

Markey	Pickering	Smith (NE)
Marshall	Pitts	Smith (NJ)
Matheson	Platts	Smith (TX)
Matsui	Poe	Smith (WA)
McCarthy (CA)	Pomeroy	Snyder
McCarthy (NY)	Porter	Solis
McCaull (TX)	Price (GA)	Souder
McCollum (MN)	Price (NC)	Space
McCotter	Pryce (OH)	Spratt
McCrery	Putnam	Stark
McDermott	Radanovich	Stearns
McGovern	Rahall	Stupak
McHenry	Ramstad	Sullivan
McHugh	Regula	Sutton
McIntyre	Rehberg	Tancredo
McKeon	Reichert	Tanner
McMorris	Renzi	Tauscher
Rodgers	Reyes	Taylor
McNerney	Reynolds	Terry
McNulty	Rodriguez	Thompson (CA)
Meehan	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (MS)
Meeks (NY)	Rogers (KY)	Thornberry
Melancon	Rogers (MI)	Tiaht
Mica	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
Michaud	Ros-Lehtinen	Tierney
Miller (FL)	Roskam	Towns
Miller (MI)	Ross	Turner
Miller (NC)	Rothman	Udall (CO)
Miller, Gary	Royal-Allard	Udall (NM)
Miller, George	Royce	Upton
Mitchell	Ruppertsberger	Van Hollen
Mollohan	Rush	Velázquez
Moore (KS)	Ryan (OH)	Visclosky
Moore (WI)	Ryan (WI)	Walberg
Moran (KS)	Salazar	Walden (OR)
Moran (VA)	Sali	Walsh (NY)
Murphy (CT)	Sánchez, Linda	Walz (MN)
Murphy, Patrick	T.	Wamp
Murphy, Tim	Sanchez, Loretta	Wasserman
Murtha	Sarbanes	Schultz
Musgrave	Saxton	Waters
Myrick	Schakowsky	Watson
Nadler	Schiff	Watt
Napolitano	Schmidt	Waxman
Neal (MA)	Schwartz	Weiner
Neugebauer	Scott (GA)	Welch (VT)
Nunes	Scott (VA)	Weldon (FL)
Oberstar	Sensenbrenner	Weller
Obey	Serrano	Westmoreland
Olver	Sessions	Wexler
Ortiz	Sestak	Whitfield
Pallone	Shadegg	Wicker
Pascarella	Shays	Wilson (NM)
Pastor	Shea-Porter	Wilson (OH)
Paul	Sherman	Wilson (SC)
Payne	Shimkus	Wolf
Pearce	Shuler	Woolsey
Pence	Shuster	Wu
Perlmutter	Simpson	Wynn
Peterson (MN)	Sires	Yarmuth
Peterson (PA)	Skelton	Young (AK)
Petri	Slaughter	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Davis, Jo Ann	Lampson	Millender-
Fattah	Meek (FL)	McDonald
Kanjorski		Rangel

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEINER) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1711

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1538, WOUNDED WARRIOR ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2007

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 1538, including corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering, and cross-

referencing and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 and 2009 through 2012.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 40

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to request that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 40. After further reflection, I have concerns that this legislation, which would propose an amendment to the Constitution relative to equal rights for men and women, could potentially compromise my longtime stance on pro-life issues. I hope that clarifying language can be added to this bill to offer assurances to pro-life supporters that this measure would not be used to undermine Federal laws on this important matter.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 695 AND ADDED AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1222

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. EMERSON be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 695 and added as a cosponsor of H.R. 1222. I regret the error.

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

There was no objection.

OLDER AMERICANS REAUTHORIZATION TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1002) to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to reinstate certain provisions relating to the nutrition services incentive program, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1002

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Older Americans Reauthorization Technical Corrections Act".

SEC. 2. NUTRITION SERVICES INCENTIVE PROGRAM.

Section 311 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030a), as amended by section 309 of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 2006, is further amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b)(3);

(2) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

"(d)(1) Each State agency and each title VI grantee shall be entitled to use all or any part of amounts allotted under subsection (b) to obtain, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), from the Secretary of Agriculture commodities available through any food program of the Department of Agriculture at the rates at which such commodities are valued for purposes of such program.

"(2) The Secretary of Agriculture shall determine and report to the Secretary, by such date as the Secretary may require, the amount (if any) of its allotment under subsection (b) which each State agency and title VI grantee has elected to receive in the form of commodities. Such amount shall include an amount bearing the same ratio to the costs to the Secretary of Agriculture of providing such commodities under this subsection as the value of commodities received by such State agency or title VI grantee under this subsection bears to the total value of commodities so received.

"(3) From the allotment under subsection (b) for each State agency and title VI grantee, the Secretary shall transfer funds to the Secretary of Agriculture for the costs of commodities received by such State agency or grantee, and expenses related to the procurement of the commodities on behalf of such State agency or grantee, under this subsection, and shall then pay the balance (if any) to such State agency or grantee. The amount of funds transferred for the expenses related to the procurement of the commodities shall be mutually agreed on by the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture. The transfer of funds for the costs of the commodities and the related expenses shall occur in a timely manner after the Secretary of Agriculture submits the corresponding report described in paragraph (2), and shall be subject to the availability of appropriations. Amounts received by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to this section to make commodity purchases for a fiscal year for a State agency or title VI grantee shall remain available, only for the next fiscal year, to make commodity purchases for that State agency or grantee pursuant to this section.

"(4) Each State agency and title VI grantee shall promptly and equitably disburse amounts received under this subsection to recipients of grants and contracts. Such disbursements shall only be used by such recipients of grants or contracts to purchase domestically produced foods for their nutrition projects.

"(5) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require any State agency or title VI grantee to elect to receive cash payments under this subsection."; and

(3) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

"(f) In each fiscal year, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly disseminate to State agencies, title VI grantees, area agencies on aging, and providers of nutrition services assisted under

this title, information concerning the foods available to such State agencies, title VI grantees, area agencies on aging, and providers under subsection (c).".

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by section 2 shall take effect beginning with fiscal year 2008.

(b) APPLICATION PROCESS.—Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall take such actions as will enable State agencies and title VI grantees described in section 311 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030a) to apply during fiscal year 2007 for allotments under such section for fiscal year 2008.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, this bill makes technical corrections to the Older Americans Reauthorization Act of 2006. The bill would restore language regarding the administration of the Nutrition Services Incentive Program that existed prior to the Older Americans Act Reauthorization of 2006.

Prior to the reauthorization, this nutrition program provided cash or USDA commodities to states to supplement meals for the elderly. Six states chose to receive USDA commodities through the program—Massachusetts, Kansas, Connecticut, Oklahoma, Nevada, and Delaware. However, while attempting to relieve administrative burdens for USDA during the last reauthorization, Congress inadvertently denied states the ability to directly purchase essential USDA commodities.

This was not the intent of Congress. The states that receive USDA commodities run tremendous programs that help provide nutritious meals to seniors. Many states reported that they were able to double the value of their appropriated funds by purchasing USDA commodities and Massachusetts reported that because of this program they were able to avoid waiting lists for meals for 17 years.

I've heard from my fellow Iowans on the importance of this program as well. Iowa has participated in this program and recognizes its benefits. We never received much money for commodities—only about \$155,000—but the money goes a long way. Our Area Agencies on Aging often have a hard time meeting their budgets, but USDA commodities allowed them to serve more meals at a higher quality. Iowa fully intends to take advantage of USDA commodities again once we pass this bill.

This bill hasn't strayed from Congress' original intent either. The bill reduces the administrative burden on USDA, and streamlines the transfer of funds between the Department of Health and Human Services, to which funds are appropriated, and the Department of Agriculture, which purchases commodities for the states.

We must pass this bill today so that states wishing to take some or all of their NSIP allotment in commodities may place their order with the Department of Agriculture for FY 2008 by April 7th.

It's time to fix the mistakes that were made and allow these states to continue to serve seniors the most effective way possible.

The Senate bill was read a third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON
THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR
2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 275 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 concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 99.

□ 1714

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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2007, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2009 through 2012, with Mr. ALTMIRE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 4 hours, with 3 hours confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) each will control 90 minutes on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

□ 1715

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 9 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H. Con. Res. 99 is not the full and final solution, but it is a good solution. It moves us in the right direction towards a balanced budget. It moves us to balance in 5 years, as a matter of fact, by 2012. It posts a smaller deficit than the President's budget over 5 years. It adheres to PAYGO, and it contains no new mandatory spending that is not fully offset.

It also includes program integrity initiatives to root out waste, fraud and abuse in the Department of Health and Human Services and in the reporting of taxes in the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this resolution described both in our markup in committee and today during the debate on the rule. I think you have to bear in mind what our critics have said, in terms of where the criticism is coming from, because the party that is opposing this resolution and criticizing this resolution is the same party that took a surplus of \$5.6 trillion between 2002 and 2011 and turned it into a deficit of \$2.8 trillion during this same period of time.

As a consequence, we have heard a lot of talk out here today, but the

truth of the matter is, with respect to taxes, their bill imposes on future generations, our children and grandchildren, an unerasable tax called a debt tax, because they will be servicing the debt of the United States for years to come.

Let me show you just a few charts to illustrate what I mean.

First of all, the chart showing the debt of the United States that has increased since 2001 when Mr. Bush took office. This is a simple chart, but it contains an enormous amount of truth.

When Mr. Bush took office in 2001, he came to office with an advantage that few American presidents have ever enjoyed, a budget in balance, in surplus by \$236 billion the year before. Within 4 years, he had driven that surplus of \$236 billion into a deficit of \$418 billion; and, as a consequence, the debt when he took office, which was \$5.7 trillion, today is \$8.8 trillion, having increased \$3.1 trillion over the last 6 years.

We have never seen a debt accumulation like this, certainly during any normal period of time. Except for the Depression or Second World War, we have never seen, except for those periods, any kind of accumulation of debt that approaches this. And if we continue on this path, if we continue on this path, then we will see the debt, by the time Mr. Bush leaves his presidency, at \$9.6 trillion, as opposed to \$5.7 trillion when he came to office.

Net interest on the national debt is today \$170 billion. That is the debt tax I am talking about. This is the debt service that our children and their children will have to pay for years to come. It is a debt tax that is indelible, almost permanent, unless we can do something to turn this budget around and start reducing our debt, instead of accumulating mountainous debt year in and year out.

The budget that we bring to the floor today fully funds the President's defense request, and we husband what little is left over for some centerpiece initiatives which we strongly support as Democrats.

First of all, we created in 1997 a Children's Health Insurance Program. The authorization for it runs out this year. We would propose in our budget resolution to reauthorize the CHIP program, Children's Health Insurance, and add \$50 billion to the program so we cover most of the children who are eligible for coverage in the United States.

The second point: With respect to education, we think the education of our children, of today's workforce, is critically important as never before in American history; and we think it would be shameful to cut back for education. But for 3 straight years President Bush has sent us a budget that would cut the Department of Education, this year by \$1.5 billion.

If you take Function 500, which includes elementary and secondary education and student loans and workforce investment and Trade Adjustment Assistance Training, the Bush administration requests \$3.6 billion next year