Minority Small Business Committee's statement that 80 percent of overall disaster loans have been denied.

My amendment requires of the Small Business Agency that no funds prohibit the approval of disaster loans at a rate of at least 70 percent. The destruction caused by the hurricanes occurred on an unprecedented scale, and the SBA should be approving disaster loans with unprecedented efficiency. SBA disaster loans offer people who have lost everything a chance to rebuild their life. It gives the survivors of Rita, Katrina and Wilma the hope that one day they can be contributing members of society.

Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment, and continue to work on this matter to ensure that small business loans go to small business persons for them to be able to rebuild their lives throughout the gulf region, including the State of Texas.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONAWAY:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by section 3010 for fiscal year 2006 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program may be used while there continues in effect a Federal prohibition on the exploration, leasing, development, or production of oil or natural gas in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge or the Outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Chairman, I rise tonight to support an amendment that would address what I believe is a hypocrisy that permeates a very im-

portant area of national policy. Section 3010 of this bill will pull funding for LIHEAP, the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, from fiscal 2007 into fiscal 2006. The idea is that certain low income folks need help with high fuel prices, high home heating fuel bills or just home heating bills in general.

The reason we have high bills is a lack of supply of crude oil and natural gas. While we have this lack of supply, it is because we have not drilled in certain areas, which I believe will provide prolific reserves that would address the energy costs.

None of us like these high energy prices we are experiencing. There are no short-term solutions. But the most immediate impact we can have open prices is to drill in areas where we have reserves. These areas include the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve, as well as the outer continental shelf.

There have been many attempts, throughout my short time I have been here, to open up these areas to drilling. The drilling contractors, the operators today so, can do so in an environmentally sensitive way and a responsible way, and it is hypocritical of us to, on the one hand, ask the taxpayers of this country to underwrite the high energy bills, and then, on the other hand, restrict supply that, in fact, drives up those costs.

So my amendment would say that none of the LIHEAP money would be available as long as we maintain restrictions on drilling in ANWR as well as the outer continental shelf.

Another point, as to the safety of the drilling in these areas, if you look at the experience we had as a result of Hurricane Katrina, you cannot imagine, you cannot formulate a worse natural disaster in the Gulf of Mexico as it relates to the producing and drilling platforms than we had in the gulf that was Hurricane Katrina. You just cannot imagine anything worse than that.

As a result of the great engineering, the hard work of many men and women throughout this industry, there was not one oil spill, one natural gas spill as a result of Hurricane Katrina sweeping through there and destroying the surface equipment. All of the sub-surface protections that are put in place to protect against that eventuality did in fact work. I think the idea that we can't do so, we can't drill offshore safely and responsibly has, in my mind, not played out.

So I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment to address what I believe is a hypocritical position in national policy.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Chairman, let me say how much I appreciate the cooperation of Mr. CONAWAY this evening. He has been helpful at every end of our business. But in the meantime, I have this responsibility that causes me to make a

point of order against the amendment, because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on appropriations bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part an amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if it changes existing law.

In this case, this amendment imposes additional duties.

So, Madam Chairman, I ask for a ruling.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair will rule. The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination of the Federal official who oversees the LIHEAP program. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

□ 2230

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Chairman, while I respectfully disagree, I accept the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY) having assumed the chair, Mrs. DRAKE, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4939) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken tomorrow.

MAKING AVAILABLE FUNDS FOR THE LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2320) to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes. The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2320

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. FUNDS FOR LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**

Section 9001 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “for a 1-time only obligation and expenditure”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$250,000,000 for fiscal year 2007” and inserting “\$500,000,000 for fiscal year 2006”;

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking “\$750,000,000 for fiscal year 2007” and inserting “\$500,000,000 for fiscal year 2006”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c);

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) LIMITATION.—None of the funds made available under this section may be used for the planning and administering described in section 2605(b)(9) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8624(b)(9)).”; and

(4) in subsection (c) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)), by striking “September 30, 2007” and inserting “September 30, 2006”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of S. 2320, legislation regarding the low-income home energy assistance program that we call by the acronym of LIHEAP.

I believe that this is a good bill that will help all Americans, both in warm weather States and in cold weather States, but it will be particularly helpful to those in the warm weather States like Texas and places where summers can be difficult as the winters are in the Northern States.

The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 which this House passed, the other body passed and the President signed recently, included \$1 billion for LIHEAP for fiscal year 2007. The moneys were offset by savings elsewhere in the titles written by the Energy and Commerce Committee, which I have the privilege to chair.

The bill before us today spends the funds this year and splits the funds equally between regular and contingency funds. Mr. Speaker, I support this approach because the increase in regular funds in the bill would allow significantly more LIHEAP funds to flow to the warm weather States to help with cooling costs this summer.

This has happened only once before in the 1980s. For Texans, which is the State that I come from, this will mean an additional \$38 million this year, almost doubling Texas's LIHEAP funds.

Overall, the funding increases in the bill before us will help both the warm

weather States and the cold weather States in the winter. Warm weather States in the summer and the cold weather States in the winter. This is a good solution for all States, both warm and cool; and I hope that we will support the bill.

We do have an unusual parliamentary procedure, Madam Speaker, that I think we need to bring before the body. The bill before us has already passed the Senate. If we pass it with no amendments, it will go to the President for his signature.

The supplemental bill, which we have been debating until several minutes ago, also has some LIHEAP funding that is under a different formula mechanism, as I understand it. It is quite possible, if not probable, that that bill is also going to pass.

If it does, we then have a situation which is somewhat murky, but, as best we can tell, whichever bill gets to the President last for his signature will be the bill that dictates the formula funding for this fiscal year. I put that into the RECORD simply because I think all Members of the Chamber need to know that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank my colleague from Texas for calling up S. 2320, and I agree with what he said. I think it is interesting, though, the parliamentary procedure that the chairman of our Energy and Commerce Committee talked about, because I would assume that if this bill passes with the two-thirds requisite votes tomorrow and goes to the President, that the section in the supplemental bill would be stripped out in the conference committee, because that bill still goes to the Senate into a conference committee. So I guess parliamentarily that would be the solution in our situation.

Madam Speaker and Members, low-income Americans have been struggling to pay for heating bills during the winter; and, thankfully, this winter has not been as cold as expected and heating bills have not increased as greatly as feared. However, natural gas prices that drive electric prices have quadrupled over the past several years. The States' public utilities commissions, PUCs, are passing those costs on to our constituents.

Low-income Americans also struggle to pay cooling bills. When the 90 and 100 degrees heat rolls around this year, the situation is going to become very critical very quickly.

Air conditioners run on electricity, and a lot of electricity comes from natural gas. The need for relief is going to be intense throughout 2006, the end of this winter, this summer, and the start of next winter due to the incredible energy prices our country is experiencing.

The LIHEAP program has been controversial because the formula can pit

different regions of the country against each other. For the first \$2 billion appropriated under this program, Northern States do very well, and relatively little funding goes to the South. Above this \$2 billion trigger, however, the formula becomes much fairer, for Congress has never crossed this trigger by any large amount, that is until tonight.

The Senate compromise legislation provides an extra \$500 million to the LIHEAP formula over and above the \$2 billion Congress has already provided. This is incredibly important for regional equity.

This legislation has provided \$500 million in contingency funding which can be used for emergencies such as blizzards, heat waves, hurricanes; and this funding is required to be allocated in 2006.

Today marks the first day we have a real chance to cross that \$2 billion trigger and provide a measure of equity for the warm States. Importantly, today also marks the best chance to increase LIHEAP for 2006 for cold States as well by providing 2006 contingency funding.

If we pass this legislation today, the LIHEAP allocations for 2006 will become much more equitable between regions. It is important we pass this legislation today. It will directly go to the President's desk and provide immediate extra assistance for the Northern and the Southern States this year.

The administration supports this bill, and I would like to introduce this letter from Secretary Leavitt into the RECORD.

#### THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH

AND HUMAN SERVICES,

Washington DC, March 8, 2006.

Hon. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE,

U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SNOWE: I am pleased to respond to your request for my view on your LIHEAP amendment (which is attached).

This is a positive step to provide additional aid for those in need of energy assistance this year. HHS supports Senator Snowe's amendment to utilize '07 funds this year to help those affected by increased home energy costs. HHS supports providing at least \$500 million of the total as contingency funds.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL O. LEAVITT.

Madam Speaker, CBO certified this bill with no budgetary effect, and I want to introduce their letter into the RECORD.

U.S. CONGRESS,

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,

Washington, DC, March 6, 2006.

Hon. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE,

U.S. Senate,

Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: As requested by your staff, the Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for S. 2320, a bill to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Matthew Kapuscinski.

Sincerely,

DONALD B. MARRON,

Acting Director.

Enclosure.

S. 2320—A bill to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes

Summary: S. 2273 would amend section 9001 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 by making the \$1.0 billion appropriated for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) available in 2006 rather than 2007.

The bill would increase direct spending in 2006 by \$750 million, but have no net budgetary effect over the 2006-2009 period as a whole.

S. 2273 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would benefit state and tribal governments by making federal funds available a year early.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of S.

2273 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 600 (income security).

Basis of Estimate: Under current law, CBO expects that the entire \$1.0 billion in LIHEAP funding appropriated for 2007 would be obligated in 2007 and spent over a three-year period, resulting in outlays of \$750 million in 2007, \$230 million in 2008, and \$20 million in 2009. Enacting S. 2320 would accelerate the spending of these same amounts to the 2006-2008 period.

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
DIRECT SPENDING						
Spending under current law:						
Budget authority .....	0	1,000	0	0	0	0
Estimated outlays .....	0	750	230	20	0	0
Proposed changes:						
Budget Authority .....	1,000	-1,000	0	0	0	0
Estimated outlays .....	750	-520	-210	-20	0	0
Spending under S. 2320:						
Budget authority .....	1,000	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated outlays .....	750	230	20	0	0	0

Intergovernmental and private-sector impact: S. 2273 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA and would benefit state and tribal governments by making federal funds available a year early.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Costs: Matthew Kapuscinski (226-2820); Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Leo Lex (226-2885) and Impact on the Private Sector: Craig Cammarata (226-2947).

Estimate approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Madam Speaker, the language in the House supplemental would not provide equity. It would provide \$750 million in contingency funding for 2006, which is no guarantee of funding at all, not for the North or the South. The House supplemental will not pass the critical trigger, \$2 billion trigger, which is very important for the equity among the regions.

The Senate North-South compromise would guarantee the largest amount of LIHEAP funding for Southern and Western States ever, while providing immediate assistance for the Northern States.

This bill would double Texas LIHEAP funding from \$40 million to \$80 million, allowing us to serve 80,000 families instead of the 40,000 we currently serve. Since our State ended its energy assistance program because of budget problems, this support is sorely needed.

Other Southern and Western States, that is, Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, the Carolinas, Oklahoma, Utah and Virginia, will also likely receive the largest LIHEAP allocations ever.

With the \$500 million in contingency funding, the Northern States will not be left out in the cold either, either in the end of this winter, during any heat wave this summer or during the next winter, November and December. We have bipartisan support, both Northern and Southern support, and we have the endorsement of the American Gas Association, which I will insert into the RECORD, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote yes on the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

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

Mr. REGULA. Madam Speaker, my colleagues, this is a classic example of robbing Peter to pay Paul. What we are going to do is propose to move money from the 2007 bill to spend in 2006.

Now that sounds very seductive and sounds like an easy way to deal with having more money available in this fiscal year. But let me point out to my colleagues that what this will do is take a billion dollars ultimately out of the 2007 bill that has to be made up.

We will have one of two choices in the labor HHS 2007 bill: Get the money out of education, or get the money out of medical research, NIH, CDC. There is no other source. Because this billion dollars that was provided by the budget reconciliation to address LIHEAP spending for 2007 would no longer be available, because what this proposes to do is to move it into 2006.

Well, obviously to make up that billion in the 2007 bill we will have to get it somewhere. Now if it would be an increased allocation, which seems unlikely, because the President's budget already has Labor HHS Education money substantially under last year, and, therefore, to make another billion available will just exacerbate the problem.

While this has a very seductive appeal, that, well, we are going to have this extra money for 2006, we are forgetting that there is a 2007 year coming up; and, therefore, by passing this kind of legislation, we are simply making it very difficult to meet the other needs in the 2007 budget.

Madam Speaker, I would urge my Members to vote against this simply because it is not responsible budgeting to say to the Labor HHS that you have to go get a billion dollars out of other very important programs such as education and medical research.

But inevitably that is where it has to come from, because this will leave a billion-dollar hole in the 2007 budget.

In the budget reconciliation, they attempted to ensure that the billion would be there for 2007. But what this legislation does is simply say we are going to move it into 2006 and figure out where to get it for 2007.

Well, there is no easy way to figure it out, because already 2007, in putting together the 2007 budget we are having a tough time having the resources to do the other important functions. I think it would not be responsible stewardship of our money, of our resources for the public, to take this money and leave a billion dollars unfunded for LIHEAP in 2007.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank our colleague and chair of our appropriations subcommittee. I understand where he is coming from. But I also know, Madam Speaker, that we have not passed a budget for 2007 and that is still to be considered.

I understand that the concern about moving money into this year. But it is also going to be very difficult for me to talk to the 40,000 plus Texas families if we do not pass this bill. By the way, this summer, I am sorry it did not fit within our legislative rules, and it is causing more problems, and we are not going to give you any heat assistance when it gets to be 100 degrees in Texas and across the South, and, frankly, even the Northern States, Illinois, Maryland and other places, New York has problems with heat in the summer.

So I would hope that next year or later this year we will probably see another supplemental. If we see a year like we have seen now for both the cold assistance for the Northern States and what we see in the South that we need help, then I would hope in the future that we would see a supplemental that would restore that money. I would be glad to support that at that time.

Madam Speaker, I also understand Chairman REGULA and the Appropriations Committee, a lot of us want them

to be able to have the funding for medical research and education. Those programs are near and dear to our heart. I hope we will still be able to do that.

But I also know there are some other ways that we can deal with that since we have not adopted a budget and we will probably have another supplemental, because they get pretty regular around here. I hope that we can add to it without having to rob Peter to pay Paul.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2245

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY).

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I would like to thank you for your leadership in bringing this bill from Senator SNOWE to the floor. I thank Mr. GREEN for his bipartisan support, and I thank the leadership of the House for allowing this vote.

I am from New Hampshire, one of the cold weather States, and even though the weather has been somewhat warmer than might be expected in most winters, we have seen at times a spike in the price of home heating oil by nearly 65 percent in some instances. It has abated somewhat, but nevertheless prices of home heating oil this winter are significantly higher.

We all know how successful the LIHEAP, the Low Income Heating Assistance Program, has been. It is effectively monitored by State and local interests, but it is funded at the Federal level. My State has seen about a 12 percent increase in applications this winter because of that spike in prices. My State has allocated all of the dollars it has received so far to trying to process the applications that it has and it is committed; and without this funding, the State of New Hampshire and other cold weather States are going to have to dip into their own State funds to help fund a Federal program in 2006.

My State, before the emergency funding was released by the President, was nearly \$3 million short, that is about 15 percent under last year and at a time when there is record demand and record high prices. That is why this bill is so important, Madam Speaker, why we need to bring it up, have this vote tonight, get it to the President's desk. This bill is balanced well because the interests of warm weather States and cold weather States because of the 50-50 split and because of the emergency funding and the formula funding.

So I am hopeful that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will see fit to move forward with this. This bill is fully offset by the Budget Deficit Reconciliation Act, which is important for our Nation's budget deficit, obviously, but it is also important for States, both in the southern part of the country and the northern part of the country, to pass this bill tonight and to

make sure it gets to the President's desk as soon as possible so States like mine can get more money into the pipeline while it is still important.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

Mr. REGULA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. A couple of other things I would point out. In reality, we will have to find \$1.4 billion when you work out the numbers to match the level provided for 2006. That is in the 2007 bill. So I reiterate, that means \$1.4 billion will have to come out of education or medical research, because I just do not see any enhanced allocation to do that.

Now, in adopting the supplemental, we recognize the potential emergency, and we provided language in there. This is an amendment that I offered in the supplemental in the full committee that allows the shift of \$750 million as needed to address any shortfall in 2006, but we do not mandate that it be done.

Under the Snowe approach, this would force the expenditure, and if the funds were not used, they would lapse. And I think that it is just not good management to require, as this bill does, the movement of this money from 2007 to 2006, and therefore, run the risk that it might lapse. When we tried to address the problem in the supplemental by saying that the money could be used up to \$750 million if needed, and I think that is a much better solution.

It is a more responsible solution to manage of potential problem without impinging heavily on the 2007 money and forcing the committee to make that up to the amount of \$1.4 billion out of other very important programs. I would urge my colleagues to reject this.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I have nothing but the utmost support for Mr. REGULA and the appropriators. All the Members, the rank and file Members, the full committee chairman, the subcommittee chairman, but I want to disagree with his premises slightly.

In most cases, a program like LIHEAP is funded from general revenue, and what Mr. REGULA said is absolutely true, absolutely true. In this case, the budget reconciliation package for the fiscal year 2007 or the budget reconciliation package that we just passed, the Energy and Commerce Committee, on a bipartisan basis, worked to offset by saving in other areas of our jurisdiction so that we could plus-up LIHEAP by \$1 billion. So the LIHEAP money that is before us today in the bill that is coming over from the other body has been paid for.

Now, it is true as the gentleman from Ohio said that that money was supposed to be spent in fiscal year 2007, but it is also true that we need additional funds for 2006. And we are going to need additional funds, in all likeli-

hood, in the warm weather States this summer, because of the expected heat. We have already had a record heat wave in Texas 2 weeks ago. It was 95 degrees. I will pledge to Mr. REGULA and Mr. LEWIS and Mr. OBEY and all the folks, the appropriators, that if we get the will of our leadership, I am willing to engage in another reconciliation package to find offsets for next year. I think that is only fair so that we help our appropriators.

But we have a bill before us that if we affirmatively pass it like the other body has, it is going to go to the President's desk. It is going to be signed. There will be additional funds to help both the cold weather and the warm weather States. And I would hope that we would, while we have nothing but respect for Mr. REGULA, that we would oppose his motion to oppose this bill. Pass it. Send it to the President so that we could get his signature and allocate these funds to the most needy of Americans in both the warm weather and cold weather States.

I ask for a yea vote.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). The gentleman from Texas has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Following the chairman of our full committee and, again, I understand the Chair of our appropriations subcommittee's concern, but this bill has a great deal of bipartisan support.

We heard from our colleague from New Hampshire, who is experiencing high utility bills and has already run out of their funding for their poor in New Hampshire. But a lot of us are looking forward to what may be happening not only this winter, but also this summer. So I am proud to have Congressman PICKERING of Mississippi and Congressman LATOURETTE, who is also supporting this legislation.

When we vote on this tomorrow, we will see a lot of Members from across the aisle who are supporting this legislation; and again, like my chairman of our full committee and also the ranking member of the committee, John Dingell is supporting this legislation. We need to do something now to help and we will work whatever we can to help with the allocation from the Appropriations Subcommittee on Health and Human Services or, again, another supplemental next year or later this year that will be able to deal with it.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote aye.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, which moves funds appropriated to the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, or LIHEAP, from Fiscal Year 2007 to Fiscal Year 2006. This legislation passed the Senate last week, so its passage in this Chamber will send the bill on to the President.

The legislation would move \$1 billion in funding to this fiscal year. Half of the funds would be allocated to the States pursuant to the statutory formula. The other half, however, would be considered contingent funding, and subject to the discretion of the Administration.

It is important that all of these funds reach those in need. The recently passed Energy Policy Act of 2005 authorized \$5 billion for this fiscal year. But even if all of the funds in this bill are sent to those in need, the total funding for the program will only total a little over \$3 billion. In other words, we are still going to be \$2 billion below the program authorization.

People in the Midwest and Northeast are in desperate need of these funds. According to the National Energy Assistance Directors' Association, since the winter of 2001–2002, yearly natural gas bills have soared from \$465 to \$1000, while annual heating oil bills have gone from \$465 to \$1000.

In my home state of Michigan, these national trends have translated to an average energy cost increase of nearly 37 percent. As a result, the state has anticipated a 6 percent increase in LIHEAP applications. Without additional funding, our state could experience as much as a \$60 million shortfall in LIHEAP money. This bill, while falling far short of providing the money necessary or authorized by EPACT, provide at least a few million dollars more to help my state address this projected shortfall.

Of course, much of the new funds will also go to warmer climates, where families will be facing unprecedented cooling bills this summer, so this is not just a regional bill.

It is unfortunate that funding for LIHEAP has remained constant over the years while heating costs have soared. Even with these new funds, many families will have a hard time paying their heating bills this winter.

Many of us would like to see LIHEAP funded at its authorized level of \$5 billion, but certainly this bill will be of immediate assistance and I urge its passage.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2320.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

**MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4297, TAX RELIEF EXTENSION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2005**

Mr. TANNER. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Tanner of Tennessee moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4297 be instructed, to the maximum extent possible within the scope of conference, to insist on a conference report which will neither increase the Federal budget deficit nor increase the amount of the debt subject to the public debt limit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. TANNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this motion is very, very straightforward. It is a motion asking our conferees to basically apply what is known as PAYGO rules to the tax reconciliation bill that is coming over from the Senate.

Just today, this morning, in *The Washington Post*, we are reminded that President Bush said in March of 2001, "Future generations should not be forced to pay back money that we have borrowed. We owe this kind of responsibility to our children and grandchildren."

Madam Speaker, since that time this Congress and this administration have borrowed about \$1.5 trillion in hard money in new debts. I have been talking about this and writing about it for the last 3½ years. We are facing a debt ceiling again and we will be forced to raise the debt ceiling for the fourth time in the last 5 years since that statement was made by our President about borrowing money that loads the debt limits of all of us, including our children and grandchildren.

This new debt limit will raise how much money this country has borrowed in additional new debt \$3 trillion. I wish I was making some of this up. But you can go to the Treasury Department's Web site at [www.PublicDebtTreasury.gov](http://www.PublicDebtTreasury.gov) and see for yourselves. This is real. This is happening. It is happening now. And if the budget that has been proposed is adopted, we will go to \$11 trillion dollars.

Now, Madam Speaker, I have got some more things to say about this but last year, this is almost unbelievable but it is happening and I wish the American public would focus on it because if they do they will be I believe not only shocked but outraged at what the financial mismanagement of this country has done to the financial balance sheet. Last year the Federal deficit for 2005 was \$319 billion. If you break that down it means we here in public life in the name of every citizen in this country borrowed \$26 billion a month, \$886 million a day, \$36 million an hour, \$615,000 a minute, and \$10,200 a second.

□ 2300

Contrast that with what our President said back in March of 2001, as

quoted in the *Post* this morning, when he said, "Future generations shouldn't be forced to pay back money that we have borrowed. We owe this kind of responsibility to our children and grandchildren."

I could not agree with that statement more, but the facts absolutely belie what that sentiment that was expressed back in 2001 was meant to convey.

Now, if that was not bad enough, last year almost 90 percent of the money that we had to borrow to operate the government of this country came from overseas, came from foreigners who do not see the world as we see it.

We are doing in this government, on behalf of the people of the United States, something that none of us who were taught, like I was as a young man, three things to live by. One is live within your means, two is pay your debts, and three is invest in the future, whether it is your own retirement, your kid's college or whatever.

This government, under this leadership, is doing none of those. We are not living within our means, we are not paying our debts, and we are certainly not investing in the future.

The more that we borrow, the more we degrade the tax base in this country. We are now paying at 4 percent, since that statement was made in 2001, we are now paying more than \$55 billion a year in additional interest checks, almost 80 percent of which is not even staying in this country. This is not only outrageous, it is the most irresponsible financial conduct of the fiscal affairs of this country that any political leadership in the history of this country has engaged in such a short period of time. That is without question.

So what is actually happening here is a weakening of our collective ability, as expressed through the Federal Government, to do two things, to keep this country strong, safe and, most importantly, secure. Strong safe and secure, what do you mean when you say that?

First of all, there is no country in the history of recorded civilization that without the ability to invest in infrastructure and human capital remained safe, strong and secure. Infrastructure, that is what the government must do to give private enterprise the ability to congregate around clean water, sewer systems, highways, bridges, roads, all of the things that go into the infrastructure of a Nation. We are not being able to keep up with not only new infrastructure that is needed but to repair the infrastructure we have got. If you do not think that is important, go to any country on the planet earth that has no infrastructure and see how many people are doing very well. Nobody is because there is no infrastructure for private capital to invest and to create jobs, to create the economy we all want.

Human capital, what do I mean by investing in human capital to keep our country strong, safe and secure? I