

clear: Of course, it is. If it was applied to the spouse or the loved one of a soldier—their answer would be: Of course, it is. I think those people are as expert as Judge Mukasey and certainly much more candid.

I also think we have risked a great deal in the administration's embrace of these techniques because today, as we look around the world, there are many nations that do not even need that kind of suggestion to embark on the torture of their own citizens. The Burmas of the world and other countries, they will use what we say and do as justification for what they might want to do. I think we have lost the moral high ground during this whole exercise going back several years.

Finally, I would like to mention my concerns about Judge Mukasey's responses to questions regarding executive power. His responses to these questions did nothing to reassure me. In fact, I now believe that Judge Mukasey believes that even a constitutional statute could become unconstitutional if its application constrains the so-called constitutional authority of the President.

As we all know, the genius of our Founding Fathers was not to allow power to be concentrated in the hands of the few. Indeed, they were particularly concerned about a concentration of power in the hands of the President.

Although they made the President the Chief Executive Officer of our Government and the Commander in Chief, the Founding Fathers constrained the President through the very structure of our Government, through both law and treaty. The Attorney General has a duty not just to serve the President but also to support, protect, and defend the Constitution.

I did not vote in support of Alberto Gonzales's nomination to be Attorney General because I was concerned about his ability to serve more than the President—a concern that has been borne out by the events over the last several months. It is largely because of his actions we are in the quandary we are in today with respect to torture and so many other issues.

Instead of protecting our Nation's Constitution and upholding our laws, he engaged in actions that damaged our Nation's core values and put our citizens' rights at risk both here and abroad.

Given the extreme politicization of the Department of Justice, and the demoralization that has followed in his wake, I believe our Nation needs an Attorney General who can help lead us like a beacon of light and help right our country's moral compass as an example again for the rest of the world.

I do not think Judge Mukasey met that standard.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what is the pending legislation?

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

FARM, NUTRITION, AND BIOENERGY ACT OF 2007—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2419) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Harkin amendment No. 3500, in the nature of a substitute.

Reid (for Dorgan-Grassley) amendment No. 3508 (to amendment No. 3500), to strengthen payment limitations and direct the savings to increased funding for certain programs.

Reid amendment No. 3509 (to amendment No. 3508), to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 3510 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 3500), to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 3511 (to amendment No. 3510), to change the enactment date.

Motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with instructions to report back forthwith, with Reid amendment No. 3512.

Reid amendment No. 3512 (to the instructions of the motion to commit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with instructions), to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 3513 (to the instructions of the motion to recommit), to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 3514 (to amendment No. 3513), to change the enactment date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Thank you, Mr. President.

We have the farm bill before us. We have been trying for a week to do amendments on the bill. The Republicans have said that because this bill is being handled in such an unusual procedural way, they are not going to let us move forward on this bill.

This bill is being handled similar to every farm bill in the last 30 years. In that entire period, there has only been one time that a nongermane amendment was offered, and that was on the last farm bill when Senator KYL offered an amendment dealing with the estate tax. It was a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. That is it.

So for the minority to cry about this is simply that they are crying about something there is no reason to cry about. We want to move this bill. I had a conversation this morning right over here on the floor with the distinguished Republican leader and the ranking member of the committee, SAXBY CHAMBLISS. At that time, as I understood the conversation, the Republicans had 10 amendments they wanted to do. Let's look at them. We have some we want to do. Let's pare them off, set very short time limits on them, and move this bill.

This is an important bill. If this bill does not move forward—a bill that is being treated similar to every other

farm bill in recent history—the reason it is not going forward is the Republicans. If they do not want a farm bill, why don't they say so. They can explain to all the farm organizations around the country that they did not want a farm bill, they wanted us to extend what is now in existence. If that is what they want, why don't they say so?

It is unfortunate we have been unable to move forward on these amendments. The first amendment pending is a bipartisan amendment offered by Senator DORGAN. It is a good amendment. It is one that should be debated and voted on. Another amendment is a complete substitute—that is my understanding—and Senator LUGAR and Senator LAUTENBERG want to do that amendment. Let's debate it, find out what the will of the Senate is, and move on. But to be in this position is really unfair to farm State Senators, to farmers and ranchers, to the Senate, and to our country. If you are unwilling to fight, just say so. If you don't want this bill to come forward, just tell us that. Don't play these games that they are not treating us right procedurally. This is the way this bill is always handled.

So I just think it is something we need to do. It is an important piece of legislation. The committee, on a bipartisan basis, reported this bill out with an overwhelming vote. This is not a Democratic bill; it is a bill reported out by the Agriculture Committee on a bipartisan basis. So I hope this afternoon we can get some work done on the farm bill.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the leader yield?

Mr. REID. I am happy to yield to my friend, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank our majority leader for all the support he has given us in getting this bill through even when we worked in committee and working with the Finance Committee to make sure we had the necessary money to meet our obligations and bringing it to the floor in a timely manner. We had all last week; we couldn't get anything done. We have this week before we go home for the Thanksgiving break. We could finish this bill, I say to our leader, we could finish this bill if we could just get the other side to agree to start the process.

We have an amendment, I say to the leader, before us which we could debate. We could even put a time limit on it. We have another amendment on which we could put a time limit. We could get two or three or four amendments done today. But, I say to the leader, I am very frustrated that we have the farm bill out here, we are ready to go—we have been ready for some time—there are amendments filed, and we would like to get started on it, but we can't until the minority leader agrees to move ahead and says we can bring up some of these amendments and move ahead on them. I just hope we don't waste another whole day.

I ask the leader, is there any way we can get the other side to kind of help move us along? I have talked to my ranking member, Senator CHAMBLISS. He wants to move ahead. He has the desire, as I do. As the leader pointed out, this bill came out of committee on a bipartisan vote. There are going to be amendments, and I may support some and not others, and I am sure my ranking member will support some and not others, but that is the amendment process. I think we have a good bill that is going to wind up getting a lot of support on the Senate floor, and the sooner we get to it, the better off we are.

So I am just kind of perplexed, I guess, as to why the minority leader won't let us move ahead or why we can't get some amendments and time agreements.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would say to my friend that we have, as I understand it, 22 amendments upon which the 2 managers have agreed.

Mr. HARKIN. That is right.

Mr. REID. We could take care of those very quickly. There are amendments that, in the minds of the managers, improve the bill. We should get those done. We are unable to move on anything.

The calendar dictates a lot of what happens here in Washington in Congress. We have a limited amount of time. We have 3 very short weeks when we come back after Thanksgiving before Christmas. I say to my friends, we are not going to have time to work on the farm bill when we come back after Christmas. We don't have time. We have to take care of all of our appropriations matters. The funding for this Government runs out on December 14. We have some must-do things that run out at the end of this year. So the record should be spread with the fact that Senate Democrats have been willing and terribly interested in moving this farm bill. If it doesn't go forward, the blame is at the doorstep of my Republican colleagues.

We are in the majority. We Democrats are in the majority, but it is a slim majority. The way the Senate operates, the Republicans can stop us from doing a lot—not everything but a lot. But I would bet, if there were a fair vote and not some arm-flexing exercise, that a vast majority of Democrats and Republicans want this farm bill to move forward. Are they asking me—is this what they are asking—to file cloture on this bill so we can have a cloture vote on it Thursday? Is that what they want? Is that what we are going to be relegated to, filing cloture on this bill without having heard a single amendment? And why? Because they won't let us. Is that what they want? If cloture fails—I know it will fail, not because of Democrats but because of Republicans. We know we have broken records here in this year of this session of Congress by having to file cloture 52 times. Only one of those cloture motions was a bipartisan effort. We did it

once. That is all. So I am very disappointed because I don't see what the Republicans are going to gain.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I say to my leader, if he will yield again, I think we have set a record in committee. In a day and a half, we had a comprehensive, 5-year farm bill passed—in a day and a half. I don't think that has ever been done.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend, that was the culmination of weeks and weeks—

Mr. HARKIN. Months.

Mr. REID. Of meetings between Democrats and Republicans to move this bill along.

Mr. HARKIN. That is right.

Mr. REID. I have great admiration for the Agriculture Committee for getting a bill out of that committee on a bipartisan basis. There are people who want very badly to try to improve this bill, but nothing will be done. It is Tuesday. We have this bridge thing coming, dealing with the Iraq war, tomorrow. Time is wasting. I am beginning to have my doubts, I say to everyone here, because of the intransigence of the Republicans, that we can do a farm bill.

Mr. HARKIN. I hope we can overcome that because, as the leader said, we had great agreement in committee. He is right. We worked weeks and weeks and weeks in meetings with people in getting it all together, and in a day and a half we got it through on a unanimous vote—not one dissenting vote. So we have a good bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend, on the floor right now are farm State Senators—Arkansas, Georgia, North Dakota, North Dakota, Iowa—and in the back of the room is a State that does a lot of agricultural products, the State of New York. Now, as I look around this room, Senator DORGAN is an example. Senator DORGAN's amendment is pending—a bipartisan amendment. He supports this bill. It came out of committee, but he thinks it would be an improvement. Why shouldn't he have an opportunity to offer that amendment and have a debate on it? That is what this is all about. It is unfair to everyone concerned, as I have mentioned before, that we are not able to move on this important piece of legislation. I am from the State of Nevada. We grow alfalfa. We are the largest white onion producer in America. We grow garlic but mostly alfalfa and white onions. This bill is important to those farmers out there. There are things from which they will benefit. I just think it is too bad we can't move forward. This is a bill—

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. REID. Oh, I am sorry. And Kentucky grows things too.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would just say to my friend, the majority leader, I am on the Agriculture Committee. I am from a farm State. I want a farm bill. We have been discussing how to go for-

ward. If I may be so bold to suggest—I know Senator CHAMBLISS and Senator HARKIN have been working on a list of amendments. I think we ought to see if we can lock in a list. It will be bigger than we would like, but that is the way it always starts. Most of those will go away in one way or another, but at least it would help define the universe. I think that is achievable, hopefully sometime this afternoon, and it will allow us to get started. That is what I would recommend.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it would be untoward on the Senate floor to walk over and hug the Republican leader, but that is what I feel like doing. I agree with him 100 percent. I think we should try to get a number of amendments locked in, whether it is 5 or 50, whatever it is. I think we should get it done and start moving on this bill.

I have been, as my friend from Kentucky knows, in a minority position more than I would like to admit here in the Senate as the minority Democratic leader. I understand he has certain things to do within his caucus. Whatever was needed to be proven has been proven. Let's move forward on this bill as the Republican leader has outlined. We greet his suggestion with open arms.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, would the leader yield just one more time?

Mr. REID. I yield.

Mr. HARKIN. I would like to ask the minority leader if during this time we are trying to work out a set number of amendments, we know there are two or three amendments that are absolutely going to be offered. One is the one we are on right now. Then there is another one with I think Senators LUGAR and LAUTENBERG. I am just wondering if we could get time agreements on those.

Mr. REID. I would say to my friend, let's take one step at a time. He has made an offer, and let's see what we can do. He has indicated—the ranking member of the committee is here, you are here, and we will work on that and see if we can get something done in the next little bit.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the majority leader. I think that is a good way to go forward, and we will work on it this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, let me just say while the leadership is here, we appreciate their assistance in moving this bill. Senator HARKIN, Senator CONRAD, and I have taken our list of amendments we have out there and we are working through them to try to get down to a reasonable number. One problem, frankly, we are having—and I think maybe on the other side too—is we keep having people come forward with amendments. I would simply say to colleagues on both sides of the aisle that we are going to reach a limit with these amendments, and if you have an amendment, we need to know about it now so we can negotiate and deliberate in good faith relative to the number of

amendments that are going to be on this list so that we can pare those amendments down to a reasonable number.

I thank the leadership for working with us.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Certainly.

Mr. DORGAN. The important point here is that I think everyone on the floor wants to get this bill passed, and while there will be some amendments, my hope and my expectation—I have one amendment—would be that we would relatively easily get time agreements, have a reasonable number of amendments with time agreements. I think there should be a lot of cooperation on the floor because I think all of us want what you want, and that is to get a piece of legislation passed. This was not easy to get out of the committee. I support this bill. I am going to support a couple of amendments here and there, but by and large I think we are on the right track, and I appreciate hearing the words of the minority leader today on this subject because we need to get this done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, first of all, I am enormously relieved to hear what has been discussed, and I hope in the next few moments that we could agree, first of all, on amendments that have to be voted on for both sides, No. 1; No. 2, that we would agree on time limits, and it is very clear that unless the time for the debate on amendments that must be voted on is limited to 1 hour apiece, on average—some could be a little more, some could be a little less, but if we don't on average have time agreements of 1 hour or less, we cannot finish the work this week; and finally, that we agree to an order. I have seen colleagues who are very interested in some certainty. For example, if we could do Grassley-Dorgan in an hour and a half and then go to Lugar-Lautenberg for an hour and a half to at least begin the process, that would be enormously helpful, and then establish a list in order with time agreements.

I wanted to take a moment to respond, as leadership is working on that kind of proposal, to an article that appeared in the Washington Post this morning that I thought was not telling the whole story about this farm bill. They have asserted that there is all this new spending in the farm bill. They focus just on the spending side of the ledger; they didn't focus at all on how we pay for it.

I want to indicate that it is true that there are increases in this bill. We have increased spending on nutrition by \$5.3 billion; on conservation, we have increased resources by \$4.5 billion; on energy, by \$1.1 billion and then an additional \$1.4 billion from the Finance Committee, for a total increase in energy of \$2.5 billion.

Where did we find the resources for those additional investments? Well,

that is the uses on this side, and the sources are on this side. Over one-third of the money came out of the commodity programs. Commodity programs have been reduced. They have been reduced from the baseline. They have been reduced as a share of total Federal spending. The fact that the press—at least some elements of the press—seem unwilling to tell the American people is that the reduction in commodities—over a third of the money that has been used to give more money for nutrition, more money for conservation, more money for energy, a third of the money came out of commodities.

Almost a third of the money came out of crop insurance. Now, if you are going to tell the story, Washington Post, tell the whole story. These are not just my estimates. These are not KENT CONRAD's numbers, or the committee's numbers; these are the numbers from the CBO. They show, on the 2007 farm bill, commodity programs have been cut by \$4.2 billion, crop insurance by \$3.7 billion, for a total savings out of the \$7.9 billion. That is from these so-called baselines. These are facts.

They also seem to overlook the fact that if you look back on the last farm bill, you will see that the estimate at the time was that the farm bill would take 2.3 percent of total Federal spending. The commodity programs were to take three-quarters of 1 percent. Look at the contrast with this farm bill. With this farm bill, the total share of Federal spending is down from 2½ percent to less than 1.9 percent, and commodity programs—the ones that draw all of the conflict and the controversy—have been dramatically reduced to one-quarter of 1 percent of total Federal spending. The Washington Post never mentions these facts.

If we look at commodity program outlays on this chart, here is the baseline at the time of the farm bill. This is what it would cost into the future. Look at the estimates from the CBO on what the commodity programs will cost now. It is a very dramatic reduction in real terms, in relative terms—in whatever terms you want to use. If you are going to report honestly to the American people, then you need to tell them the whole story, not just the story that is the way you want to write it. You have an obligation to people to tell them the whole story so they can make a judgment about what is fair and what is right.

This bill is fiscally responsible. It is paid for. It takes up a much smaller share of total Federal spending than the previous farm bill, and the commodity provisions have been cut by two-thirds as a share of total Federal spending. If you look at where the money goes—I will tell you, I sometimes read these articles and hear broadcasts, and I wonder why don't these reporters tell people where the money is going. You would think this is all for subsidies for rich farmers.

The fact is, the vast majority of the spending in this bill is going to go to nutrition programs; 66 percent of the money in this bill is going to go for nutrition programs. Have you seen any article written by the major mainstream press that has told the American people that fact? Nutrition programs go to every corner of this country. They are 66 percent of the money in this bill. Crop insurance is 7.6 percent. Conservation is 9 percent. Again, conservation is important to every corner of America. When you put conservation and nutrition together, that is 75 percent of the spending in the bill. Commodity programs are only less than 14 percent of what is in this farm bill.

I hope at some point somebody will start to tell the American people the full story. I certainly don't read it in the Washington Post. I have not seen a single story in the Washington Post about agriculture that I thought was fair and balanced. I have not seen one. They are writing with a point of view. They are writing as advocates.

When I grew up, news people felt an obligation to try to tell both sides of the story. But, apparently, those days are gone. Today, if a publication has a point of view, or your television program or television station or network has a point of view, that is how you report it. You report one side of the story. That is not responsible, and it is not telling people what they really need to know to make an informed judgment. It is withholding from people certain information they would need to make any kind of objective judgment. That is what is going on here.

I don't want my colleagues to be fooled or to miss the point that this farm bill is taking much less of total Federal spending than the previous farm bill, and the commodity provisions that, in the last farm bill, were estimated to take three-quarters of 1 percent of Federal spending is down to one-quarter of 1 percent. Why do we need that one-quarter of 1 percent? Very simply, because our major competitors, the Europeans, are providing more than three times as much support to their producers as we provide to ours. This is a fact. The Europeans are providing more than three times as much support to their producers as we provide to ours.

So what happens if you yank this slim rug out from under American producers? Even though we are already outspent more than 3 to 1 by our major competitors, what would happen if we yank that rug out from our producers? Two words: "mass bankruptcy." That is what would happen.

Is anybody paying attention? Do these publications or these news broadcasts give one whit about what happens to the rural economy in America? Why don't they ever report that the Europeans—on export subsidies—are outgunning us more than 80 to 1? That is a fact. But they don't seem to care.

They don't seem to care because, I guess, it doesn't affect their economic lives directly. But I represent a State that has farm and ranch families from one side of our State to the other, from one corner of North Dakota to the other. The hard reality is they are out there competing against the French and German farmers, and they can do that. They are ready to do that, to take on a fair fight. But when you ask them to take on not just the French and German farmers but the French Government and the German Government, as well, that is not a fair fight. To say to our farmers and ranchers: You go out there and take on the French and German farmers, and while you are taking on the French and German Governments, your Government is going to be AWOL, absent without leave; your Government is going to declare unilateral disarmament; your Government is going to let you fend for yourself—good luck, Charlie, because the other side is outgunning us more than 3 to 1 already.

But some here say, let's not even put up a fight; let's throw in the towel and let the Europeans take over world agriculture. They are already equal to us in world market share. They are already advancing every day, increasing their market share, while ours slips—they are not alone, by the way. It is also our friends in Brazil, Argentina, and other countries who manage their currencies to secure advantage in terms of agriculture.

How long will it be, I ask these cynics, before America succumbs on the agricultural front the way we have on automobiles, electronics, and all the others, where our foreign competitors have taken the advantaged position? How long? We are right on the brink of it happening now.

This farm bill is an attempt to meet many needs of the American people. As I said, if you look at where the money goes, the overwhelming majority of this money goes for nutrition; 66 percent of the money in this bill goes to nutrition. I hear some of my colleagues from nonfarm States saying, "I don't have a dog in this fight; I don't really care what happens in the farm bill." Really? Then you don't know what is in the bill. Somebody from a nonfarm State who says they don't have anything in this fight simply don't know what is in the bill.

Sixty-six percent of the money goes for nutrition, 9 percent for conservation, and more for research and trade. That is where the money goes in this bill. Commodity programs are a small minority of less than 14 percent. As a share of total Federal spending, the commodity parts of this bill, according to the Congressional Budget Office, will be less than one-quarter of 1 percent of Federal spending. That is a fact. It is an important fact. It is a fact that the Washington Post, apparently, doesn't want people to know because they never report it. They also never report that the vast majority of this

money goes to nutrition programs, or that the next biggest category is conservation. They have an agenda, and their agenda is to look down their nose at people who are in production agriculture, farm, and ranch families, who apparently don't have their respect.

It is interesting, they don't write the same kind of article about any other industry that gets help from the Federal Government. Virtually every industry in America has some kind of Federal assistance, whether it is highways for the trucking industry or airports for the airline industry or any of the other things that are done for industry after industry. I don't see them come after them with this same sort of look-down-your-nose arrogance because that is what it is. It is incredible arrogance.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will have a chance to pay attention to both sides of the story in this farm program today. They deserve to hear both sides of the story.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MCCASKILL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENTIAL VETO

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, earlier today, President Bush vetoed the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations bill. I wish I could say I was surprised but, frankly, few actions by this President surprise me anymore. This is a good bill, a bipartisan bill, a bill that cleared both Houses with clear, strong majorities. In fact, the first one cleared here by 75 votes. It is a bill that reflects the critical education, health, job training needs of our country, especially for Americans who are at the bottom rungs of the socio-economic ladder. The bill was endorsed by more than 1,000—actually 1,075, to be exact—health, education, social service, and labor organizations in this country. There are disability groups in this letter, disease advocacy groups, school groups, community action partnerships, religious groups—millions of people across America are represented on this letter. This morning President Bush turned his back on all of them.

He seems to have no problem pouring billions of dollars into Iraq for schools, hospitals, job programs, health needs, but when it comes to those priorities here in America, the President says no. After spending all these billions of dollars on schools, hospitals, job pro-

grams, and health needs in Iraq, it is time to start investing some of that money here in America.

The President insists we have to stick to exactly the top number in his budget. Frankly, if we did that, we would be cutting programs such as the Low Income Heating Energy Assistance Program for the elderly at a time when we know fuel prices are going to be extremely high this winter.

The President completely zeroed out the social services block grant and cut the community services block grant by 50 percent.

Under the President's budget, we would be cutting the National Cancer Institute. At a time when we are starting to make some progress in the fight against cancer, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's and so many other things, he cuts funding for the NIH.

Again, we need to put more money into special education to help some of our beleaguered property tax payers in our States.

We have a backlog of several hundred thousand cases in Social Security. People who have paid in all their lives to Social Security, if they have a problem and they have an appeal pending or a case to be heard—there are 700,000 backlogged. It is about a year-and-a-half wait right now to get Social Security. It is unconscionable. We put money in there to reduce the backlog.

We wanted to fund more community health centers as one of the great things we have done in this country to help people who are not getting their health care needs attended to, to get them at their community health care centers. It has done a great job nationally.

We put more money into the Head Start Program. And No Child Left Behind—we put more money in there to meet our needs in title I schools, teacher training.

These are all provisions that were in our bill. As I noted before, it was bipartisan. I worked very closely with Senator SPECTER, our ranking member. There were dozens of provisions and funding increases in the bill that were requested specifically by Republicans, those on the other side of the aisle who requested that we increase funding in these areas. Unfortunately, it seems Mr. Bush is more interested in provoking a confrontation than in governing responsibly. He recently dismissed the funding in this bill as "social spending," as though somehow it pays for ice cream socials or Saturday-night socials or something such as that—social spending. I never heard it referred to like that. It is out of bounds, it is out of touch, it shows how isolated this President has become.

Every dime of additional funding in this bill goes to bedrock essential programs and services that have been shortchanged in the last few years. I mentioned them: community health centers, Head Start, NIH, special education, student aid, social services block grant and community services