House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC, March 16, 2005,

I hereby appoint the Honorable JEB BRADLEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend James P. Campbell, Pastor, Christ Life Church, Woodstock, Illinois, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. Almighty God, once more this esteemed body gathers to legislate for the people of this Nation. The scripture states "that government is God’s servant for good." Remind hearts of this in all actions today. Help these great women and men to remember those who are less fortunate in all their decisions that they make.

We lift our Nation up to You for protection against terrorism and to protect our troops everywhere. Bring peace to our Nation, Father, and peace to all the troubled areas of the world. Help those in this Chamber that struggle with illness, bring healing and health. Help those who wrestle with personal or family problems, bring solutions and peaceful resolve. Aid each Member of this House who is in the valley of indecision concerning matters of this Nation to make the right decision and action. Most of all, Father, let us feel Your love and care for all of us. In Jesus’ name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day’s proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof. Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. SOLIS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1160. An act to reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program through June 30, 2005, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 105–83, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, appoints the following Members to the President’s Export Council:

The Senator from Montana (Mr. BAU-CUS).

The Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN).

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 10 one-minute speeches per side.

HONORING RHEA TAYLOR, MAYOR OF FAYETTE COUNTY, TENNESSEE

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Fayette County, Tennessee, Mayor Rhea Taylor.

As the Fayette County Mayor since 2002 and a public servant for years, Rhea Taylor has been actively involved in planning for the rapid growth of Fayette County. And during their annual awards banquet, the Fayette...
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Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to congratulate one of the Nation’s top public universities, the University of Florida, and their men’s basketball team on their first-ever SEC title.

This was a Gators 40th try for the SEC title against a team that has defined success in this event, the Kentucky Wildcats.

The Gators beat the No. 4 Wildcats 70 to 53 on Sunday, March 13 in Atlanta, Georgia’s Georgia Dome in front of 25,000 fans.

This win marked the second time in 8 days that Florida had beaten Kentucky, which increased their winning streak to seven in a row. This winning streak comes at a very hot time, as the Florida Gators are heading into this year’s NCAA tournament. The Gators are playing their first tourney game this Friday in Nashville, Tennessee, against Ohio. I wish them the best of luck in the NCAA tournament and congratulate them for their first-ever SEC title. Go Gators.

NOT AN INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday while testifying before a Senate committee, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan said on the tax cuts, “It turns out we were all wrong” about President Bush’s tax cuts.

In his book, Ron Suskind quotes the Fed Chairman as telling Secretary O’Neill, “Without the triggers, that tax cut is irresponsible fiscal policy.”

Despite his private views, Chairman Greenspan publicly supported the tax cuts without reservation. I only wish he had expressed publicly what he knew privately.

Mr. Greenspan went on to say that he wanted to use the tax cuts to eliminate the budget surplus. Well, he succeeded beyond his wildest imagination. We now have $2 trillion in additional debt because of those tax cuts. Now where do we send that bill, Mr. Greenspan?

The Fed Chairman would have us believe that no one could have seen this coming, that it was an honest mistake. I know something about spin. Mr. Greenspan, that is spin. Now, Mr. Greenspan advocates making tax cuts for millionaires permanent while advocating a cut in Social Security benefits for the middle class, all the while moaning the rising deficits this country has seen and $2 trillion of additional debt.

Thank you very much for that independent analysis, Mr. Greenspan. Mr. Greenspan, you know better.
ANGELA DAVIS (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have practiced medicine for over 20 years, and I know that in order to treat the right disease you have got to make the right diagnosis, and the right diagnosis for the Social Security system is that we are on an unsustainable course. The right treatment is to fix the problem today rather than passing the problem on to future generations.

If we continue to postpone solutions, our only alternatives will be large tax increases or significant benefit reductions.

The goal of our ongoing discussion is not to pin blame on anyone. The goal is to have a system that will work for our children and our grandchildren, one that is stable, funded and secure.

A Social Security system that was designed for the world of 1935 will not work for the world of 2035 and beyond. Changes must be made, and the sooner we act the more secure we all will be.

VITAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF AFRICAN AMERICAN NEWSPAPERS THROUGHOUT OUR HISTORY

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to rise today to recognize the vital contributions of African American newspapers throughout our history and the continuing need for their perspective today. The Seattle Media in my district is a good example.

For nearly 180 years, black newspapers have provided their readers with not only the news of the day but with hope for a better tomorrow, and for the past 65 years the National Newspaper Publishers Association has been the standard bearer in that proud tradition.

A federation of more than 200 black community newspapers, the NNPA has provided outstanding service to its member papers and the 15 million Americans who rely on them for news.
Social Security

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, at the urging of the Democrat leadership in the Congress, political campaign veterans have formed a new liberal group that plans to spend $25 to $50 million to pressure lawmakers to vote against any Social Security plan that includes prepaid individual retirement accounts.

With straight faces, the Democrats call themselves “Americans United to Protect Social Security.” They say: “The President and his supporters in Congress are messing with the third rail of politics; and we’re going to be sure they get zapped good.”

Mr. Speaker, this is about our children. The greatest disservice to our children and grandchildren would be to give in to groups like this who claim there is no problem and who simultaneously use Social Security as a political club to beat down those of us who would dare to strengthen it.

House Democrats have become the party of noes, and they are led by “Minority Leader No.” If we do nothing, as some Democratic leaders would have it, today young workers and future workers will face benefit reductions, payroll tax increases and unprecedented debt.

Mr. Speaker, we should be worried about the next generation, not simply the next election.

Where is the Democrat Social Security Plan?

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up the comments of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SHAW), because it is one thing for the Democrat Party and the liberal groups in Washington, D.C., the very, very special interest groups, to say we are against whatever the President wants to do. We understand that. But it is another thing when they do not offer their own plan.

What I would ask the Democrat Party is to put your plan on the table, because most people agree with the facts, and the facts are that Social Security is running out of money.

Most people understand life expectancy has changed since Social Security started in 1937 when folks lived to be 59 years old. Today, they live to be 77 years old.

Most people understand that in 1937 when Social Security started there was 60 workers for every one retiree, and today it is six to one.

Most people understand the changing demographics that caused it so that if you retired in 1960 it took you 2.8 years to get all of your money back that you put into the Social Security Trust Fund, and yet if you retired in 2003 it will take you 17 years to get your money back.

Most people understand that there is a generation-to-generation issue that needs to be addressed.

What I would ask the Democrat Party is just put your plan on the table. Let us take a look at it. Let us take the best of the Democrat ideas, combine them with the best of the Republican ideas for what is best to protect and preserve Social Security for the next generation.

Election of Members to Joint Committee on Printing and Joint Committee of Congress on the Library

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 147) electing members to the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution. The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

General Leave

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 147. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

General Leave

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 1268, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? There was no objection.

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 151 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in
the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1268.

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1268) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

THE CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, March 15, 2005, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read page 72, line 17.

It is now in order to consider the fifth amendment listed in the order of the House of March 15, 2005.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

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

TITLES VII——ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 7001. None of the funds provided in this Act for national intelligence programs shall be available for obligation until the President submits to the Congress a proposal or procedure to fully inform the congressional intelligence and defense committees of all clandestine military activities for which it is intended that the role of the United States Government will not be apparent or acknowledged publicly and that will be conducted in countries identified by the United States Government as sponsors of terrorism.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Clerk to read the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 5 minutes.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I made clear yesterday that based on conversations with Andy Card, the President’s staff director, I have agreed to withdraw this amendment pending the administration’s getting together with the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations and working out a process by which activities of the Department of Defense that are classified will in fact be communicated to the Congress. I am not just talking about after the fact; I am talking about a communication prior to the activities.

I simply want to read one sentence from an article that appeared in the New Yorker about this matter. It reads as follows: “The intelligence system is now designed to put competing agencies in competition. What is missing will be the dynamic tension that enables administration to enforce priorities in the CIA, the DOD, the FBI and even the Department of Homeland Security. The most insidious implication of the new system is that the Secretary of Defense no longer has to tell people what he is doing so they can ask, ‘Why are you doing this? What are your priorities?’ Now he can keep all of the mattress mice out of it.”

Well, if the Congress considers itself to be the guardian of the Constitution, it is very important to know that the Secretary of Defense is accountable to Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

It is now in order to consider the sixth amendment listed in the order of the House of March 15, 2005.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FILNER:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLES VII——ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. (a) REQUIREMENT FOR VETERANS HIRING PREFERENCE FOR FEDERAL CONTRACTORS PERFORMING CONTRACTS FOR RECONSTRUCTION IN IRAQ.

None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with a private sector contractor to perform reconstruction in Iraq unless the contractor provides for and meets with the Federal Government requirements for the priority hiring of veterans.

(b) PREFERENCE ELIGIBLE VETERAN DEFINED.

In this section, the term “preference eligible veteran” has the meaning given the term “preference eligible” in section 2108 of title 5.

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

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order on the amendment is reserved.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be read on the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

It is now in order to consider the seventh amendment listed in the order of the House of March 15, 2005.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to make clear that I assume good faith on the part of the White House, and I hope we can work things out. But if we do not, I will be pursuing every possible avenue to see that an amendment such as this is adopted. The Congress has an obligation to know what is happening in some of these covert and clandestine operations.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

It is now in order to consider the eighth amendment listed in the order of the House of March 15, 2005.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FILNER:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLES VII——ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. (a) REQUIREMENT FOR VETERANS HIRING PREFERENCE FOR FEDERAL CONTRACTORS PERFORMING CONTRACTS FOR RECONSTRUCTION IN IRAQ.

None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with a private sector contractor to perform reconstruction in Iraq unless the contractor provides for and meets with the Federal Government requirements for the priority hiring of veterans.

(b) PREFERENCE ELIGIBLE VETERAN DEFINED.

In this section, the term “preference eligible veteran” has the meaning given the term “preference eligible” in section 2108 of title 5.

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

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order on the amendment is reserved.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be read on the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

It is now in order to consider the ninth amendment listed in the order of the House of March 15, 2005.
the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I call this the “Let U.S. Veterans Rebuild Iraq and Afghanistan” amendment. Once again we are in support of the veterans of our Nation. We have a major, major, major operation in Iraq and Afghanistan. The bill on the floor today appropriates a sum of $81 billion, and we will be spending over $200 billion. It seems to me that we ought to guarantee jobs to veterans with companies that are awarded government contracts from this fund. Our active duty are fighting, but those who volunteer to go and help in other ways should have the preference that their veterans’ service offers.

We have all rallied to support our troops, and after they come home, our veterans are not treated with the respect they deserve. I outlined yesterday the lack of respect that they will have and continue to have because of lack of adequate funding in the health care system. PTSD, post-traumatic stress disorder, for example, will not have the funding that is needed to treat what is expected to arise out of the current war. As I said yesterday, research funds are being cut, nurses’ positions are being cut.

I tried yesterday to put an amendment on the floor that would supplement this supplemental with an additional $3 billion that the veterans groups think and have testified and have outlined is necessary. That $3 billion was not added in yesterday’s supplemental. So today I ask that we ensure that there are jobs for our Nation’s veterans whether they are new or old. Let us give them the preference that they have in law at home with the preference for the contracts that are being awarded with such abandon in the Middle East today.

We know, if we do not serve our veterans with jobs or health care, what occurs. We know that up to half of the homeless on the streets today are veterans, mainly from Vietnam, because we did not give them the honor, the respect, the health care, the jobs, the housing that they needed. And so they are often after having fought for this country. One way to make sure that this does not happen to anyone else is to include veterans in the rebuilding of Iraq and Afghanistan. Many of them fought for freedom for those nations. Let us get them involved in the effort to build the future.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the rules are not invoked here once again to stop a commonsense approach to helping our veterans in this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman’s amendment is most intriguing. The gentleman is interested in having opportunity for veterans to gain employment. I presume they are veterans, whether veterans of World War II or circumstances in Iraq or otherwise. I presume that is the case. I certainly would be supportive of ensuring every veteran has an opportunity to find work, wherever the veteran might have served. I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman.

Yesterday we had a discussion on the floor of the House relative to the gentleman’s wanting to ensure there were additional funding flows for veterans. There was some resistance to that suggestion because some of us thought there was money in the pipeline that adequately serviced the hospitals; and in regular order we would make sure whatever was necessary would be available, at future hearings and markups of bills that affect funding. So I want to ask a question: Is there veterans hospital in San Diego County? Is there not?

Mr. FILNER. Of course.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to remember, what is the name of that hospital. I am trying to remember.

Mr. FILNER. La Jolla.

Mr. LEWIS of California. San Diego Veterans Medical Center in La Jolla. And does it happen to be the gentleman’s district?

Mr. FILNER. No, it is not.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that hospital needs a lot of work. I assume the gentleman suggests that veterans ought to be first in line if we do some refurbishing?

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, in last year’s appropriation bill, that hospital was awarded close to $100 million for seismic retrofitting, retrofitting for earthquake safety.

Mr. LEWIS of California. And was the gentleman involved in that?

Mr. FILNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman, did we successfully get money for that seismic retrofitting?

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, yes, in last year’s appropriation bill, La Jolla Medical Center was one of a variety of hospitals, I think about two dozen.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would have discussed that with me at the time.

We had a similar problem at Loma Linda Veterans Medical Center, the sister hospital of the Jerry Pettis Veterans Hospital, and we found a way to do seismic retrofitting by way of using a laser. No portion of the hospital needs to be closed down while the work is being done. Thereby, patients can actually be in the hospital while the work is being done. We did not have that discussion.

Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman visited that hospital in the last years?

Mr. FILNER. Many times.

Mr. LEWIS of California. In the last years?

Mr. FILNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I attempt to visit my hospital regularly as well. And, indeed, visit the veterans who are now back at Walter Reed or Bethesda. Indeed, we all should be concerned about that priority.

But, frankly, I am a little confused by the gentleman’s suggestion yesterday that would indicate that we do not give priority on a bipartisan basis to veterans. I would ask the gentleman to join me in a special mission. Would the gentleman consider the mission?

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, whatever the gentleman from California (Chairman Lewis) suggests, I would consider.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the mission is the veterans service organizations are a great voice for veterans here in Washington. Like the gentleman, they are constantly pounding their chest saying, I am calling for money, more opportunity for veterans. I insist that they help us go back to where the hospitals are and see that veterans are treated like real human beings in those hospitals. I cannot get the VSOs to do it. Maybe I can get the gentleman to do it because the gentleman is obviously more concerned than the VSOs are about those veterans benefits and the way they are being treated.

Mr. Chairman, I ask, would the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) join me in that effort, or does the gentleman believe the money is being spent very well at veterans hospitals?

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, let everybody witness the efficiencies in this system; but I will say, for paralyzed veteran with a spinal cord injury, there is no better place than the VA to get care.

To keep that quality of care for those veterans requires investment in our system. We are all looking for efficiencies but I will tell you there is no independent person, including the VA.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman asked me a question. Including the VA that says that we have enough money.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Who says we do not have enough money? . . .

Mr. FILNER. The VA says we do not have enough money.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair has been trying to facilitate this colloquy, but the Chair will
now insist that Members follow regular order in yielding and reclaiming time. Members will not speak at the same time.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) controls the time and is recognized for the balance of his time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman has 15 seconds.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill which is not in order under section 2 rule XXI.

The rule states that an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if it changes existing law or imposes additional duties. I ask for the Chair’s ruling.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. FILNER. Once again we are using the rules to block a commonsense amendment. It seems to me that the chairman has deeper issues than a blocking of the thing on a procedural ground and feels that the VA Committee is not doing its job. That is obviously a deep issue that we ought to discuss, but that should not lead him to block this amendment.

In addition, the only way I could judge the sincerity of the majority party in these issues is to see what they had done to the chairman of the committee I have sat on for the last 12 years; that is, the VA Committee. The chairman was removed from that job, purged from that job because he stood up for veterans.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman will join me on a mission as I join him on a mission for accountability and efficiency to convince the leadership of his party to put back on that committee members of the committee who actually fight for veterans.

Once again, I think the veterans of this Nation ought to understand that the rules of this House can be waived for anything that the majority party wants, but when it comes to the veterans of this Nation, they refuse to waive the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The Chair finds that the amendment, although in the form of a limitation, proposes a legislative contingency imposing new duties on the Executive.

As such, the amendment violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained.

It is now in order to consider the seventh amendment listed in the order of the House of March 15, 2005.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Ms. Velázquez.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. Velázquez: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the title:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 7001. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fund any contract in contravention of section 15(g)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(g)(2)).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of March 15, 2005, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. Velázquez) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Ms. Velázquez).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. Velázquez asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, Federal contracts for overseas work have increased substantially over the last several years. This rapid increase in government buying has largely resulted from the war in Iraq and combating terrorism. Since the spring of 2003, Congress has appropriated close to $200 billion for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The supplemental appropriations bill we are considering today provides an additional $81 billion.

Much of this funding will be spent on contracts for overseas work, and most of these contracts will be awarded to large corporations. Unfortunately, while billions of dollars spent domestically must include small businesses, there is no requirement that small companies have access to the bulk of overseas contracts. My amendment would change that by requiring that small businesses have access to international contracts as well.

Federal agencies currently do not include overseas contracts when calculating their small businesses goals. Therefore, the regulations of holding agencies accountable for providing U.S. small companies with access to international work. As a result, only 1 percent of government overseas contracts are awarded to small companies, and barely 500 of the more than 23 million U.S. small businesses are performing work abroad. By requiring that contracts funded by this bill are calculated in the Federal Government’s small business goals, we start to instill credibility in the system while ensuring that small firms receive their fair share.

These goals were enacted to ensure small business participation in the Federal marketplace. However, the Federal Government has failed to meet its small business goal in each of the last 5 years. In one year alone, this failure cost U.S. small businesses over $15 billion in lost contracting opportunities.

We have a lot to make up for with our Nation’s small business owners. We can start by ensuring that they have access to overseas contracts.

Mr. Chairman, there are 23 million small businesses in the United States. They represent 99 percent of all employers, create three out of four new jobs, and employ more than half of all private sector workers. Historically, when the government has needed to build up for military operations, it has turned to small businesses to fulfill its procurement needs because of their flexibility and quick response time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate the gentlewoman from New York yielding the floor.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Gracias. I am sorry. I thought this was English-only here.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I wanted to say to the gentlewoman, first, I very much appreciate the thrust of her amendment. While we are prepared to accept her amendment, let me add to that there could be some resistance, perhaps, on the part of the State Department. If there were resistance, it is because they have never seen fit to apply the existing law to overseas contracts. I think that is a small mistake on their part, frankly, if they have not. I think the gentlewoman is not just raising an important point but a point that needed to be addressed.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate the gentleman’s support of this amendment. I would say that it does not surprise me that the Department of State would raise a concern because they are the worst offenders when it comes to fulfilling the statutory goals set by Congress regarding contracting practices on behalf of small businesses in our Nation. I would love to see that the gentleman work with me on behalf of small businesses and make sure that in this $81 billion there is small business participation. They can do the work and they can do it more effectively than many of the large corporations that are mismanaging and misappropriating much of the money that has been spent so far.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Let me say to the gentlewoman that her amendment is overdue. I am happy to accept it and I am happy to be her partner on behalf of small business.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. Velázquez).
The amendment was agreed to.

Amendment offered by MR. MARKEY.

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

Sec. 7001. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used in contravention of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (division G of Public Law 105–277; 112 Stat. 2801–2822; 8 U.S.C. 1231 note) and any regulations prescribed thereto, including regulations under part 308 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations, and part 95 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations.

Recorded Vote

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote was demanded. A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 430, noes 2, answered "present" 3, not voting 9, as follows:

Ayes—420

Baird (PA)
Baker (WA)
Boucher (VT)
Bunning (KY)
Cajete (NM)
Caulfield (NY)
Chabot (OH)
Chevy (MN)
Cline (TX)
Collins (GA)
Conger (ID)
Cuellar (TX)

Price (GA)
Rohrabacher (CA)
Westmoreland (NY)

Voting "present"—3

Messrs. KLINE, PUTNAM, CARDOZA, TANCREDO, BLUNT, SMITH of Texas, GOODLATTE, MCHENRY, THOMAS, AKIN, FLAKE and EHLERS and Mrs. EMERSON changed their vote from "no" to "aye". Messrs. PRICE of Georgia, WESTMORELAND and ROHRABACHER changed their vote from "aye" to "present".

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, due to a previously scheduled commitment away from Capitol Hill, I was unavoidably detained and regretfully missed rolcall vote No. 75, the Markey Amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye".

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, time and time again, the Bush administration has not been straightforward with Congress, the American people, or our soldiers about the costs of this war and what it will take to ensure stability and security in Iraq so our troops can return home.

Instead of disclosing the actual findings of field reports on contracting audits, troop needs, or the projected cost of the reconstruction effort, the administration has withheld, distorted, and even deliberately hidden information.

Just this week, despite the administration's refusal to turn Pentagon audits over to Congress, I obtained a report by Defense Department auditors concluding that Halliburton overcharged the U.S. government by more than $100 million for a single task order under its no-bid $7 billion contract to restore Iraq's oil infrastructure. I would like to know why unredacted versions of this audit report and the audit reports on nine additional task orders are still being withheld from Congress.

I have also learned that administration officials violated a U.N. Security Council Resolution by intentionally concealing these overcharges from international auditors. The administration only provided heavily redacted audits to the international auditors charged with overseeing the Iraqi oil revenue used to pay Halliburton's inflated costs.

Worst of all, correspondence between the Army Corps of Engineers and Halliburton officials indicates it was Halliburton that blacked-out references to egregious overcharges and other key audit findings regarding the unreasonableness of Halliburton's prices.

I am deeply disappointed that the House voted down an amendment calling for the investigation of reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan including contracting procedures, possible money laundering, and profiteering.

It is disturbing that the Republican leadership has been unwilling to assert its oversight responsibility and demand fiscal accountability.
I have been a critic of the Bush administration's policy in Iraq. But I think even those who have supported it should be deeply concerned about the escalating cost of our efforts there. If approved, the President's emergency supplemental appropriations request will bring the total cost of our operations in Iraq so far to over $200 billion. This is indeed a pause, but Congress must not fail to supply our troops.

When I visited Iraq last year, I met with our troops and it is clear to me that more resources, including body armor and military equipment, are needed to save their lives. The bill we are considering today provides these resources. It includes important provisions to raise the military death gratuity from $12,000 to $100,000 and to increase funding for add-on vehicle armor kits, night-vision equipment, and electronic roadside-bomb jammers. It includes funding for contract linguists for the Army and additional body armor for the Army and Marines. And thanks to the passage of the Markay-Blumenauer amendment, which I supported, the bill reaffirms the U.S. commitment to the U.N. Convention Against Torture.

It also provides funding for tsunami disaster relief, $1.3 billion to train and equip Afghan security forces and the Afghan army, $92 million for Darfur and $150 million for food aid to Ukraine, $27 million for Lebanon and Liberia, and $580 million for peacekeeping programs, most of which are for Sudan. Importantly, the bill appropriates the President's request of $200 million for economic development in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

But large as it is, the bill still falls short in some respects. More funding is needed for veterans' health care and mental health care and helping members of the National Guard transition back to civilian life.

And most problematically, the House-passed rule incorporated into the bill the REAL ID Act, legislation that I opposed when the House passed it in February. I opposed it again by voting against the rule. I believe the REAL ID Act does not strengthen national security, but it does create undue difficulties for the Departments of Labor and Homeland Security, an agency统筹s the powers of the Secretary of Homeland Security.

The bill also lacks answers to some tough questions. How many more supplemental requests like this one does the administration plan to present to Congress? What is our post-election strategy in Iraq? Can we account for the billions of dollars already spent in Iraq, and are the remaining billions of dollars in re-construction funds being well spent? Why can't we get a solid answer about the numbers of trained and equipped Iraqi troops? How many troops will we send immediately?

That lack of a strategic and timely investment in the leadership of Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas. The accountability requirements in this bill will set an example for the international community for formulating assistance packages that protect against corruption, embezzlement, and mismanagement, which in the past siphoned millions of dollars to Arafat loyalists and terrorist organizations.

And so, I will vote for this legislation to support our troops and to support these other worthwhile U.S. humanitarian endeavors, but we have an obligation to hold the Bush administration accountable for its policies in Iraq.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for this supplemental appropriations bill today.
vulnerable position because of this war, and now we are asked to surrender the responsibilities of this body to hold the administration accountable for its actions.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. Chairman, as a Member of Congress I must provide answers to my constituents about how the Government spends. Accountability is not a partisan issue, we must all demand answers. Our Constitution was carefully crafted so as to allow a balance of power in our Government. Congress is obligated to use appropriations and the oversight that accompanies them as a means of holding the executive branch accountable for its spending of American funds. Any attempt to usurp that balance of power is a betrayal of the moral fiber of our Government and must be taken as an attack on the integrity of this body.

The Department of Defense by law must submit reports to Congress with a detailed explanation of the spending and future costs of the Iraq war. These reports were due October of last year and at the beginning of this year. Despite this legal obligation clearly delineated in law, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act has not had to date received no report accounting for the spending and detailing cost estimates of previous supplemental funding. Our Government should not fail to meet its legal responsibility without consequence. How can we justify more emergency appropriations without adequate accountability without consequence. How can we justify a lack of accountability without consequence.

Sad, we have no report directly from DoD but the Inspector General reported that almost $9 billion in reconstruction funding has been mishandled. The administration has not provided an accounting for the spending and the dollars not spent. The Inspector General suggests that thousands of "ghost employees" were on an unidentified ministry payroll.

In addition, DoD has stated in the past that $220,000 Iraq security forces had been trained and equipped, that number was then scaled down to 136,000. Moreover, the Pentagon has recently put into question if these troops are truly prepared for service.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, opposition to this bill is not a vote against supporting our troops. This body has proven over and over again through appropriations that it supports our troops. Congress has appropriated $20 billion for Iraq reconstruction despite the administration's claims that Iraq reconstruction would cost between $1 and $2 billion and could be financed by Iraqi oil revenues. With enactment of this bill Congress will have appropriated $300 billion for the efforts in Iraq without proper accounting of the spending of these funds. The administration claimed that we would be greeted as great liberators and that just a few short months after the invasion we could start withdrawing troops, but instead we have no exit strategy and over 1,500 troops have died and thousands seriously injured. I could go on and on about the disastrous miscalculations and misleading estimates. This bill is critically lacking in accountability. No more blank checks for this administration.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I cannot support the President's request to spend billions more for this protracted war in Iraq. It's time to bring our troops home.

Next week we will commemorate the second anniversary of the war and U.S. occupation. Over 1,500 American lives have been lost along with countless numbers of Iraqi civilians. Over 11,000 Americans have been wounded. The world is still not a safer place.

What have we gained? I disagree with those who claim a vote for this bill is a vote to support our troops. I stand behind these brave Americans and believe they ought to have every resource to protect them.

How is it supporting our troops to keep them in harms way without a plan to win this war?

How is it supporting our troops when we continue to allow the administration to spend hundreds of millions of dollars at will on no bid Government contracts with no oversight?

How is it supporting our troops when we don't provide for mental health services for those troops traumatized in combat?

For all of these reasons, I am voting "no" on the President's $81.3 billion supplemental request. It is time for a plan to bring our troops home, not the President another blank check.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, in a few days we will mark the second anniversary of the invasion of Iraq and the start of a war that, in my judgment, did not need to be fought. At the time, the war was rationalized on intelligence estimates of Iraqi destruction capabilities that were wrong, and on suggestions that Iraq was somehow connected with the September 11 al-Qaeda attacks on our country that were never true.

The President now says that the war is really about the spread of democracy in the Middle East. This effort at after-the-fact justification was only made necessary because the primary rationale was so sadly lacking in fact.

The one constant in 2 years of combat has been the courage, dedication, and skill of the men and women of our Armed Forces. For more than 1,500 of our troops, service in Iraq required the ultimate sacrifice. That is a loss for which our country mourns each day.

Thousands more have been wounded—their lives, and the lives of their families changed forever by this war. Similar losses have been experienced by families in Spain, in Italy, and, of course, in Iraq.

The bill before us provides another $75 billion for military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. The Congress has not been requested to spend this money through the normal budget process, not subjected to any hearings, and not counted against our massive budget deficits. In fact, this will be the third largest appropriations measure this year.

And this $75 billion will be on top of the more than $200 billion previously appropriated, mostly by the supplemental appropriations process, for these military operations.

How much of this cost would have been unnecessary had the administration taken the time to plan adequately for a war of choice? We will never know. But we do know—because these supplemental appropriations are evidence of it—that our troops were sent into combat without the equipment they would need for a protracted insurgency operation.

Our responsibility now is two-fold. First, to ensure that our troops have what they need to do their jobs effectively and as safely as possible. And second, to develop a strategy for success that will contain clear benchmarks by which the American people can measure progress towards the time when our forces will be brought home.

That strategy for success must include an aggressive plan for transferring responsibility for their country's security to the Iraqis, an improved plan for Iraq's reconstruction, and an intensification of diplomatic efforts in the region.

Other countries—the Netherlands and Italy among them—are making plans for the return of their forces. The United States cannot afford to keep the troops there, but we do need clear criteria for judging certain fundamentals, including the capability and willingness of Iraqi security forces to deal with the insurgency and protect the country.

Somewhere between an open-ended U.S. commitment to Iraq and a timetable for withdrawal is a strategy for ending our military involvement. That fact was the heart of the amendment by the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. MORAN, which this House adopted yesterday.

The President owes it to the American people and this Congress to develop such a plan, clearly describe it, and provide an assessment of how much it will cost and how long it will take.

I understand and share the frustration that will lead some to vote against this bill. We are being asked, again, to clean up a mess that many of us argued strongly against creating.

Putting aside our frustration with this administration so that we can provide our troops what they need does not, however, mean that we forget the mistakes of the past, the misrepresentations, and misrepresentations that brought us to the point where these billions are necessary.

The time is long past due for an accounting for those failures. We in Congress understand our responsibility to provide for the common defense. The administration must understand its responsibility to use the money this Congress provides effectively, and with a transparency that can withstand scrutiny.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1268, the Emergency Supplemental Warliime Appropriations Act for FY 2005. My opposition to this bill does not mean that I do not support our troops. I wholeheartedly support our troops and believe that we should fully fund our troops so that they have the necessary equipment to ensure their safety. Also incorporated into this bill is funding for tsunami relief efforts for affected Southeast Asian countries. Having gone to Sri Lanka and personally seen the devastation, I know how important our relief efforts are for these countries.

Sadly, I'm opposing H.R. 1268 because it includes the REAL ID Act of 2005. The REAL ID Act of 2005 would deny drivers' licenses to immigrants, and slam the doors on refugees seeking asylum from persecution. The REAL, bad, ID Act has nothing to do with supporting our troops, let alone national security. Also incorporated into this bill is funding for tsunami relief efforts for affected Southeast Asian countries.

It is such a shame that Republicans had to include the REAL ID Act in the Iraq Supplemental and Tsunami Relief bill when it has nothing to do with these two pressing issues. This is an unprecedented move on the part of the Republican leadership and this concerns me.

The REAL ID Act, H.R. 418 will not make us safer. What H.R. 418 will do is undermine several key security features that were dealt with responsibly in the Intelligence Reform legislation which was based on the 9–11 Commission recommendations.

If the Republicans and this administration really want to strengthen national security, they should start by providing full funding for
the Department of Homeland Security, particularly the security improvements authorized in the Intelligence Reform bill. Yet the President’s 2006 budget did not include funding for 10,000 new border guards, 40,000 new detention beds to hold people awaiting deportation, and 4,000 new immigration inspectors as the bill directed. At the direction of the Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005, Iraq and Afghanistan. We must take additional steps however, to improve benefits for the families of our troops not addressed in this bill. When families of our service members do not have access to healthcare because they cannot afford it, that is a substantial problem that we must address. We must take additional steps however, to improve benefits for our troops and their ongoing efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I applaud my colleagues who are working to include at least some FY2006 funding for Iraq and Afghanistan in this FY2006 Budget. The Congressional Budget Office projects that the net cost of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan could reach $458 billion over the FY 2005 to 2014 period, on top of the more than $200 billion already expended. An emergency is something unforeseen, but these war costs can be estimated far in advance of our troops ever engaging in battle.

In his FY2006 budget request, President Bush did not include funds for construction of the U.S. Mission in Iraq. Instead, a week after submitting his FY2006 budget to Congress, the President sent Congress an FY2005 emergency supplemental funding request which included more than $1.3 billion for the embassy in Iraq. This hardly seems to be emergency funding since we have known we will need to operate and maintain an embassy in this country. Our only concern after Congress and the State Department have agreed to fund the U.S. embassy in Iraq included in the previous two wartime supplemental bills, and again in this bill.

There is also $36 million dollars included for the construction of a new detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. I believe the Secretary of Homeland Security to waive environmental regulations, undermine the competitive bidding process and threaten the ability of workers to be paid a prevailing wage on these projects. The most important part of this issue is compelling Congress to authorize funding to secure and staff our secretaries of Homeland Security to maintain and improve benefits for the families of our troops. Our children to inherit.

I do strongly support a number of provisions in this bill, however, which will better protect the men and women serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, better provide for the families of those who gave their lives serving in these countries, and better equip our troops. It is time that we increase the military death gratuity benefit to $100,000 and the subsidized life insurance benefit to $400,000 for the families of soldiers who died or were killed on active duty while serving in Iraq and Afghanistan after October 7th, 2001. We must take additional steps however, to improve benefits for the families of our troops not addressed in this bill. When families of our service members do not have access to...
$75 million for body armor protection and $611 million for add-on vehicle armor kits which was $48 million more than requested. We also provide necessary oversight on the vehicle armor kits and several other procurement requests, while offsetting increases in funding for our troops with decreases in unnecessary spending. In addition, I increased the request for the family of medium-tactical vehicle, or FMTVs, to $735 million after recognizing wartime operations are causing much greater wear and stress on these vehicles than peacetime operations. I suspend the emergency—spending package today. It provides the equipment and armor our service members need on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan. H.R. 1268 also significantly improves our support of military families by increasing the death gratuity to $100,000 and improving the life insurance coverage we provide to those risking so much in the battlefield. Our service members need this bill. However, I was extremely disappointed by the tone of our discussion in this bill.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to incorporating the unnecessary provisions of the REAL ID Act, H.R. 418, in the Emergency Supplemental Wartime Appropriations bill. I intend to vote for the emergency—spending package today. It provides the equipment and armor our service members need on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan. H.R. 1268 also significantly improves our support of military families by increasing the death gratuity to $100,000 and improving the life insurance coverage we provide to those risking so much in the battlefield. Our service members need this bill. However, I was extremely disappointed by the tone of our discussion in this bill.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to incorporating the unnecessary provisions of the REAL ID Act, H.R. 418, in the Emergency Supplemental Wartime Appropriations bill. I intend to vote for the emergency—spending package today. It provides the equipment and armor our service members need on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan. H.R. 1268 also significantly improves our support of military families by increasing the death gratuity to $100,000 and improving the life insurance coverage we provide to those risking so much in the battlefield. Our service members need this bill. However, I was extremely disappointed by the tone of our discussion in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to incorporating the unnecessary provisions of the REAL ID Act, H.R. 418, in the Emergency Supplemental Wartime Appropriations bill. I intend to vote for the emergency—spending package today. It provides the equipment and armor our service members need on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan. H.R. 1268 also significantly improves our support of military families by increasing the death gratuity to $100,000 and improving the life insurance coverage we provide to those risking so much in the battlefield. Our service members need this bill. However, I was extremely disappointed by the tone of our discussion in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to incorporating the unnecessary provisions of the REAL ID Act, H.R. 418, in the Emergency Supplemental Wartime Appropriations bill. I intend to vote for the emergency—spending package today. It provides the equipment and armor our service members need on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan. H.R. 1268 also significantly improves our support of military families by increasing the death gratuity to $100,000 and improving the life insurance coverage we provide to those risking so much in the battlefield. Our service members need this bill. However, I was extremely disappointed by the tone of our discussion in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to incorporating the unnecessary provisions of the REAL ID Act, H.R. 418, in the Emergency Supplemental Wartime Appropriations bill. I intend to vote for the emergency—spending package today. It provides the equipment and armor our service members need on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan. H.R. 1268 also significantly improves our support of military families by increasing the death gratuity to $100,000 and improving the life insurance coverage we provide to those risking so much in the battlefield. Our service members need this bill. However, I was extremely disappointed by the tone of our discussion in this bill.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to incorporating the unnecessary provisions of the REAL ID Act, H.R. 418, in the Emergency Supplemental Wartime Appropriations bill. I intend to vote for the emergency—spending package today. It provides the equipment and armor our service members need on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan. H.R. 1268 also significantly improves our support of military families by increasing the death gratuity to $100,000 and improving the life insurance coverage we provide to those risking so much in the battlefield. Our service members need this bill. However, I was extremely disappointed by the tone of our discussion in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to incorporating the unnecessary provisions of the REAL ID Act, H.R. 418, in the Emergency Supplemental Wartime Appropriations bill. I intend to vote for the emergency—spending package today. It provides the equipment and armor our service members need on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan. H.R. 1268 also significantly improves our support of military families by increasing the death gratuity to $100,000 and improving the life insurance coverage we provide to those risking so much in the battlefield. Our service members need this bill. However, I was extremely disappointed by the tone of our discussion in this bill.
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Regardless of the merits, everyone should be troubled by the use of supplemental legislation to pay for regular military action in Iraq and Afghanistan. Funding these operations outside of the regular budgeting process limits our ability for effective oversight and distorts the true budget picture. Our ability for effective oversight and distorts the true budget picture. The Rules Committee burdened this legislation with all the flaws of H.R. 418, the “REAL ID Act,” which, among other things, placed the entire 7,514 mile border completely outside all legal protections. This is perhaps the most damaging single precedent since I’ve been in Congress.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1268, the War Supplemental Appropriations bill for FY 2005, which will provide funding for military operations and reconstruction activities in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as important funds for tsunami relief and recovery.

The bill before us includes important changes made by the Appropriations Committee to the President’s original budget request. These changes are essential to providing our servicemen and women the equipment and support they need to help keep them safe as they fulfill their important mission. Committed to the fact that the well-being of our troops is our highest priority, the Appropriations Committee increased funding by 69 percent more than requested for additional armor kits; $401 million more, or twice the amount requested, for new trucks; and $50 million in unrequested funds for radio jammers to disrupt attacks by Iraqi insurgents to ex-plode remote controlled bombs and mines.

The bill also includes important provisions to increase the military death gratuity from $12,000 to $100,000 and to provide subsidized life insurance benefits from $250,000 to $400,000 for families of soldiers who die or are killed on active duty, and we make these important provisions retroactive to the beginning of military operations on October 7, 2001. No amount can compensate for the death of a loved one, but an increase in these benefits that can help a family cope with the financial impact of a combat death is long overdue.

When the Appropriations Committees met, I strongly supported the Jackson amendment to add $150 million in food aid for Sudan, and I am pleased we have acted again today to add $100 million in additional disaster assistance. The United States has an obligation and opportunity to assist this troubled country, and I believe this additional funding sets an important example for the United Nations and other countries that still need to respond to the crisis in Sudan.

I have been very concerned about the lack of accountability by the Defense Department and the Administration as we provide them with enormous, although necessary, sums of money. While there has been some improvement, I am troubled that the Department of Defense has not submitted the required biannual report on the extraordinary operations of the armed forces and on the reconstruction activities administered by DOD in Iraq and Afghanistan. I know that Chairman JERRY LEWIS, Defense Appropriations Chairman BILL YOUNG and ranking members DAVID OBEY and JOHN MURTHA, as well as my colleagues on the full committee, have expressed similar concerns about DOD’s lack of responsiveness.

I am also troubled that the Administration continues to request emergency supplemental funds for military operations. We have been engaged in Afghanistan for over three years, and nearly three years have gone by since we invaded Iraq. Therefore, it is no surprise that funds are needed to support our servicemen and women overseas. The Administration should be taking into account these costs into their regular budget submissions.

I am also disappointed that the Republican leadership failed to make in order an important amendment by Representatives HOOLEY and DELAURA to expand veterans’ health care and to extend health care to our returning troops des-erve whatever help they need to successfully transition to civilian life.

Finally, I am particularly angry that the Republi-can leadership is using this bill as a vehi-cle to move an unrelated piece of legislation, the Sensenbrenner “REAL ID” immigration bill. The important bill before us provides critical resources for our servicemen and women overseas and badly needed disaster relief. It should not be used by the Republican leadership to fulfill their political promises. I hope the Senate will oppose this legislative gambit and confine the bill to address the serious needs it is intended to address.

However, in spite of my concerns, I believe it is our responsibility to provide our service- men and women necessary for them to fulfill their mission and come home safely. Protecting our troops, who are sacri-ficing so much on our behalf, and providing for their families, will always be my first priority, and that is why I am supporting this bill today.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, today I voted in support of the Fiscal Year 2005 Iraq and Tsu-nami Relief Supplemental.

This decision was difficult for me. I strongly opposed the REAL ID Act of 2005. The REAL ID Act has no place on a bill to fund support for our military families and tsunami victims. In fact, I voted against H.R. 418 when it was considered by the U.S. House of Representa-tives on February 10, 2005. This type of political pay-to-play is the sort of legislation that really is the greatest threat to the United States and our way of life. I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation.

What troubles me the most about this bill are two key concerns: One, there are no mechanisms for tracking if the money is prop-erly spent. There is simply no mechanism for improving accountability of how taxpayers’ dol-lars are spent. The Defense Department is one of the least accountable agencies in the federal government. The American people have a right to know how these dollars are spent. And, two, by increasing investments in our war and defense efforts, we further con-tribute to the desperate situation in education, highways, community development, first responders, health care, public health and more. What is at stake here is the very wel-fare of our states and communities, who find themselves financially strapped because of the economic policies of this administration. Our domestic economy cannot continue to pursue this trend.

Despite my misgivings over this spending bill, I will vote for its passage. We in Congress must call on the Defense Depart-ment to provide better accountability for the spending decisions it makes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this $82 billion “emergency” supplemental bill. I also am opposed to the manner in which the REAL ID Act, H.R. 418, was attached to the Rule, thereby stealthily making the estab-lishment of a national ID a part of an “emergen-cy” bill to which it is completely unrelated. Once again we see controversial bills being hidden inside another bill so that they are automatically passed where they otherwise might face opposition. I do not believe this is a wise practice.

This “emergency” supplemental is the sec-ond largest supplemental appropriations bill in United States history, second only to the one last year. The funds will be considered “emer-gency” funds so Congress can ignore spend-ing caps that would require the billions in new spending to be offset by reducing spending elsewhere.

We are told that this is emergency spending, and that we therefore must not question this enormous expenditure. Does an emergen-cy require sending billions of American taxpayers’ dollars overseas as foreign aid an emergency? This bill is filled with foreign aid spending. If we pass this ill-conceived legisla-tion, we will spend $658 million for tsunami re-habilitation; $94 million for Darfur, Sudan; $50 million for food aid, most to Liberia and Sudan; $580 million for “peacekeeping” overseas; $582 mil-lion to build a new American embassy in Iraq; $76 million to build a new airport in Kuwait (one of the wealthiest countries on earth); $267 million for education, highways, community development, and alternative development programs to help farmers stop raising poppy; $200 million in economic aid for the Palestinians; $150 million for Pakistan (run by an unelected dictator); $200 million for Jordan; $34 million for Ukraine.

Does anyone really believe that all this for-eign aid is “emergency” spending? Or is it just an opportunity for some off-budget spending? Just the above foreign aid equals almost $3.5 billion. Does anyone believe that sending this much money abroad as international welfare is a good thing for our economy?

Is there a baseball emergency? There must be, if we can use this supplemental spending bill to send $100 million in unrequested funds to build a baseball sta-dium.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is almost unimagi-nably expensive. It is our out-of-control spend-ing that really is the greatest threat to the United States and our way of life. I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation.
Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a motion to recommit that would provide $100 million in health and $50 million in job training transitional assistance to help active duty forces make the transition to the veterans benefits system. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) and I have been working on this issue together and trying to add $1.3 billion for VA health care and reintegration services. While our amendment was ruled not in order, we now have the chance to ensure that this supplemental includes at least some funding for vital health and employment services.

America is currently asking more of its all-volunteer military force than it ever has before. Yet even as America prepares to continue its large and prolonged military campaign in Iraq, it has done very little to provide for the veterans of this war. Our obligation to support our troops does not end when they leave Iraq.

But how are we supposed to provide adequate health care to these new veterans when we did not even meet the needs of our current veterans? The fiscal year 2005 Omnibus was $1.3 billion short of the amount that then Secretary Principi, as well as the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, stated was needed to just maintain the current level of veterans health care.

We should not make our returning soldiers have the readjustment assistance they need, particularly for members of the Guard and Reserve. You have to understand, these members do not go back to a base, they go back to their home State and then are scattered throughout that State. Members of the National Guard returning home face immense challenges in transitioning out of active duty deployment and back to civilian life. While the State Guard offices are working to provide returning soldiers with important information regarding their health care, employment assistance and other transitional services, they simply do not have the money they need to complete the education and counseling necessary for a smooth transition back to civilian life. I think our returning soldiers deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion to recommit and keep our promise to our Nation's veterans.

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

RECORDED VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was taken; and the RECORDED VOTE was ordered.

March 16, 2005
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions 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.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later in the day.

AMENDING INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986 EXTENDING LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND FINANCING RATE

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1270) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund financing rate.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1270
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 4081(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund financing rate) is amended by striking “April 1, 2006” and inserting “October 1, 2005.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA).

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I rise in support of H.R. 1270 to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Trust Fund financing rate.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out this leaking underground storage tank stuff; we are talking about a LUST bill. I thought we might as well get that on the record and endure whatever the smirks are, because it is really an important bill. It is not controversial. It is a straightforward extension for 6 months, and I got a smile from Mr. Speaker.

It is a 0.1 cent per gallon excise tax. It will go to clean up drinking water and the environment. I appreciate the support of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA) for this bill and look forward to its passage.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House is continuing the funding mechanism for the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Fund or LUST fund. Across this country there are hundreds of thousands of leaking underground storage tanks.

Many, if not most, of these have MTBE in them and have been linked to the contamination of groundwater in thousands of communities. So it is important that we continue funding for the Trust Fund that helps communities get these messes cleaned up where responsible parties can’t be found.

But I agree with my colleagues who, noting the needs that are out there, have called for a longer extension of this funding mechanism. Clearly, we have to give states more support and the ability to know that the LUST fund will back up their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is also important to note how inadequate the efforts of this Administration have been in addressing the problem of leaking tanks.

For example, the LUST fund could take in approximately $200 million in revenues this year alone. And yet the Administration proposes to spend only slightly more than a third of that to address the problems caused by these leaking tanks.

This is a completely inadequate response to addressing the 136,000 spills across the country.
We should be spending more to help these communities clean up. We should also be enacting common sense reforms like requiring secondary containment for underground storage tanks. We should be requiring more frequent inspections of all underground tanks.

And we shouldn’t be taking steps like those in the energy bill that would weaken “polluter pay” laws. The energy bill as currently drafted weakens EPA’s authority to recover the money they spend to clean up sites.

We have to continue holding polluters accountable for the damage they cause. So while I will support this bill, I believe we should postpone the LUST Trust Fund.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of cleanup of leaking underground storage tanks and this bill to extend part of the funding source for this program. However, I am concerned that this resolution only guarantees this funding source through October 1, 2005.

Leaking gasoline tanks are a major problem in this country. There are currently 136,000 leaking tanks across the country. More than 36,000 of these are in California—more than 100 oil refineries in my district alone. Seventy-five percent of these leaking tanks could release MTBE into our groundwater supplies. This problem is not going away.

The EPA estimates that over the next 10 years 120,000 more tanks could leak. That means 120,000 more communities polluted—harming their soil and water and public health and leaving communities with the cleanup bill. To put it in perspective, cleanup from MTBE alone could cost at least $28 billion.

So while I support this legislation, the cleanup problem is much bigger than a 6-month extension—our communities and states deserve a real funding commitment.

Ironically, while we are here today talking about ensuring funding for 6 months, the current energy bill, like last session’s bill, threatens to gut the program.

Last year language was inserted in the energy bill which would largely gut this program which our communities and water providers depend on.

Chairman of this program in the energy bill restrict the Environmental Protection Agency from getting money for cleanups from polluters—therefore rewarding polluters at the expense of working families, communities and states.

Taxpayers should not shoulder the burden of cleanup costs. Language in the energy bill also fails to require that tanks be inspected every 3 years as recommended by the General Accounting Office. In fact, under the energy bill, it could be six years before these tanks are inspected.

Adopting more stringent inspection requirements is a common sense proposal, one that will save taxpayers money and prevent unnecessary threats to our water supplies.

Finally, the energy bill fails to require secondary containment.

More than 20 states already require at least secondary containment because these states recognize the savings to taxpayers, water providers and redevelopers from preventing contamination of soil and water.

So while we are here today committing ourselves to a 6-month funding of the program, we are also preparing to unnecessarily gut important principles.

This program helps protect the health and water security of my constituents. Changes to this program should not be done haphazardly in the energy bill. We owe it to our constituents and communities who deal with leaking tanks to not shelve random provisions in the energy bill.

Mr. Speaker I support this bill and urge my colleagues to support it to guarantee at least some funding for cleanup, but I also urge my colleagues to seriously reject the changes to the Leaking Underground Storage Tank program included in the energy bill.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of H.R. 1270, legislation to extend, for 6 months, the tax that finances the Leaking Underground Storage Tank, LUST, Trust Fund.

As chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Environment and Hazardous Materials, I have spent the last couple of Congresses getting familiar with the LUST program. I think the goal behind this program—and its tax—is important. The LUST program, though well intentioned, is unable to realize its full potential because of the way Congress operates it.

Congress first initiated this tax in 1986 primarily through a 0.1 cent-per-gallon motor fuel tax. The LUST tax generated roughly $150 million per year over a 9-year period, more than three times what was collected for the fund before the taxing authority expired in December 1995. Congress reinstated the LUST tax through the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, Public Law 105–34, from October 1, 1997, through March 31, 2005. In fiscal year 2004, the LUST program generated $192.9 million in revenues, and the fund earned $66.7 million in interest on an accrual basis. At the end of 2004, the fund’s net assets were $2.33 billion.

This is all well and good, but Congress has had a history of making annual appropriations in an amount that is close to the amount of interest that the LUST Trust Fund earns each year. In fact, the appropriated amount is much less than the annual revenues created each year by this tax. The LUST Trust Fund has been used by Presidents and Members of Congress to balance their books rather than protect and clean up groundwater pollution that was released from these tanks.

Mr. Speaker, myopic views of LUST have helped to create the program deficits facing LUST and extending the LUST tax cannot be thoughtfully considered unless it is looked at as a whole. Several experts, including the Government Accountability Office, have testified before the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Environment and Hazardous Materials that the program should be spent in greater quantity and that these amounts should help encourage inspection requirements, operator training, and more clean up. These are important LUST program reforms that must be secured in order to make the justification of a LUST Trust Fund, and the tax that finances it, solid public policy arguments.

Again, while I am not going to oppose this bill on this day, it is essential that prior to another extension of the LUST tax that, at a minimum, reform to the LUST program be coupled with any extension of the tax. These reforms have passed the House on two occasions last year and are currently contained in the energy bill discussion draft currently before the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I am hopeful we can get these reforms enacted soon.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1270.

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

EXPRESSING GRAVE CONCERN OF CONGRESS REGARDING PASSAGE OF ANTI-SECESSION LAW BY NATIONAL PEOPLE’S CONGRESS OF PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the recent passage of the anti-secession law by the National People’s Congress of the People’s Republic of China.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas on December 9, 2003, President George W. Bush stated it is the policy of the United States to “oppose any unilateral decision, by either China or Taiwan, to change the status quo”;

Whereas in the past few years, the Government of the United States has urged both Taiwan and the People’s Republic of China to maintain restraint;

Whereas the National People’s Congress of the People’s Republic of China passed its anti-secession law on March 14, 2005, which constitutes a unilateral change to the status quo in the Taiwan Strait;

Whereas the passage of China’s anti-secession law escalates tensions between Taiwan and the People’s Republic of China and is an impediment to cross-strait dialogue;

Whereas the purpose of China’s anti-secession law is to create a legal framework for possible use of force against Taiwan and mandates Chinese military action under certain circumstances, including when “possibilities for a peaceful reunification shall be completely exhausted”;

Whereas the Department of Defense’s Report on the Military Power of the People’s Republic of China for Fiscal Year 2004 documents that, as of 2004, the Government of the People’s Republic of China had deployed approximately 500 short-range ballistic missiles against Taiwan;

Whereas the escalating arms buildup of missiles and other offensive weapons by the People’s Republic of China in areas adjacent to the Taiwan Strait is a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area;

Whereas given the recent positive developments in cross-strait relations, including the
Lunar New Year charter flights and new proposals for cross-strait exchanges, it is particularly unfortunate that the National People’s Congress adopted this legislation.

Whereas in 1979, the Taiwan Relations Act (22 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.), which codified in law the basis for continued commercial, cultural, and other relations between the United States and the people of Taiwan, has been instrumental in maintaining peace, security, and stability in the Taiwan Strait;

Whereas section 2(b)(2) of the Taiwan Relations Act declares that “peace and stability in the area are in the political, security, and economic interest of the United States and are matters of international concern”;

Whereas, at the time the Taiwan Relations Act was enacted into law, section 2(b)(3) of such Act declares that the United States decision to establish diplomatic relations with the People’s Republic of China rested upon the expectation that the future of Taiwan would be determined by peaceful means;

Whereas section 2(b)(4) of the Taiwan Relations Act declares it the policy of the United States “to consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means, including by boycotts or embargoes, a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States”;

Whereas section 2(b)(5) of the Taiwan Relations Act declares it the policy of the United States “to maintain the capacity of the United States to resist any resort to force or other forms of coercion that would jeopardize the security, or the social or economic system, of the people on Taiwan”;

Whereas since its enactment in 1979, the Taiwan Relations Act, not to remain silent in the face of ill-advised action constitutes not only a unilateral change in the current status quo in the Taiwan Strait, but also provides a legal framework for military action against Taiwan when “possibilities for a peaceful reunification have been completely exhausted.”

Adoption of this law followed upon a threat, made in China’s Defense White Paper released on December 17, 2004, to “crush” any attempt to split Taiwan from China, noting its “sacred responsibility” of the People’s Liberation Army to stop any attempt at splitting the country.

We are all aware as to how seriously the PLA takes its responsibility to further the goals dictated by the Communist regime in Beijing. When the PLA was presented with a clear choice between serving the people or obeying the orders of the leaders of the Chinese government in June 1989, a day of infamy, the tanks rolled into Tiananmen Square and Chinese blood was spilled by fellow Chinese.

Thus, we should not assume that the attempt in the anti-secession law to provide a legal justification for the use of force against the people of Taiwan is an idle threat. History shows that this is not the case.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush, in welcoming the Chinese Premier to Washington, D.C., made Chinese policy crystal clear with regard to this issue. President Bush stated, “We oppose any unilateral decision by either China or Taiwan to change the status quo.” At the time the President spoke firmly concerning attempts by Taiwan’s President to unilaterally change the status quo.

Well, what is good for the goose is good for the gander. Beijing’s unilateral attempt to change the status quo must be met with resistance by both the administration and the Congress. The Congress, in particular, is obliged, under commitments made in the Taiwan Relations Act, not to remain silent when confronted by this challenge from Beijing. The Taiwan Relations Act clearly and unequivocally states: “It is the policy of the United States to consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States.”

Beijing’s new anti-secession law clearly qualifies as such an effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means and thus represents a grave concern to the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, Beijing’s reckless action comes at a time when there were signs of renewed thawing in the cross-strait relations which gave some cause for optimism over the ultimate peaceful resolution of this issue.

The commencement of the Lunar New Year’s holiday of cross-strait charter flights, the resumption of cross-strait commercial investment, and the arrival of mainland representatives in Taipei to attend the funeral of a leading negotiator for Taiwan on cross-strait issues were all extremely positive signs.

It is unfortunate, however, that Beijing has chosen once again to be its own worst enemy by dissipating all the goodwill generated through such gestures by stubbornly pursuing this provocative and ill-timed measure.

Contrary to the observation of Chairman Mazo, cross-strait issues will never be solved by resorting to the barrel of a gun.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and first I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for introducing this important and timely resolution and for moving it so expeditiously to the floor. I also want to express my gratitude for his support to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH). I am proud to be the lead Democratic sponsor of this important measure.

Mr. Speaker, I just returned from visiting both China and Taiwan a few weeks ago. I cautioned in both places prudence, moderation, stability, no precipitous action, no turmoil. The lives of the people of Taiwan and the People’s Republic of China are increasingly intertwined. More than half a million Taiwanese now live on the mainland. Nonstop charter flights between Taiwan and the mainland were launched during the Lunar New Year, and both sides are actively exploring new options for a variety of exchanges across the Taiwan Strait.

This is the main reason why the Chinese Government’s decision to move forward with the so-called anti-secession law is so unfortunate. By codifying the potential use of force against Taiwan, Beijing has thrown a bucket of ice water on the warming relations that had been developing between the people of China and Taiwan. Beijing should be using their best and brightest young leaders to build new bridges between the people of China and Taiwan. Instead, the government has bowed to pressure from hard-line elements in the PLA to ratchet up the pressure on Taipei.

Passage of this law, Mr. Speaker, is a wasted opportunity. The anti-secession
law mandates military action against Taiwan when “the possibilities for a peaceful reunification would be completely exhausted.” In other words, whenever Beijing decides there is no longer any point in talking to Taipei, the new anti-secession law requires the Chinese military to take action against Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of the anti-secession law is a threatening move by Beijing which will undoubtedly heighten tensions across the Taiwan Strait. It will eliminate the chance that either side will be willing to resolve differences peacefully. The law is reprehensible, and it should be reconsidered by the National People’s Congress in Beijing.

Mr. Speaker, both Taipei and Beijing have a paramount responsibility to maintain restraint and to avoid any action which could increase tensions across the Taiwan straits. With passage of this law, Beijing has failed this critical test of time, duty, and it is my profound hope that China’s top leaders will find a way to repair the damage that the law’s adoption has caused. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations, chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Committee on the Judiciary, and cochair of the House Taiwan Caucus.

Mr. CHABOT. I very much thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to first, Mr. Speaker, commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), chairman of the full committee, for bringing this timely and important resolution to the floor. The so-called anti-secession legislation adopted by the National People’s Congress of the People’s Republic of China (PRC). The new law reaffirms the PRC’s sovereignty over Taiwan and threatens peaceful and non-peaceful means to defend its “One China” policy. In passing this law, the PRC imperils the status quo and durability of the delicate cross-strait truce that has been established.

The United States has consistently maintained that differences between Taipei and Beijing should be resolved diplomatically and with the full involvement of the people of Taiwan and China. I appreciate the position and the view that the status quo must be preserved until a peaceful resolution can be achieved. The anti-secession law disturbs the status quo and creates and unnecessarily tense situation that may lead to an escalation of hostilities.

While the anti-secession law may have originated as a reaction to political rhetoric in Taiwan, the Taiwanese government supports the status quo, further obviating the need for the anti-secession law. The new law also seems at odds with recent positive developments between China and Taiwan that seem to signal closer relations. For example, direct flights between Taiwan and mainland China were initiated during the Chinese New Year holidays and two senior representatives from the People’s Republic of China attended the memorial services for Koo Chen-fu who was instrumental in moving cross-strait dialogue forward 10 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, in light of these positive events, it is unfortunate that the PRC has chosen to take a step backwards in the effort to resolve cross-strait tensions. The anti-secession law has made it necessary for us today to pass this resolution, which expresses the Congress’ grave concern that China is establishing legal justification for the use of force against Taiwan. The resolution rightly urges U.S. officials, through appropriate diplomatic channels, to express our nation’s grave concern to the PRC, and it reaffirms U.S. support for fostering cross-strait dialogue in an effort to reduce this international threat.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 98, which expresses the concern of the U.S. House of Representatives regarding China’s Anti-Secession Law. This misguided law effectively authorizes use of military force against Taiwan if Taiwan moves toward formal independence.

I believe the anti-secession law is a dangerous and unnecessary escalation of tensions between China and Taiwan. The future of Taiwan should be determined by the people of Taiwan. The United States should continue to encourage dialogue between Taiwan and China. In today’s world, we should strive to ensure peace, liberty and democracy. I am proud to join my colleagues in support of this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHood). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 98.

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. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I declare 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 motion will be postponed.

EXPRESSIONS OF CONCERN REGARDING VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS BY SYRIA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 18) expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the continuing gross violations of human rights and civil liberties of the Syrian and Lebanese people by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Con. Res. 18

Whereas the Syrian Arab Republic is governed by an authoritarian regime which continues to commit serious human rights abuses, including the use of torture and arbitrary arrest and detention; and

Whereas the Department of State’s Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2004 states that Syria’s “human rights record remained poor, and the Government continued to commit numerous, serious abuses”; the government “significantly restricts freedom of speech and of the press”; “freedom of assembly does not exist under the law”; and “the Government denied freedom of association”;

Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, That the President be authorized to transmit the above resolution to the President of the Syrian Arab Republic.
Whereas Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that “Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression. This right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”;

Whereas Article 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that “Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.”;

Whereas Syria’s September 2001 press law permits the government to arbitrarily deny or revoke publishing licenses for vague reasons and to submit all material to government censors;

Whereas Syrian authorities have arrested, or, in the case of foreigners, expelled journalists for writing critically about Syria’s policies;

Whereas Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International have reported that the security forces of Syria are targeting emerging Syrian human rights organizations, as well as their attorneys, in an apparent attempt to intimidate those organizations;

Whereas Syrian security forces arrested more than 30 human rights dissidents and civilians at a sit-in in front of the parliament;

Whereas a United States diplomat who was watching the peaceful demonstrations was also arrested and held for an hour in what the United States called an unacceptable violation of diplomatic immunity, which the United States protested “in the strongest terms”;

Whereas Article 7 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that “All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law.”;

Whereas the criminal law of Syria provides for reduced sentences in cases of “honors” killings, and spousal rape is not illegal;

Whereas the infringement by Syria on human rights and civil liberties extends into the Lebanese Republic, which it continues to occupy in violation of United Nations Security Council resolutions;

Whereas hundreds of Lebanese civilians are believed to have been killed or “disappeared” by Syrian occupation forces or its secret police;

Whereas hundreds of Kurdish civilians were injured or killed in clashes with the Syrian police in March in Qamishli, a city in northeastern Syria, and Syrian security forces arrested and tortured Syrian Kurdish civilians from the town of Al-Mayd in January 9, 2005;

Whereas Syrian authorities continue their harassment of Aktham Naisse, Syria’s leading human rights activist, President, and founder and member of the Committees for the Defense of Democratic Liberties and Human Rights in Syria, and the 2005 winner of the Martin Ennals Award for Human Rights Defender of the Year from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to thank the leadership for bringing up this resolution.

H. Con. Res. 18, Mr. Speaker, addresses the grave concern of the Syrian regime’s violations of human rights committed by the Syrian regime. The terrorist regime in Damascus is one that not only supports and facilitates terrorist attacks against innocent civilians throughout the world but also engages in a widespread campaign of terror. Damascus is behind the attack on Argentina in 1994 and has been behind a string of bombings throughout the region. Damascus must also be held fully accountable. After all, nobody has suffered more from the brutality of the
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Whereas in November 2004, Syrian journalist Louai Hussein was banned from writing by the Syrian Interior Ministry’s political security office;

Whereas in November 2004, the arrest in Germany of a Syrian embassy official for espionage and issuing threats against the Syrian opposition in Europe is evidence of a pattern of political detention by Syrian dictator Bashar Assad, aimed at intimidating the regime’s opposition abroad;

Whereas thousands of Syrian citizens, along with their families, children, and grandchildren, live outside their country in forced exile, solely because of their political views, or because of the views of members of their families;

Whereas human rights and democracy groups in Syria have sponsored a petition urging greater freedoms and the release of all political prisoners; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) condemns the consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic;

(2) calls on the international community to adopt and support the upcoming session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights which details the dismal human rights record of Syria;

(3) expresses its support for the people of Syria in their daily struggle for freedom, respect for human rights and civil liberties, democratic self-governance, and the establishment of the rule of law;

(4) encourages the President and the Secretary of State to reach out to dissidents, human rights activists, and the nonviolent democratic opposition in Syria, and to assist them in their efforts; and

(5) urges the adoption and pursuit of these and other policies to seek a democratic government in Syria, will—

(A) bring freedom and democracy to the people of Syria;

(B) cease the illegal occupation by Syria of the Lebanese Republic;

(C) abandon support for terrorism;

(D) not pursue research, development, acquisition, production, transfer, or deployment of biological, chemical, or nuclear weapons, will provide credible assurances that such behavior will not be undertaken in the future, and to allow United Nations and other international observers to verify such assurances; and

(E) live in peace and security with the international community.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to thank the leadership for bringing up this resolution.

H. Con. Res. 18, Mr. Speaker, addresses the Syrian regime’s violations of human rights committed by the Syrian regime. The terrorist regime in Damascus is one that not only supports and facilitates terrorist attacks against innocent civilians throughout the world but also engages in a widespread campaign of terror. Damascus is behind the attack on Argentina in 1994 and has been behind a string of bombings throughout the region. Damascus must also be held fully accountable. After all, nobody has suffered more from the brutality of the

Whereas, in November 2004, Syrian journalist Louai Hussein was banned from writing by the Syrian Interior Ministry’s political security office;

Whereas in November 2004, the arrest in Germany of a Syrian embassy official for espionage and issuing threats against the Syrian opposition in Europe is evidence of a pattern of political detention by Syrian dictator Bashar Assad, aimed at intimidating the regime’s opposition abroad;

Whereas thousands of Syrian citizens, along with their families, children, and grandchildren, live outside their country in forced exile, solely because of their political views, or because of the views of members of their families;

Whereas human rights and democracy groups in Syria have sponsored a petition urging greater freedoms and the release of all political prisoners; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) condemns the consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic;

(2) calls on the international community to adopt and support the upcoming session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights which details the dismal human rights record of Syria;

(3) expresses its support for the people of Syria in their daily struggle for freedom, respect for human rights and civil liberties, democratic self-governance, and the establishment of the rule of law;

(4) encourages the President and the Secretary of State to reach out to dissidents, human rights activists, and the nonviolent democratic opposition in Syria, and to assist them in their efforts; and

(5) urges the adoption and pursuit of these and other policies to seek a democratic government in Syria, will—

(A) bring freedom and democracy to the people of Syria;

(B) cease the illegal occupation by Syria of the Lebanese Republic;

(C) abandon support for terrorism;

(D) not pursue research, development, acquisition, production, transfer, or deployment of biological, chemical, or nuclear weapons, will provide credible assurances that such behavior will not be undertaken in the future, and to allow United Nations and other international observers to verify such assurances; and

(E) live in peace and security with the international community.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to thank the leadership for bringing up this resolution.

H. Con. Res. 18, Mr. Speaker, addresses the Syrian regime’s violations of human rights committed by the Syrian regime. The terrorist regime in Damascus is one that not only supports and facilitates terrorist attacks against innocent civilians throughout the world but also engages in a widespread campaign of terror. Damascus is behind the attack on Argentina in 1994 and has been behind a string of bombings throughout the region. Damascus must also be held fully accountable. After all, nobody has suffered more from the brutality of the
Syrian government than the Syrian people.

According to the State Department’s annual human rights report released recently, Syria continues to commit egregious human rights abuses, including torture, detention without trial, political prisoners without trial, censorship and harassment of journalists, protections for spouse-rapists, and light sentences for so-called honor killings. According to Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, Syria is engaged in an unceasing campaign to harass and intimidate human rights organizations.

In recent days, the world has focused on Syria’s actions against the Lebanese people and, indeed, another resolution we are considering today deals directly with that issue. But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot credibly say we favor political reform in the Middle East if we ignore Syria’s depredations against its own citizens.

Syria is certainly, and I quote, one of the world’s most repressive regimes, as the United Nations Commission on Human Rights has indicated. Accordingly, I urge the Congress to continue to work to condemn the Syrian government for its actions against its neighbors but, more importantly, to express our support for the Syrian people in their struggle to achieve the kind of government they deserve.

When I met with Syrian President Assad in Damascus, I urged him to change his government’s behavior at home so that Syria could rejoin the ranks of the civilized world. This resolution is one result of his failure to heed that advice.

Mr. Speaker, a Syria that is accountable to world standards and norms, a Syria that respects its own citizens and no longer occupies Lebanon or supports terrorism against Israel must be a central goal of our project of reforming the Middle East. In the long run, a Middle East in which people are stakeholders in their own public life offers the greatest hope for peace and safety in the region and beyond.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 18.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield such time as he may consume to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman’s courtesy in permitting me to speak on this resolution and his leadership in bringing it forward. I am going to support the resolution. I, too, am troubled by what we have learned about Syrian government practices. I am heartened by some activities in the Middle East. I think there is some real progress. But I would step back for a moment and ask us to reflect on something that has been happening that does not reflect so well on our government.

Just moments ago, the House overwhelmingly approved an amendment advanced by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and me that dealt with making sure that money that we approved in the supplemental was not used to torture suspects of terrorism. We have this sense, and it is one that the people I represent feel very strongly about, that we have a responsibility and an obligation as the world’s oldest democracy to be upholding our standards of rule of law, of due process. We have made torture illegal not just because people are concerned that it brings violations of U.S. law. We do so because it is a not a good way to get useful information.

Dictatorships torture indiscriminately, but it is not a way, as the Intelligence Community well understands, that we get good information upon which to base activities that may put our men and women at risk and to protect United States interests. Furthermore, we do not torture suspects of terror because if we do so, then any information that is gathered from that process taints any potential case and we cannot bring people to justice in a court of law.

Last but not least, we do not torture because we want a standard established where there can be any moral authority to make sure that Americans abroad are protected, whether they are in uniform or they are civilians.

There are a variety of moral, practical reasons why we are against torture. Yet I would note that there are too many reports for us to ignore, too many reports from non-governmental organizations that the United States is participating in and condoning torture on behalf of prisoners that we have taken to other countries. There is a famous case that now the Canadian government wants investigated where the United States kidnapped a Canadian citizen and renditioned this person to Syria where he was tortured. We have called for this Congress to get on top of what is, I am afraid, an emerging scandal, where we use extraordinary rendition, where we kidnap and transport people, where there is not effective oversight, where Congress does not know what is going on, where there are people who are not being held accountable, where there are problems that we have seen with people who have been in custody of the CIA and some of the American prisons that we have had in Afghanistan and Iraq.

We, as a Congress, need to be doing our job because we do not believe in extraordinary rendition. It is against international conventions; it is against the interests of the United States. And I must re-emphasize the irony when we come forward with a resolution that points out the problems, legitimates problems, the abuses in Syria, and then it appears that the United States is willing to offer up people to countries like Syria, where we thought they are in fact going to be tortured.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that Congress gets ahead of this issue. That Congress does its job to investigate these widespread reports that are coming through now our own legal system, that are coming through the media, that are coming from nongovernmental organizations. That Congress get ahead of it, that Congress get ahead of it. That Congress get ahead of it. There should be no prospect that we are on one hand going to be a Congress that condemns torture and abuse of human rights in Syria knowing that these individuals will be tortured and that there are going to look the other way when we may be offering up people who are suspects, not convicted of anything, to be turned over to the hands of these same torturers.

I would sincerely hope that we will have activity on the part of all of us to make sure the many committees in Congress do their job to provide this oversight and that we are not relying on the media, nongovernmental organizations, and what trickles through the legal system to do a job that we should be doing.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, while I rise in support of this resolution, I do so with serious concerns.

Torture is a crime and a vile human rights abuse. Syria should be condemned in the strongest possible terms for committing acts of torture against detainees and prisoners. This is why I support the resolution. Yet, the fact that our government has sent detainees to Syria knowing that these individuals would be tortured and abused is morally repugnant and violates international, as well as U.S., law.

The practice of extraordinary rendition—our government’s practice of outsourcing torture to countries like Syria must also be condemned, repudiated and immediately ordered stopped by President Bush. Human Rights Watch, which is frequently cited as an authoritative source in this resolution, has stated that the U.S. policy of “denouncing torture in Syria, and then handing over prisoners to Syrian torturers sends the ultimate mixed message.”

Syria is a notorious violator of human rights that should be condemned. The hypocrisy of our government using Syrian torturers as a subcontractor to immorally and illegally commit human rights abuses is shamefully absent from this resolution.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 18 to express Congress’ concern about the treatment of the Syrian and Lebanese people by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic. I want to thank my colleagues from Florida and New York for introducing this resolution and bringing it to the floor today.

Earlier this body considered H. Con. Res. 32, which expresses support for the liberation movement in Lebanon. Now, under this second resolution, we take into account the situation and the effect of Syrian rule of its own people. The Syrian Arab Republic is governed by an authoritarian regime which continues to commit serious human rights abuses, including the use of torture, arbitrary arrest, and detention.

Within Syria both freedom of speech and freedom of the press are suppressed through systematic intimidation. Syrians are prohibited to publicly assembling in order to express content of any kind. Political prisoners are
known to have been held in detention for up to twenty years. Ruling authorities continue to allow honor killings. In the North, Syrian forces have attacked unarmed Kurd populations with live ammunition. Human rights organizations working in opposition these injustices are targeted by Syrian authorities with intimidation tactics.

The Syrian government’s treatment of its people can no longer be tolerated. I encourage my colleagues to pass the resolution in question and in doing so condemn the Syrian government’s gross human rights violations upon its own people and support the Syrian people’s struggle for a free and democratic government.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Smit) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 18, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 18, the concurrent resolution just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The two-tempore pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair’s prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EXPRESSING GRAVE CONCERN OF CONGRESS REGARDING OCCUPATION OF REPUBLIC OF LEBANON BY SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 32) expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the occupation of the Republic of Lebanon by the Syrian Arab Republic, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 32

Whereas since its invasion of the Lebanese Republic in 1976, the regime of the Syrian Arab Republic has implemented a systematic policy of domination over Lebanon that has transformed the political, social, and economic character of Lebanon;
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and ask unanimous consent he be permitted to control the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time as I may consume.

This is an important resolution before the House today at a time when hundreds of thousands of Lebanese are flocking to the streets issuing cries for freedom. It is critical that the United States Congress reaffirm its commitment to the restoration of Lebanon's sovereignty and independence and specifically acknowledge the plight that Lebanon has endured as a captive nation.

For too long, Lebanon has been denied its independence by the regime in Damascus, a regime that has imposed its will upon the Lebanese people through electoral intimidation, through political assassination, through the use of a proxy terrorist threat, the assassination of opposition leaders and brutal military force. But the Lebanese people's desire to be free and sovereign could not be silenced and could not be repressed any longer.

The protests that have followed the Valentine's Day bombing in Beirut that killed former Prime Minister Hariri ushered in an immediate demand from a unified and diverse Lebanese opposition for Syria to withdraw from Lebanese territories; but I do not correlate that with any alleviation of the threat of Hezbollah just a few days ago, let us underscore that we will not tolerate an appeasement of Hezbollah in Lebanon.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it calls for the United States policy to include support for the independent human rights and pro-democracy advocates in Lebanon and for the full restoration of sovereign democratic rule there.

The resolution underscores the U.S. position against Syria's brutal occupation of Lebanon and U.S. policy about holding state sponsors of terrorism accountable for their actions. Calling for Syria to depart from Lebanon once and for all is in keeping with the post-9/11 approach of forcing terrorists out of their caves and placing them on the run. The U.S. position on Syrian withdrawal forces the terrorists to retreat to their own soil; and in doing so, it sends a necessary signal that freedom and democracy can flourish once again in Lebanon and throughout the region.

The Lebanese people have had enough, and they will not allow their territory to continue to be used as a staging ground for terrorists and their state sponsors. Let us stand with the Lebanese people and overwhelmingly adopt this resolution.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 32 and send a clear message to the Syrian terrorist regime to get out of Lebanon. Not to the border; not to the Bekaa Valley. Completely out.

God willing, as our Arab-speaking Lebanese brothers and sisters would say, inshallah, we will soon witness a free, independent, sovereign, and democratic Lebanon.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)
America, come save us, come in here, tell us what to do, tell us what to do with our elections. They have had elections going on for you in Lebanon without any violence directed against Syrian troops as we see daily in Iraq. They have an election coming up in May. It has been scheduled all along. It is not like they have been avoiding them.

We complain a lot about the Syrians being there, and if I have a personal preference, since I believe in self-determination, I would have the troops out just as I would have our troops out of most other places. But I would have foreign troops out of the Golan Heights. Why are we so excited about the Syrian troops, who were invited by the Lebanese Government? Why are we not excited about foreign troops in the Golan Heights and in the over 100 countries where that we have troops?

So I think we lose credibility. I think the Arab people just laugh at us and say, who are these well mean elections, and they have got to get these troops out; and at the same time we have troops all over the place.

The Syrians went into Lebanon in 1976, and if we go back and look at history, it was at the urging of the Government of the United States because there was about to be an election. And at that time, it was perceived that the election would undermine the minorities, the Christians and the Druse. So, therefore, it was in our interest at that time to interfere with the election, just as we have interfered so many times since then over the world.

Just think of the elected leader in 1953 in Iran, the elected leader, Mossadeg. But he did not follow what we wanted him to do with regards to oil. So what did we do? We sent in the CIA. We overthrew him, and then we had our puppet government, the Shah, for 25 years, which did nothing more than provide fodder for the radicals, and we radicalized the ayatollahs against us.

In a conversation with a veteran of the CIA, an expert in this region, he explained, at least he sincerely believed, that we did a tremendous favor for Osama bin Laden, and that is to go into Iraq, expose ourselves, and then create the chaos of Iraq. Where there was no al Qaeda before, it is now a haven for al Qaeda.

It has served as a recruiting ground for al Qaeda. So no matter how well the intentions are, we should look at the conclusions; what finally happens.

Our problem here simply comes from the violation of the basic principle that we should follow, and that is that we should be friends with nations and trade with nations, and that we should be neutral in foreign affairs, because it does not serve our interests. It costs a lot of lives. It costs a lot of dollars, and it costs a lot of lives.

Just think of what the interference in Iraq has cost us: Over 1,500 men; over 11,000 battle casualties, with another 9,000 sent home because of illness; and over $200 billion. And there is no end in sight. Today we had to pass another $82 billion, which was not put into the budget, to continue this process. My argument is not because we made a misjudgment, not that this resolution is simply a misjudgment of the day; it just is that part of the misjudgments that we have made now for many, many decades in overall foreign policy.

It is fully endorsed. The American people certainly have not been up in arms about it and have endorsed it, along with the large majority in the Congress. But long term it does not work. Just look at the legation, why any American people supported Vietnam, until finally they had to throw up their arms and demand an end to the senseless war.

But, ultimately, not only do the people get very angry and upset and frustrated with what we are doing, but there are economic limitations to this as well, and that is something that I do not think anybody here hardly pays any attention to; that is how long can we continue to spend this amount of money and not have the money from the oil pay for this? We are not being paid economically? The 1960s came back to haunt us in the 1970s, and the basic financial condition of this country is much worse than it was in the 1970s. Yet there is no reduction.

I see resolutions like this as not restraint, but encouragement, without looking back and seeing how we participated in contributing to the problems that we have in the Middle East. I am not saying that we do not think about overall policy with consistency, and think almost what is in our best interests?

I would like to read a quote from Ronald Reagan, because he was involved in Lebanon and our government was involved in the early 1980s. In his memoirs he admits it was a serious mistake, and we ought to take advice from Ronald Reagan on what he said about his misadventures in Lebanon. We were in there in 1983. This is what he writes in his memoirs several years later.

"Perhaps we didn’t appreciate fully enough the depth of the hatred and complexity of the problems that made the Middle East such a jungle. Perhaps the idea of a suicide car bomber committing mass murder to gain instant entry into paradise was so foreign to our own values and consciousness that it did not create in us the concern for the Marines’ safety that it should have."

Further quoting Ronald Reagan, "In the weeks immediately after the bombing, I believed the last thing we should do was turn tail and leave ... yet, the irrationality of Middle Eastern politics forced us to rethink our policies there."

He concluded with advising us to stay clear. I would like to suggest that I believe that is pretty good advice.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution. Let me first pay tribute to my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. Ros-Lehtinen) for her work on this resolution, and for her outstanding leadership on our Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House expresses the grave concern of the Congress regarding the ongoing occupation of Lebanon by Syria.

Mr. Speaker, I first visited Lebanon and Syria in 1956, almost half a century ago. Lebanon was a prosperous, free, open and democratic society. I remember going to the Bekaa Valley, to the City of Ba’albak, where among the ancient Roman ruins Shakespeare was performed on alternate nights in English and French.

Since 1976, Syria has occupied Lebanon with our consent. Our resolution appropriately demands that the occupation end now.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the people of Lebanon tore down gigantic billboards in Lebanon that portrayed the former and current Syrian dictators, Mr. Assad and Mr. Hafez. Just imagine having in the United States huge billboards of Joe Stalin or the ayatollahs of Tehran, how would we feel about this? Well, that is how the Lebanese people felt about having these gigantic billboards pay tribute to a country which occupies their land.

As we speak, there is no Syrian embassy in Lebanon. What could speak more eloquently of the colonial outlook that the Syrian regime has towards Lebanon? In colonial times, the colonial power did not have an embassy in its colony because it did not recognize it as an independent, sovereign nation. That is precisely the attitude of Syria towards Lebanon today.

All of us have been inspired by what the Lebanese call their “independence” uprising. By passing our resolution, the Congress will express its solidarity with the brave anti-Syrian occupation, freedom-loving demonstrators in Martyrs Square in Beirut.

Mr. Speaker, Bashar Assad, Syria’s ruler, continues to play games with the international community. As his speech earlier this month showed, he still believes he can ignore the international community. We want Syria withdraw immediately and totally from Lebanon. Let us not be fooled by his promises of gradual withdrawal delinked from time tables. If you can tell a man by his friends, all you need to know about Assad is that his only friend in Lebanon is the terrorist gang Hezbollah.

Mr. Speaker, Syria has not only persecuted the Lebanese people, arresting, abducting, torturing and killing opponents, most recently the Prime Minister of Lebanon, it has also destroyed Lebanon’s lively institutions, rendering them little more than outposts of Syrian control.
These crimes have taken place on the soil of what was once the Arab world’s lone democracy. That is why it is vital that the Lebanese people succeed in throwing off Syrian rule and that the Lebanese be allowed to conduct free and fair parliamentary elections this spring, prevented by the fist of Syria’s military or the brutal machinations of its intelligence agents.

Mr. Speaker, we stand shoulder to shoulder with those who seek full restoration of sovereign, democratic rule in Lebanon. Mr. PAUL: Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few points regarding the unintended consequences of our foreign policy, as well as what might happen in Lebanon.

It has been said about our administration that we hope the Lebanese people will be able to express their view at the ballot box through free elections without intimidation and outside interference. That sounds like a pretty good suggestion, with the conclusion by the administration that when there is outside interference the elections are unreliable.

One again, I ask the question, does that not raise the question of whether or not the elections in Iraq are as reliable, as is supposed?

Also, President Bush said that these elections must take place without external forces, and all the troops must be out. The UN resolution calls for the troops out as well as the security forces, but the resolution also calls for disarming the people of Lebanon.

In other words, this resolution takes the position that we should go in Lebanon and repeal the Lebanese Second Amendment rights so that nobody has any guns. I just see that as an interference that is going to lead to trouble.

We see civil strife precipitating a civil war in Iraq, and I think what our involvement here now is liable to lead to that type of situation, rather than peace and prosperity and elections.

It is said that this has all come out from the murder and killing of Hariri, and maybe just assume that the government of Syria had something to do with that. Yet there is no evidence for that. There is absolutely zero benefit for the Syrian government to have killed Hariri.

But there is a theory that some of the radical Muslims in Syria that object to Assad, because he is too moderate, because he endorsed the Persian Gulf War and because he takes some of our prisoners and he participates in the interrogations of our prisoners, that he is siding too friendly with the West, and some suppose that that could have been the reason that the murder had occurred, believing that it

would bring down the government of Assad.

Now, that could be an unintended consequence, that consequence that could have a great deal of significance, and that is that the radicals end up taking over, and that the radicalism, and taking over Syria, which is always the possibility. But too often these unintended consequences occur and then we do not know how to respond to them.

In Iraq in January of this year there was something to the effect by the people on what they thought about foreign occupation. Eighty-two percent of the Sunnis, I guess understandably so, said that all foreign troops ought to leave, and 60 percent of the Shiites said all foreign troops ought to leave. I wonder why that is not important to anybody?

Instead, we are talking about occupation for years, about building 14 bases in Iraq. How long do we stay in these countries and what is necessary for us to be telling other people what to do and when to do it and how to do it and stirring up nothing but anti-American sentiment, while at the same time, even though our goals may be well-intentioned, they are not achieved? We just do not achieve them. And to think that the election under the conditions that we are condemning in Lebanon is the salvation, is the evidence that we are having tremendous achievement, I think is something that we are just pulling the wool over our eyes.

Mr. PAUL: Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Yleem Poblete and Paul Ostburg Sanz, long and dedicated, hardworking members, staffers on our committee on these measures and the work of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia.

I would like to thank Chairman Hyde of the International Relations Committee, for understanding the need to support the Lebanese people at this critical time, and moving this resolution quickly through the Committee.

I would also like to commend our leadership in the House, in the Senate, in the Appropriations Committee, in the Middle East and Central Asia.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Yleem Poblete and Paul Ostburg Sanz, long and dedicated, hardworking members, staffers on our committee on these measures and the work of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia.

Tom Lantos has experienced first hand what happens when one appeases dictators and ignores the oppression of human beings. We cannot stand idly by and allow Syria to continue to deny the Lebanese people their rights and their nation.

Thanks to the cooperation of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we are able to send a clear and unified message to both the Syrian oppressors and to the Lebanese people. As we did with the Syrian Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration, we have an opportunity today, by supporting H. Con. Res. 32, to demonstrate a united front and show that freedom transcends party lines, geographic borders, and entangling alliances.

When it comes to freedom and democracy, the U.S. is speaking with one voice, as the Lebanese people are speaking with one voice.
In so doing, we become one with our brothers and sisters in Lebanon as they seek to remove the shackles of Syrian tyranny and occupation. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to encourage U.S. support of the people of Lebanon in their struggle to free themselves from Syrian occupation. Syria has illegitimately held control over its neighbor for 25 years, a situation which can no longer be permitted to continue.

Syria has proved itself an utterly destructive force upon its neighbor, Lebanon. Syria has systematically deprived the Lebanese people of their many liberties. It has illegally extended the term of pro-Syrian officials in the Lebanese government by altering the Lebanese constitution. It has and continues to intimidate Lebanese dissenters with threats of political persecution. Lebanese citizens with views not in keeping with Syrian authorities have been arrested, kidnapped, tortured and in some instances even killed. The Lebanese press has been effectively stifled in order to repress anti-Syrian sentiment. Finally, and most reprehensibly, Syria has allowed and even funded the continued existence of the terrorist group Hezbollah within the southern Shebaa Farms region of Lebanon. Today Hezbollah is the largest international terrorist organization on the globe, with cells in Asia, Europe, Africa, and the Americas. The presence of Hezbollah ensures continued turmoil within Lebanon and throughout the Middle East.

When it first sent troops to help quell the Lebanese civil war, Syria claimed its purpose was to stabilize the country. Instead Syria has consistently prevented Lebanon from becoming a stable and prosperous state for which many Lebanese patriots, including the late former Prime Minister Rafik Hariri, have toiled.

Today the people of Lebanon are taking to the streets, crying out for their freedom from this foreign oppression. As an American of Lebanese descent and a direct beneficiary of my ancestors coming to this country in search of freedom, I am filled with the vision come alive in the form of transportation measures in south Florida and around this nation. He will be sorely missed. I can assure Members that it would be appropriate to stay in contact with his family with their condolences.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 154 and ask for its consideration. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the question was taken.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a great day in our great Nation, and I have the honor to be here to begin the debate on House Concurrent Resolution 95, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2007 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 through 2010.

The Concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be available for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by an opponent and a proponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

The Concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be available for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by an opponent and a proponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. Slaughter), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. PUTNAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a great day in our great Nation, and it is an honor to be here to begin the debate on House Concurrent Resolution 95, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2007 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 through 2010.
Mr. Speaker, as a member of both the Committee on Rules and the Committee on the Budget, I am pleased to bring this resolution to the floor for its consideration. This rule provides for 5 hours of general debate with 4 hours equally divided and controlled by the chairs of the majority and minority parties of the committees on the Budget and Rules, respectively. It also permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by the gentleman of New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) or their designees.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution.

This rule makes in order four amendments which are printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution. Each is debateable for 40 minutes, the time equally divided and controlled by the proponent and the opponent.

The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report, except that the adoption of the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution and amendment. It also permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to offer amendments in the House to achieve mathematical consistency.

This is a fair rule. The Committee on Rules has allowed substitute budgets to be considered on the House floor. They range across the political spectrum affording Members of varying philosophies within each political party and across political parties an opportunity to support the budget they deem appropriate for our Nation.

Since before my time in this body, the Committee on Rules has consistently afforded the minority the opportunity for its alternative to be heard, with the only exception being the fiscal year 2003 budget when there was not a budget alternative offered. I am pleased this rule provides a chance for all our Members to express their views on how our Nation should prioritize its spending.

The congressional budget is an important tool of the Congress, allowing us to set priorities for the coming fiscal year. Therefore, this budget provides for America’s most urgent needs. The driving force behind this budget are continued strength, continued growth, and restrained spending.

The congressional budget is the ultimate enforcement tool, allowing Congress to clearly identify its priorities for how taxpayer dollars should be spent. It allows us in a time of war to ensure that our Nation’s soldiers are sufficiently equipped. Prioritizing guarantees that our economy continues to expand, providing jobs and opportunities for more Americans each day. And more and more. Reconciliation instructions are the critical step to begin the process of getting our mandatory spending back to a sustainable level.

I am hopeful that while the authorizing committees are reviewing their programs the priority to fund the military and the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE), the chairman of that committee, for pushing forward with fiscal discipline and bringing this outstanding budget for consideration.

I urge Members to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), my colleague, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, every day from this floor we hear our Members talk about values and morals that guide our Nation, but nothing reveals our true values as legislators more than how we choose to spend the American taxpayers’ money. Each decision to fund a program or not to fund another is a conscious choice that we make.

These choices have real consequences for the hardworking Americans we serve, and so, really, those choices are about our values and our morality. We, as legislators, choose to fund what is most important, what has the most value. And the budget of the United States is a moral document.

When we establish the financial priorities of the government each year, we show the American people in black and white what and who we value most.

As the budget resolution we debate today shows with startling clarity, the majority’s priorities I think are out of step with the values of the American people.

The majority’s budget resolution throws an additional $106 billion in tax cuts to the Nation’s wealthiest, while cutting billions in crucial funding for health care, education and housing programs; programs that help the hardworking Americans get by from day-to-day; programs that give hope to mothers and fathers that they, too, may one day share in the American dream.

I believe this budget resolution sends the wrong message, values the wrong priorities and shortchanges too many of our hardworking taxpayers that we should, in fact, be helping.

What message are we sending about the values of this House when we cut more than $30 billion from Medicaid, the health care for millions of children, seniors and disabled Americans?

What message are we sending about the values of this House when we cut student loans, Pell grants and other educational spending by more than $21 billion?

What message are we sending about this House when we cut more than $5 billion from farm and nutrition programs, slashing the food stamp program that so many Americans depend on to feed their children?

How can we hurt all these people, cut all this funding, slash all these programs and still afford $106 billion in...
tax cuts for our wealthiest, a tax cut that balloons the deficit and shifts the financial burden to pay those taxes to our grandchildren and our children.

That is right. Every penny we give away in this budget’s massive tax cut to the wealthy shifts the burden of those taxes to the middle class and to the working poor who cannot even get unemployment benefits extended or an increase in the minimum wage out of this Congress.

What will it take for this House to get its priorities in order? How much debt will we strap to the backs of our get-dumb debt will we strap to the backs of our get its priorities in order? How much increase in the minimum wage out of the working poor who cannot even get those taxes to the middle class and to the wealthy shifts the burden of viability of our Nation, the real knock-down punch looms on the horizon.

Social Security privatization, while not detailed in this budget, would have disastrous, long-term, far-reaching impacts on the budget. The plan would cut Social Security benefits, make solvency problems worse and require massive borrowing, mostly again from the foreign countries, to the tune of $4 to $8 trillion over the next 10 years, and we have no less authority than Vice President CHENEY who verifies this.

In order to make certain that we are able to meet future budget obligations for the health and well-being of our elderly and disabled, we must protect Social Security from privatization.

Therefore, at the end of this debate, I will be asking for a “no” vote on the previous question so that we can consider legislation by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR), our colleague, that will prohibit the use of the Social Security Trust Fund to pay for the administration’s ill-adviced private accounts plan.

Whether my friends on the other side of the aisle want to admit it or not, the administration plan to divert Social Security payroll taxes to private accounts will cut future Social Security benefits and further delay the responsibility to meet the future needs of so many Americans. That is why it is so important to stop this potential hemorrhage of Social Security in its tracks. The Salazar bill is a good step to show the American people that we will not allow their retirement checks to be slashed by the majority continues to encumber us. That is on top of the debt we incurred earlier today of $80 billion that we are hoping the Chinese will finance.

If the majority had its way our grandchildren would end up having to use those privatized Social Security accounts. They have been pushing for the past few weeks to pay off this massive new debt that Congress keeps piling on to foreign countries to finance the deepening debt with which this majority continues to encumber us. That is on top of the debt we incurred earlier today of $80 billion that the Chinese will finance.

If the majority had its way our grandchildren would end up having to use those privatized Social Security accounts. They have been pushing for the past few weeks to pay off this massive new debt that Congress keeps piling on to foreign countries to finance the deepening debt with which this majority continues to encumber us. That is on top of the debt we incurred earlier today of $80 billion that the Chinese will finance.

In a disingenuous attempt to conceal the increases for our national defense and as they prepare to pass this resolution, the majority continues to encumber us. That is on top of the debt we incurred earlier today of $80 billion that the Chinese will finance.

In 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest.

I will be asking for a significant cut in Social Security payroll taxes to private accounts, which this majority continues to encumber us. That is on top of the debt we incurred earlier today of $80 billion that the Chinese will finance.

In 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest, in 5 short years paying the interest.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), my distinguished colleague on the Committee on the Budget.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my New York colleague for extending the rule and the budget resolution. The rule allows for debate, along with three substitutes, two of which were offered by the minority. I think it is a good rule.

I commend the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSELE) because if he had not put $50 billion in, there would have been a substitute. I also agree with the President’s budget proposal for veterans, and I will continue to seek further and additional funding for our veterans and their health care.

I continue to have some concerns with the budget. I am a strong supporter of vocational education and TRIO programs. The President’s budget proposal would combine these into a high school intervention initiative and reduce funding. TRIO programs are very successful. I actually worked in one in helping low income students with their transition to college.

Vocational ed programs offer many high school students the motivation to work hard in all of their classes and provide job skills who do not go on to college. I look forward to working with appropriators to ensure adequate funding levels for both TRIO and vocational ed.

Medicaid funds are very important also to all West Virginians, particularly low income West Virginians, and I urge my colleagues to avoid cuts to Medicaid as the reconciliation instructions found in this resolution are implemented.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure priorities like veterans education, economic development and Medicaid are adequately funded as the process continues.

I support the rule and the resolution.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my New York colleague for extending this rule and the budget resolution. I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the budget resolution. The rule allows for debate, along with three substitutes, two of which were offered by the minority. I think it is a good rule.

I commend the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSELE) and members of the Committee on the Budget on a good product that addresses several of the concerns that I have had with President Bush’s budget.

I am pleased that the budget provides for extension of tax cuts that have brought 20 months of job growth to our Nation’s economy. I also agree with the increases for our national defense and homeland security to provide for our troops fighting the war on terror and to keep our communities safe.

One source of concern for me was the Community Development Block Grant program. It is crucial to city and rural areas across my district. The President’s budget proposed reducing funds to the CDBG and 17 other economic development programs from $5.31 billion to $3.71 billion. I am pleased that the Administration in an additional $1.1 billion to the President’s request for the functional category encompassing these programs. This budget resolution makes no assumption on the President’s proposed Communities Initiative.

Our veterans deserve the very best health care and services our Nation can offer them. Funding for veterans have increased by 47 percent over the past 4 years, and I am pleased that the committee added $207 million this year to the President’s budget proposal for veterans, and I will continue to seek further and additional funding for our veterans and their health care.
I am glad that the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSELE) saw fit to put the $50 billion in because it is an indication that they know that a war is going on, and I only wish that they would put something in there to help those veterans that are fighting the war.

Lastly, if the President is going around the country selling this concept that we ought to eliminate this Social Security system and set up a new system, everyone agrees that it is going to cost a lot of money to do this. The transition is very, very costly. It runs into trillions of dollars, and yet there is not one scintilla of evidence that the President’s legislative ideas are considered by the House in this budget.

The President had a press conference today, and he has indicated that the personal accounts, as he called them, and private accounts, as we called them, actually will not do anything to make the Social Security system solvent. Of the President’s position, what are we saying here in defeating the rule, give us the opportunity to bring legislation to my colleagues that would prohibit us from taking the contributions that are made to the Social Security fund out of the check and putting it into a private fund, which the President agrees with us has nothing to do with saving Social Security.

As a matter of fact, he says that personal accounts will make sure that individual investors get a better deal in whatever emerges as a Social Security system, which means that if it is separate and just to make someone feel good because they have private investments, then come, Mr. President and my fellow colleagues of the other side of the aisle, and let us talk about it by taking personal private accounts off of the table and, in a bipartisan way, help us to get something that emerges out of Social Security.

Then, if we want to encourage incentives for savings, since the third rail that the President has grabbed is changing the income tax system, then let us work together and put incentives in the tax system that would encourage low and middle income workers to have a savings.

It just seems to me to have a budget today that excludes the real cost of the war, that punishes veterans that suffered in the war, that makes no provisions for relieving the economic pain that is going to be causes by the alternative minimum tax, and to act like the President going for 60 cities in 60 days will have legislative impact, then let us save a lot of money and say that we cannot deal with Social Security reform today, not because we do not have a problem, but the President is committed in making certain that we do not find a bipartisan solution.

But the President going into districts knocking Democrats because they are not coming forward to work with him is inconsistent with what our President has said when he brought this subject up, and that is keep your powder dry, do not be critical because I will be coming up with a bill, and then after that come to us.

The President has changed his position three times. First, he says there is no crisis; and we agree with him that there is a problem. Two, he indicates that the personal accounts really are not the solution and have nothing to do with the solution of solvency. And, three, he indicates these ideas are deferred instead of coming up with what he thinks should be the solution.

It just seems to me that it is up to us to make certain that we still work for a bipartisan solution; and if the President does not believe that his personal and our private accounts are going to help us in resolving this problem, then for God’s sake let us get on with Social Security and with the help of the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), a personal friend of the President who listens to him, tell him we agree with the President that if it does not solve the problem, get out of the way and let us together, Republicans and Democrats, solve this problem.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the concern of the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means in regard to the alternative minimum tax. The gentleman from California will be delighted to learn that this budget makes accommodation for a further AMT extension of relief so that middle-class Americans are not impacted by that AMT provision that originated in the Committee on Ways and Means. The gentleman from New York will be further delighted to know that the budget process allows the flexibility and the discretion for that authorizing committee to make those changes rather than having the Committee on the Budget direct them for them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules, (Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SPRATT) for doing a superb job, along with our colleague from Dallas, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). As members of the Committee on Rules, they are also serving in the very important capacity of the Committee on the Budget where they have played an important role in fashioning this work product that we are going to see.

Let me speak about the rule itself. I am happy to see the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished member from Rochester, New York. I am happy this rule has been able to report out every single substitute that was submitted to the Committee on Rules calling for an opportunity to be considered here in the House. I am also happy we have been able to include an additional amendment which is unusual in that as Members know from the perspective of both sides of the aisle, when Democrats were the majority here, we have traditionally only made substitutes in order. But out of deference to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, we have chosen to do otherwise and move the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

I believe this rule is extraordinarily fair, extraordinarily balanced and will provide an opportunity for a wide range of public policy discussions to take place as we move ahead with consideration.

Let me say when it comes to the budget itself, I think we have a clear choice. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) I know the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), as we proceeded, asked the questions in the Committee on Rules, not about thePresident’s concern over things like tax cuts.

I think it is very important as we proceed with this budget for us to recognize what it is that tax cuts have brought about. I know in the eyes of many people it is counterintuitive in a sense that if we reduce tax rates, we can somehow increase the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury and reduce the size of the Federal deficit. I know it is counterintuitive because there are many who unfortunately are stuck with this notion that the way to do this is that we have no way to increase revenues to the Treasury is to dramatically increase taxes.

One of the points that I think is important for us to make, and I mentioned this yesterday in the Committee on Rules, not the attack of September 11 against our Nation, September 11, 2001, if we did not have the horrendous cost of the war in Iraq with which we have had to contend, we would still have a Federal deficit. We often hear during this debate that we saw under President Clinton a dramatic improvement in the budget and a surplus created. It was during the leadership provided by a Republican Congress that we got to that point, but the issue that needs to be brought to the forefront was that it was economic stimulus, not the attack of September 11, not the war in Iraq, as painful as that has been, that led to the deficit itself.
It is the economic slowdown that began the last two quarters of the year 2000. The recession, the slowdown that we saw in early 2001, of course exacerbated as is regularly said by the attacks of September 11, by the corporate scandals, and the other challenges we have had to contend, but that economic slowdown is what led to the deficit itself.

So the single most important thing that we can do is to ensure that we expand our economy. That is the best way to deal with the deficit. That is not to say we should not be reining in Federal spending. I believe at my core as a Republican that the reach of the Federal Government impinges on individual initiative and responsibility, two very, very important things that need to be encouraged. If we can couple focusing on economic growth with responsibly reining in Federal spending, it is an effective way to deal with the deficit.

So what have we seen? When we had the debates in 2001 and then in 2002 and 2003 and 2004 on the issue of tax cuts, we saw the argument from our very distinguished friends on the other side of the aisle that the Bush tax cut would ruin the country. It would dramatically increase the deficit itself. I am very happy to report, as I know most of my colleagues know, based on the projections we had for the last fiscal year, because of the economic growth that we saw, because of the unanticipated revenues that came into the Federal Treasury, because of the tax cut reduction that brought about that economic growth, we have seen the deficit itself actually reduced by $109 billion over what had been projected. That reduction in the anticipated level of the Federal deficit demonstrates that reducing rates is, in fact, the best way for us to deal with this. That is just a philosophical difference that we have between the two political parties.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to believe a Democrat, John F. Kennedy, was absolutely right when he argued this in the early part of the 1960s. It was successful. We saw dramatic economic growth as President Kennedy brought about a dramatic reduction on capital gains in the early 1960s. We have empirical evidence. It happened during the 1980s when we saw a doubling of the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury following the implementation of the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for us to recognize that this package is one which is deserving of bipartisan support. It is a responsible budget which will rein in the kind of profligate Federal spending and at the same time we are focused on very important priorities.

Last night in a speech the President gave to an event we had, he talked about the importance of an ownership society, how homeownership is at an all-time high. It is approaching 70 percent. Minority homeownership is at an all-time high.

One of the things we want to do, we want to make sure that younger workers have an opportunity to have confidence in the Social Security system. We have all been forced to pay into the Social Security system. Anyone who has been around since 1937 when it was implemented has been forced to pay into that so that we need to make sure that it is solvent.

We know in 13 very short years more will be going out of Social Security than is coming into Social Security through the FICA taxes. We also know while people talk about the so-called $2 trillion hole, the other night the Treasury Secretary told me if nothing is done on Social Security, that borrowing level will be even greater than the $2 trillion that those who are critical of the President's proposal argue is out there on the horizon.

I think if Members look at these very important issues and then focus on what is our number one priority, the national security of the United States, this budget we should enjoy broad support across the board from Democrats and Republicans alike. I urge support of this rule which allows alternative proposals, those that I have just discussed, to be considered. I think that the rules themselves are modeled after the rules that our friends when they were in the majority put together for consideration of the budget.

I look forward to strong support for the rule, and I hope at the end of the day there is strong bipartisan support for the budget resolution.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, just a brief word about the gentleman from California's remarks about unprecedented deficits. The gentleman points to 9/11, it was one of the causes; so was the recession that occurred under the Bush administration, and also policies that were adopted by this Congress and the President and the tax cuts that went predominantly to the very wealthy. When we confronted with this, he said, "I relied on the projections that most people made," but he was reminded he was wrong. A lot of us here said that at the time.

I want to say now a word about this rule. It completely dumbs the issues of Social Security and what the costs would be if privatized. The President said just a few hours ago, "personal accounts do not solve the issue." I am glad that the President acknowledged that privatization does not solve the issues that he did not say it makes it worse, far worse if it were to occur.

When we take their own figures and project them through the first 20 years if privatization were to occur, and we are going to make sure it does not, it would mean that this $2042 shortfall year, 2052 according to CBO, but take 2042, the shortfall would occur 11 years early. It is fiscally irresponsible.

I recall the President said, "I have not laid out a plan yet internally; I have laid out principles." But they have also had briefings and endorsed plans and called them a good blueprint, and the impact would mean, it would mean there would be a deduction from Social Security benefits between 100 percent what would be in private accounts.
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What it also means is that there would be a mammoth cut in benefits under Social Security, worse and worse for the younger you were, $152,000 for a younger worker over their lifetime. We know enough about these proposals that come out of the White House, come out of their briefings or words of the President to know massive debt, major benefit cuts, and they would not, for most younger workers, help but hurt.

The President also said, "A nest egg you could call your own." Those are his words. No, that is not correct. Because it would be under a government managed account and most workers would have to annuitize what was left in their private accounts and there would be nothing to pass on. No, it would not be a nest egg. It would be, for most people, an empty egg.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR).

Mr. SALAZAR. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the effort to defeat the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, my bill, H.R. 1330, the Social Security Trust Funds Protection Act, will be brought before the House for debate and a vote.

My bill would ensure that Social Security payroll contributions cannot be diverted to establish private accounts. I know that people say that Social Security was not meant to be the only source of retirement income, but the sad reality is that for too many people it is the only source of retirement.

Amelia Valdez from Pueblo, Colorado, gave me this photograph about 2 weeks ago. As she gave it to me, she looked up into my eyes with tears as she said, "This is a photograph of Franklin D. Roosevelt signing the Social Security Act in 1935, please hang it in your office as a reminder." She continued and said, "Please do not let them dismantle my only source of income.

In rural America, Social Security keeps tens of thousands of people from falling into poverty. My Democratic colleagues and I are committed to keeping our promises to American workers. We will fight to strengthen
Social Security so that American workers get the benefits that they were promised.

Creating private accounts will only hasten the demise of Social Security by draining trillions of dollars from the Social Security Trust Fund. We cannot forget the lessons that we learned from Enron. A retirement fund that relies on the stock market is simply not a secure benefit. The proposal to privatize Social Security would mean a 40 percent cut in benefits. It simply does not make sense to change the Social Security system program so that it cuts benefits. The first step towards saving Social Security is to make sure that the payroll moneys are only used to pay Social Security benefits.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question so that we can protect the retirement security of every American.

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

I thank the gentleman and the previous speakers for drawing attention to the looming crisis that impacts people my age in Social Security, the people who frankly have come to the conclusion that unless Congress acts sooner rather than later, there will not be that program and that dramatic and important action is needed. But coming back to the rule on the budget, which is the order of the day, it is also good to know that it is more about what reforms we will be taking up later this year are dominating the discussion, which I take to mean and assume to mean that the overall and underlying budget itself is a sound one and that the rule is fair.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the budget resolution sets the priorities of the Congress. It is a moral compass for what we stand for, what we believe in. It shows if our priorities are in the right place. It shows whether we are going to provide for the less fortunate or if we will continue to reward the rich and the powerful at the expense of people in need. The mundane minutia that are detailed as budget authority and that are actually the blueprints of our Nation. I do not like what the Republicans are building. They are creating a government without a conscience.

The Republicans control the White House, they control the Senate, and they control the House of Representatives. It is their agenda that determines the future direction of this country. That agenda includes slashing Medicaid, food stamps, education programs and veterans benefits. That agenda is to change the Social Security system program so that it cuts benefits for the very wealthy in this country. That agenda also includes privatizing Social Security. Today, they will have an opportunity to put their vote where their rhetoric is. As we just heard, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) has introduced a bill that frames this issue plainly, that no payroll taxes may be diverted to privatize Social Security to pay for the very wealthy in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose privatization as do most if not all of my Democratic colleagues. The position of our Republican friends is not quite as clear. They say that all options are on the table and that they are open to listening to ideas. But unfortunately, the impending doom facing Social Security, creating a crisis out of thin air. They extol the virtues of Wall Street. They are desperately trying to find a way to make Social Security privatization more palatable. Their problem is that the more the American people learn about privatization, the less they like it. I believe that Social Security is a sacred compact between the Federal Government and senior citizens. It is an insurance policy for everyone who has worked hard. It is intended to keep our senior citizens out of poverty. It has worked for 60 years. The privatizers want to unravel that safety net. They want to slash guaranteed benefits, run up trillions of dollars in debt, privatize Social Security, create a crisis out of thin air. They extol the virtues of Wall Street. They are desperately trying to find a way to make Social Security privatization more palatable. Their problem is that the more the American people learn about privatization, the less they like it.

Today we will have a chance to see if those privatizers have the courage of their convictions. So far, we have not seen that courage, because the budget resolution before us does not include the trillions of dollars in transition costs required to privatize Social Security. The Republican majority claims to support the President’s privatization scheme. They say they want to do it this Congress. But they are not willing to put it in a budget.

Maybe the vote on the previous question will help them. If you believe as I do that we must not privatize Social Security, then you must vote “no” on the previous question. If you believe in privatizing Social Security, then you will vote “yes” on the previous question. It is that simple.

Social Security does face long-term funding challenges. Everyone recognizes that. As Democrats, we stand willing to work in a bipartisan way to meet those challenges. But we will not stand idly by and let the Republican majority destroy Social Security in the name of saving it. I urge my colleagues to say no to privatizing Social Security by voting “no” on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This is a vigorous debate about the priorities that are embodied in our budget blueprint. But for the second day in a row now, we have had this characterized as a government without a conscience. That is more than $1,000 on the head of each and every man and woman in this country. They are gleeful. They believe that what they are doing is what was so good, then why is it that we have so many people saying that we have our priorities in the wrong place? Why is it that we have firefighters coming to us decrying this budget? Why are we seeing so many people saying that we have our priorities in the wrong place?

Even though Social Security privatization is the President’s number one priority, this Republican budget resolution hides the cost of the harmful effects of Social Security privatization. It refuses to include any details on the President’s privatization plan and it further continues to spend every single cent of the Social Security surplus reserve on things other than Social Security. That means over the next 10 years under this budget that we have before us, $2.6 trillion of worker contributions that are supposed to be dedicated to Social Security will be spent on something other than Social Security. Like what? To pay for these tax cuts that are going principally to the wealthiest Americans in this country.

Even with that being done, using all the Social Security surplus moneys, we still have deficits never seen before in this country. This year alone we will have the biggest deficit this country has ever seen, more than $400 billion. That is more than $1,000 on the head of each and every man and woman in this country. They are gleeful. They believe that that is what was so good.

Mr. Speaker, many of us believe that we should have a plan as the Salazar legislation would propose that we save every single cent of the Social Security surplus which this year alone the surplus in Social Security contributions that will not be needed to spend for benefits to Social Security recipients will equal $169 billion. We can start by saying that $169 billion of Social Security moneys will not be spent, because this budget spends every single cent of federal $169 billion of Social Security in this year for Social Security on something other than Social Security. That is why so many Americans are so insecure about
Social Security and insecure about what the President proposes to do about Social Security.

Not more than 2 hours ago, one of the President’s Cabinet secretaries, Secretary Elaine Chao of the Department of Labor, appeared before the committee. Social Security is not guaranteed.

I asked the Secretary, “Can you clarify? Do you mean in the future perhaps if we don’t do something to make it stronger, it won’t be guaranteed?” She said, “No, it is not guaranteed.” That is why people today feel so insecure about what the President is proposing, especially with privatization, because he will not tell us what it will cost. We know it could end up costing some 46 percent in benefit cuts if we privatize. We also know that it would require massive government borrowing, some $5 trillion over the next 20 years, if you try to privatize the system.

What does all that money come from? Mr. Speaker, the reason people are so insecure about Social Security is not because the system is not there for them, it is because we have leaders talking about changing it without giving us the facts. Mr. Speaker, it is time for us in our budget documents to speak to the people, to give them the facts. This budget resolution does not do it. We should defeat it.

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

I am delighted to provide the gentleman some facts. Fact number one, title I has grown 10 percent per year since 2000. Pell grant funding, grown 10.3 percent per year since 2000. No Child Left Behind funding, grown 40 percent. Special education since 1996 has more than quadrupled. Funding for IDEA has quadrupled since 1996. IDEA funded only 8 percent of the per pupil expenditure in 1994 and 1995. Now it is nearly 20 percent. The Education Department discretionary budget authority has increased 146 percent since 1995. Those are the facts.

Was there not a conscience in the Congress prior to 1995? Is a 146 percent increase unconscionable? The commitment to education, the commitment to health care, the commitment to the NIH, the commitment to defense and the commitment to policies that expand and grow our economy and give Americans tremendous opportunities have been embodied in our budgets and are embodied in this budget.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. Pomroy).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge a ‘no’ vote on the previous question and a ‘no’ vote on the rule. The minority has an issue we want to discuss in the course of this budget. That issue is whether or not we should allow a 46 percent cut in Social Security benefits or very draconian budget cuts. Massive additional borrowing or budget cuts if the revenue coming into Social Security is diverted into private accounts. We think right now is the time to have this discussion. I support so much the amendment brought up by my friend from Colorado (Mr. Salazar), a new Member.

He wants to have this body move immediately to a debate on his amendment which would prohibit the diversion of Social Security money away from the Social Security trust fund, why we should not discuss today the prospects of massive additional Federal borrowing if we divert the Social Security money, why we should not discuss today the Dracoian budget cuts that would reduce benefits potentially to people who desperately need them, if we divert money that is coming in to pay benefits into private accounts.

There is a lot of explaining to do, in my opinion, for those who are advancing this privatization scheme on Social Security; and I know the Nation would feel an awful lot better, certainly those I represent, if we conduct this debate having first adopted the preservation of Social Security. Let us move to the discussion on how we shore up and maintain and strengthen Social Security, but not in ways that would cause massive additional borrowing, massive benefit cuts.

Vote ‘no’ on the previous question. Support this opportunity to debate the Salazar amendment.

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

There will be that opportunity, this being the rule on the budget; but I will engage in a bit of discussion about the Social Security because I am one who stands so strongly in preserving surplus for the safeguarding of Social Security. I think this is a good idea. I would like to hear one reason why we ought not to have this opportunity to debate the amendment which would prohibit the diversion of Social Security money away from the Social Security trust fund, why we should not discuss today the prospects of massive additional Federal borrowing if we divert the Social Security money, why we should not discuss today the Dracoian budget cuts that would reduce benefits potentially to people who desperately need them, if we divert money that is coming in to pay benefits into private accounts.

There is a lot of explaining to do, in my opinion, for those who are advancing this privatization scheme on Social Security; and I know the Nation would feel an awful lot better, certainly those I represent, if we conduct this debate having first adopted the preservation of Social Security. Let us move to the discussion on how we shore up and maintain and strengthen Social Security, but not in ways that would cause massive additional borrowing, massive benefit cuts.

Vote ‘no’ on the previous question. Support this opportunity to debate the Salazar amendment.

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

Social Security means a lot to me. I have received that survivors benefit when my dad died. It meant so incredibly much to our family. One in six North Dakotans that I represent, 114,000, got a Social Security check every single month. We have over half of North Dakotans pay into Social Security. They say what we have heard all across the country, and that is, “My Social Security taxes are for Social Security. Don’t raid those Social Security dollars.”

Now, of course, given the discussion on this radical overhaul of Social Security, we have the other prospect that these dollars will be taken away from Social Security and placed into private accounts, resulting in either massive additional borrowing to continue Social Security benefits or very draconian budget cuts. Massive additional borrowing or budget cuts if the revenue coming into Social Security is diverted into private accounts.

I asked the Secretary, “How much of this Social Security money is going to be diverted?” And there is a stone wall of resistance to any discussion at all about for the gentleman from Colorado getting ahead of a big issue, for once Congress actually dealing with the problem before it is crashing down around our heads, for once Congress actually being bold and looking into the future, beyond the next budget cycle, beyond the next election, beyond the next short-term problem and actually tackling it and dealing with it.

Anyone who has been through their first-year firefighting, there has been a bipartisan group give them the long-term unfunded liabilities of this government, and we acknowledge that there are vast differences in the approach to saving Social Security. But, ultimately, large and small, brave exception in the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Boyd), there has been total resistance to have any constructive effort to bring about a solution to this problem.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado speaking so strongly in preserving surplus dollars saved Social Security first, walling them off, the lockbox. We saved Social Security revenues for Social Security. And it is the Democrat Members of this body who have opposed to enter discussions when going-in principles are agreed to. Those principles: there shall be no insecurity added into Social Security and that there should be no additional Federal borrowing, no vast amounts of Federal borrowing.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman’s comments. I look forward to that constructive effort because we have that passion among and older, those at or near retirement, will not be impacted. But by golly, we have got an obligation to those people who are under 35 or under 45 or whatever number we finally arrive at, people who have time to plan and people who know, and all of us know, of all stripes, that there will be a problem in either 2040 or 2041 or 2042. We can argue over months and weeks all day long, but the point is we are not doing anything to improve the situation of the first-year, that first-year firefighter, that first-year soldier that all of us stand up on a regular basis and claim to speak for.
Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me just say to the gentleman from Florida that we do not believe that the unwise and irresponsible scheme of the Republican majority of this Congress is to decrease the solvency of Social Security. Everybody on our side of the aisle is prepared to work in a bipartisan way to increase the solvency of Social Security. What we are objecting to is this privatization scheme.

Let me also say to the gentleman, because he questioned why I said that the Republican majority of this Congress has a budget that will create a government without a conscience, the reason why I say that is because this budget would cut $5.3 billion from the Department of Agriculture, cutting food stamps and other programs that are vital to America’s farmers. This budget would cut 21.4 billion from education, cutting student loans and higher education spending.

He brags about the increase in money for No Child Left Behind, but we never properly funded No Child Left Behind. And our teachers and our principals and our superintendents are screaming about the fact that we have passed an unfunded mandate to them.

This bill would cut $20 billion, mostly from the Medicaid program. It would cut $270 million in spending from section 8 and other housing and homelessness programs. It would cut money from the Witness Protection Program, $103 million from transportation. It would cut $798 million for veterans health care. It would cut the earned income tax credit. It would cut money for unemployment insurance programs.

I mean, this is why I say that this is a budget that creates a government without a conscience. We are turning our backs on people who need our help, and I think that is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would respectfully request that the gentleman give us the page number and paragraph of this budget blueprint that cuts the Witness Protection Program.

As the gentleman knows, the budget document is a broad blueprint for spending that directs the authorizing committees of the Congress and their members to develop in the committees of their jurisdiction those savings in a variety of programs.

This budget blueprint is a sound document that sets the course for our Congress and for our Nation for the coming year; and the cuts that the gentleman refers to are reductions in the rate of growth in those programs, with the exception of defense and homeland security programs, which are a remarkable and historic first step to this Congress reining spending and funding priorities and simultaneously getting our arms around the deficit that both parties are understandably concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me first say to the gentleman that only in Washington would one call a cut a reduction in the rate of increase in spending. The bottom line is that this budget is more than just a general blueprint. There are specific directions in this budget that not only cut but cut through the bone. And, again, I repeat that this is a budget that creates a government that will have no conscience, and it needs to be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, I will modify this rule to provide that immediately after the House passes the budget resolution, it will take up H.R. 1330, the Social Security Trust Fund Protection Act. This legislation, introduced by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Salazar), would ensure that Social Security contributions are used to protect Social Security solvency by mandating that trust fund moneys cannot be diverted to create private accounts.

Mr. Speaker, while Members of this House may differ on what is the best long-term solution to ensure solvency of Social Security, I think we probably all agree that we need to protect the money that goes into the trust fund and that any diversion of these funds must be undertaken with great care. Private accounts do not help the trust fund solvency. In fact, it is estimated that they would cost the system more than $5 trillion. H.R. 1330 will give us an opportunity to vote up or down on whether we want the Social Security trust fund to be used for these fiscally irresponsible private accounts.

Let me make it very clear that a “no” vote on the previous question will not stop consideration of the budget resolution; nor will it change the process by which it is to be considered. But a “no” vote will allow the House to vote to prevent the siphoning off of the Social Security trust fund to pay for private accounts.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the Record immediately before the text of the previous question. (The SPEAKER pro tempore asked the previous question. [Mr. LaHood].) Is there objection to the rejection of the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection. Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
We have done a lot of great things over the past several years: doubling NIH, continuing to invest in research and cures and trials to make the human condition better. And, frankly, we have succeeded to the point that the reason why Social Security faces insolvent is because the life expectancy of Americans continues to grow. Every 5 years that pass, life expectancy goes up a year. This budget continues to fund our priorities, continues to invest in people, and continues to lay the groundwork for policies that allow people to pursue their own version of the American Dream, to find opportunity in a growing, expanding economy; that allows for job creation, that does not punish entrepreneurial spirit, that allows people to continue to invest in their businesses, to have more money in their own pocket to make decisions about their own children’s future, about their own opportunities, and about their own hopes and dreams.

And I urge my colleagues to support the rule, which is a very fair and balanced rule, and to support the underlying budget produced by the committee.

The material previously referred to by Mr. McGovern is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 154, RULE FOR H. CON. RES. 95.

At the end of the resolution the followiing new section:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, and in lieu of the disposition of the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 95, the Speaker shall declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of consideration of the bill (H.R. 1330) to provide that Social Security contributions are used to protect Social Security solvency by allowing for job creation, that does not punish entrepreneurial spirit, that does not divert to create private accounts. The President pro tempore of the Senate shall be notified by the Speaker.

The question is on the previous question and there were—yeas 230, nays 202, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—230

Abelerd 
Akin 
Aleichem 
Allen 
Amar 
Ames 
Anderson 
Anderson (SC) 
Annunzio 
Armstrong (OK) 
Armstrong (CT) 
Armstrong (IN) 
Arroyo 
Asa 
Assumption 
Atkins 
Atkins (NC) 
Auburn

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 230, nays 202, not voting 2, as follows:

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I

Mr. Putnam. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I

Not Voting—2

Culkin

Radvansky
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Mr. PALLONE and Mr. REYES changed their votes from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. FORTENBERRY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOD). The question is on the resolution.
Mr. SPRATT changed his vote from "aye" to "no." So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986 EXTENDING LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND FINANCING RATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1270.
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So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING GRAVE CONCERN OF CONGRESS REGARDING PASSAGE OF ANTI-SECSSION LAW BY NATIONAL PEOPLE’S CONGRESS OF PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 98. The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 98, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 4, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]
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bill, I was detained out of the building and away from the Capitol, and I missed the following votes and would like to have recorded in the appropriate place of the transportation bill that on the Graves amendment if I was present; I would have voted “no” on the Kennedy amendment if I was present; I would have voted “no” on the Osborne amendment if I was present; I would have voted “aye” on the Moran amendment if I was present, I would have voted “aye” on the Conaway amendment if I was present, I would have voted “no.”

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 161) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 161

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON RULES.—Ms. Matsui.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 525

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 525.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the fiscal year 2006 budget resolution.

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

There was no objection.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 154 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. 95.

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. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LA'TOURNETTE) as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HOFF) to assume the chair temporarily.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

General debate shall not exceed 5 hours, with 4 hours confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget; I hold our kids and economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

This gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRAT) each will control 2 hours of debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE). Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today we are here to debate the budget resolution for 2006, the Federal Government spending blueprint that will guide all of this Congress’ spending and revenue decisions for the coming fiscal year.

Let me start by thanking my staff on both sides, Republicans and Democrats. What Members will hear today, this is probably one of the heartiest debates of the year when we talk about the priorities for the coming year. As Members might imagine, because we come from different backgrounds and different States and different philosophies, we have different ideas of what is important. Members will hear quite a bit of debate from time to time that will sound rancorous. It will sound like we do not agree on anything and everything is going to be difficult, and I do not think it is quite that bad.

We have some pretty important priorities that we all agree upon, and we share a number of the goals. How to achieve those goals is in part the budget process: how are we going to get it done, and how are we going to accomplish it. That, unfortunately, gets into the details where we may disagree.

I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRAT), my partner and friend who will come forthwith his own budget today, and we appreciate that. Members will hear his ideas and our ideas. We will get to debate those ideas, and we will come out at the other end with a better understanding of exactly how both sides will approach the problem, the challenges we will have; and we will hear about some of the ways to solve this.

Long before today, long before this debate started and quite honestly before we received the President’s budget, we knew what the priorities were going to have to be. If you attend any town meeting in Iowa or across the country, Members are going to hear these same kinds of themes: we have to keep the country strong and defended. If we are not strong, we are not free; and if we are not free, we have lost everything. We have lost the most important gift we have been given, that has been bestowed on us, and that we feel so passionate about being able to bestow on generations to come here in this country and around the world. We need to continue to be strong.

Second, we need to continue to grow the economy. We really do. We need to create jobs and keep the opportunities flowing for our kids and grandkids because we know when we are strong and growing, we are able to accomplish so much in the world. Our economy must continue to grow.

Lose but not least, and I can tell Members this is true wherever you go, people around the country are frustrated by the attitude and almost arrogance that government can solve all of our problems, that somehow another government program will solve the problem, or more bureaucracy or more government regulations or just another law or more employees working in fancy white buildings downtown, if we would only do that we would solve the problem, and that means spend much more money, too much money.

So America’s continued greatness comes from, I believe, the unlimited opportunities that our freedom provides, but we have to get our hands around the spending. Right along with our well-meaning folks who come along, we have created a government that is too big and spends too much, and we have to get control of that spending if we are going to be successful.

As I have said, these must be our Nation’s highest priorities, continued strength, continued growth, and making sure we can restrain spending because one of the good things that the Federal Government does in so many areas such as education and health care and veterans benefits and agriculture and transportation and energy and science, I could go on and on, we all have our favorite areas where we think the government ought to invest, but none of that continues to happen, none of that will be achieved if we are not strong, if our economy does not grow, and if we cannot get our arms around the spending.

So we chose to write a budget that ensures that first and foremost our needs must be met, gives all other priorities a fair shake, that is what the
budget process does, it puts in a $50 billion what we call a place holder, recognizing that we need to fund next year’s likely emergency request for the war on terror, we have to plan for that; and it continues the progress that we have made in reducing the deficit and getting our spending on a sustainable path.

Last year was really the first year that we have been able to move beyond the crisis mode that we have had in our budget in response to September 11, 2001. We began a path to get hold of our out-of-control spending and to reduce the deficit. We had, I think, some pretty good success. We ought to recognize that we made some progress last year and realize how it happened. Despite cries from many different quarters in the country that all we need to do is just raise some taxes, tax the wealthy is always what people say, tax all those small businesses that are creating jobs, tax those farmers, tax those families that are sending their kids to college and are trying to make ends meet around their kitchen table, just give them a raise, and we will solve the problem. We decided we were not going to raise taxes. As a result of that, the economy continued to expand, and, due in large part to those economic policies, we now have strong, sustained economic growth and job creation. We also, for the first time in a long time, managed to slow the rate of this non-security spending that has been out there, for the first time below the rate of inflation. I think that is a whole lot more reasonable than what we saw in years past.

Let me just show my colleagues what we did last year. This is what happened in just one year. The President when he came in, almost a year ago right now, the budget deficit was going to look like this, $521 billion. We all said that was not what we wanted, that we did not want to do that. We wanted to see if we could get our arms around it last year. We knew it was going to be tough. We knew there were going to be all sorts of complaining, claims that we were not keeping the priorities straight, but when the President started, this is where we started, at $521 billion. In one year alone, 20 percent, $109 billion was reduced on that deficit. $109 billion. In one year, one-tenth of 1 percent. Why? Two reasons. Number one, the economy grew. The economy grew faster than anybody expected, because when you unleash this 10-plus-trillion-dollar economy and allow it to just chug along and create jobs and have people investing and creating those opportunities for our young people around the country and others to make money for themselves and deal with their own problems and their own challenges, our economy is a wonderful thing when it has just a little bit more growth than we expect, that brings in a lot of revenue to our Treasury. In one year, we reduced the deficit 20 percent. In that same year, even with tax reductions, more money came into the Treasury than the year before. This is not a science experiment. It is a fact. When you reduce taxes and you cause economic growth, oftentimes, and last year we did that, and already we are seeing it this year, more money comes into the Treasury. That combined with holding the rate of growth of spending, we were able to reduce that deficit and get back eventually to balance. We took the first steps by keeping the economy growing, creating jobs, beginning to restrain this out-of-control spending.

But while both of these items are critical alone, they are not going to get the job done. We have so many Members who understand that every year we come down to the floor on appropriation bills and we battle over a million here and a million there, and I know it all adds up, but there is a part of the budget that is not being addressed. I will get to that in just a moment.

This year in the budget, much like the President’s budget, we take the necessary next step for slowing spending, at the same time ensuring that our troops are safe. This includes reducing the top line number for all the non-homeland, nondefense spending by eight-tenths of 1 percent. What we are doing is we are saying we are going to take the President’s number for defense and for homeland security, we want to keep the country strong, but in all other areas of our discretionary spending, we are going to start weeding the garden. We want to look through all of those programs and find ways to save money, find ways for us to reform programs, find places where we are wasting money, where money is not being spent appropriately, and as a result of that be able to reduce some of those increases.

Additionally, and probably more important, this budget begins to address the unsustainable growth on the other side of the budget, the 55 percent of the spending that simply operates automatically. This is the dirty secret of our budget. This is the one percent that is out of control. People are just going to keep getting frustrated. And so what we need to do is we need to go in and reduce that growth just one-tenth of 1 percent. That is all we are asking for. We are saying instead of growing at 6.4 percent, it is going to keep growing at 6.3 percent. But let us get the committees and let us get the Congress and let us get the Governors into a room and let us begin talking about these programs, reforming them and getting them under control.

I will note that there is a very interesting phenomenon about this decision to slow the rate of growth which ends up being about one-tenth of 1 percent over the next 5 years. It has created a very interesting phenomenon, because what happens about this time of year is people come to the floor and they start saying things like, oh, these cuts are going to do horrible things. It is not helping families, it is locking people into the dependency on government, asking no personal responsibility in return. Un-
Let me explain what I am saying here. What I am saying here is that in Washington, if you do not get what you expected from one year to the next, if you do not get the increase you thought you were going to get, they run to the media, they run to the press conferences, they run to anywhere it is they can run and complain and suggest that they are being cut. It would be as if your son came to you and you have been negotiating your lawn mowing fee. Maybe over the last number of years and you were able to pay him 10 bucks every time he mowed the lawn. This year he came to you and he said, "Dad, I want 15." You said, "Son, I love you. You're a great son. You do a great job. I'd like you to trim your lawn a little bit more, but you're doing a pretty good job with the lawn. I'm not going to give you 15, I'm going to give you 12." If he ran to the microphones with a lot of people around here, they would claim he was cut $3. My goodness, what an outrage. You should love your son. You should love what he does to your lawn, that he should get an increase to $15. My goodness, what an outrage, instead of recognizing that it was a $2 increase. That happens so often and is just the way we are going to have to continue to do this. I understand that we are going to hear some of that rhetoric today, but we are slowing the rate of growth. We are just saying it needs to be slowed down. Just slow it down. Let us reform the programs. Let us get the people in a room who need to be part of the discussion to reform these programs and let us slow down the spending and make sure that the programs that we are talking about, which are so vitally important to people, take the food stamp program. That is for people who are hungry. Take the Medicaid program. That is for people who do not have health care. Take a number of these programs and suggest that they should be allowed to control? Or suggest they should meet the changing needs of a population, and that is something that we have to come to do and it requires constant weeding of the garden and constant attention if we are going to get that done.

The problems facing our mandatory spending did not happen overnight. We are not going to fix this overnight. We are not suggesting this is being fixed overnight. It is like going from 60 miles an hour to 30 miles an hour with the brakes on? No. That is not what we are doing. We are just saying, slow down, figure out a way to make these reforms.

One thing I will guarantee you is that if there is no budget, if you do not put these kinds of instructions into the budget, if there is no budget or if an entity or a Member comes to the floor with a budget today that does not have these serious kinds of instructions in the budget to reform the programs, I will guarantee you they will not get fixed. And if you do not get something, nothing is not an option. You cannot complain about Medicaid and offer no solution. You cannot complain about the error rate in food stamps and say there is no solution. You cannot complain about these programs and say there is no solution. We do not think there is a silver bullet but we want to set up a process to begin the discussion to fix these programs. We can do this. It is going to take time. The budget recognizes that, the budget we brought to the floor today, that we need a reasonable pace to get there. We set September as a deadline so we can invite all of the interested parties in to begin this. It will tell us how much work that we have done over the past number of years to shore up and strengthen national defense and create jobs and make sure that we continue our reduction in spending. I believe it is a doable, a fair and honest budget, one that we can work with the President in order to make sure it gets put into place.

I want to end with this. We plan to enforce this budget. This is a good budget. One that we plan to enforce this budget. Whether this is by way of announcement or however you want to do it, do not worry if we do not get an agreement with the Senate, with the other body. I understand that the other body has decided to walk away from the President on the budget. They are not going to do real reform. It does not look like they are going to try and control spending. I am very frustrated with what I see over from the other body. They are watering it down and they are not going to change anything un- fortunately does not appear to be there in order to make some of these big changes that I think our Nation demands at this time. But I will tell you that in the House, just like last year, we enforced the budget. There was a controversy for those Congress watchers that have been brewing on the floor this week about people who wanted to really enforce the budget. Thank goodness we do that. Last year we enforced the budget. This year, we were able to hold the line on spending, keep within that budget. As a result, we got the deficit reduction that we needed. Just like last year, we will do that again this year. I do not need any special rules. I do not need any Member to tell me that that is how we ought to do it. That is my commitment. That is the Speaker's commitment. That is the majority's commitment. When we pass something, we mean it. That is what we lived under last year and we will do that again. We have had terrible extra budgetary spending in an emergency basis. I understand people are frustrated with all the extra spending. I want to show it to you. Every year we have had to do extra spending. I understand that. On September 10, 2001, we had a surplus.

There is no question, we had a surplus on September 10 of 2001. We all know now. And the reason we did that was because we all know and we all joined in the spending to meet the needs of our changed world. None of that was in the budget. We knew we had to do it. We knew we had to keep the economy strong. We knew we had to support our troops. We knew we had to combat terror- orism. We knew we had to protect the country.

I decide we would do whatever it took. That is whatever it took. And it meant we had to run deficits. But just like last year, we made a commitment to reducing the deficit. We did it 20 per- cent last year. We are going to do it again this year. We will get to cutting the deficit in half by 2009. We will get that accomplished and then some, and we will get back to balance. But we have got to stick to a plan.

We will do whatever it takes, not only to protect the country, but we will do whatever it takes not to pass on that legacy to the next generation. We cannot do it all in 1 day. We cannot do it all in 1 year.

We made progress last year. This budget builds on that progress, meets the needs of our country, and it is a good budget that I hope my colleagues adopt.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. (Mr. SPRATT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, it is hard to believe that just 5 short years ago we were sitting on a pinnacle of surpluses totaling $236 billion. And it did not come easily, it did not come without the fall out from some fantastic economy, some serendipitous result.

Democrats, beginning in 1992 and 1993, made the hard choices that moved the budget to surplus in unprecedented fashion. $290 billion was the deficit inherited by President Clinton when he came to office, as this chart will show. $290 billion was the largest deficit in our Nation's peacetime history.

The President, as his first legislative act, sent us a budget to cut that deficit by more than half over the next 5 fiscal years. I will never forget the day we passed it here on the House floor by one vote, and in the Senate by the Vice President's vote. I will never forget the taunts, the claims that we were cut- ting the economy off at the knees, buying ourselves a one-way ticket to a re- cession, and ballooning the deficit instead of resolving it.

Mr. Chairman, every year thereafter, after adoption of the Clinton budget in 1993, every year the bottom line of the budget got better, to the point where in the year 2000 we had a surplus of $236 billion. We made the hard choices to make that happen. And that was the surplus inherited by President Bush when he came to office in the year 2001.

No President in recent times has en- joyed such an inheritance, and he squandered his inheritance. We warned the President against going for deep tax cuts and relying upon the projection of surpluses at that point in time, which was $5.6 trillion.
We told the President then that while we may seem to be sitting on an island of surpluses, we were surrounded by a sea of red ink, a sea of debt; and we needed, now that we could, to attend to our long-term needs, our obligations to Social Security in particular.

He defied and ignored all those priorities and went solely with the budget whose primary thrust and emphasis was the biggest tax cuts we have passed in the history of this Congress.

Unfortunately, the prophecies and predictions we made have come to pass. The boost to the economy imparted by those tax cuts did not replenish the revenues to the Treasury of the United States. As a consequence, today we have the largest deficits in our Nation’s history. Not just this year. It is not just something episodic. Two years ago we had a deficit of $375 billion. This past year we had a deficit of $412 billion. This year, according to OMB, can be a deficit of $427 billion. Each of those deficits, 375, 412, 427, each of those deficits is a record deficit.

And now what do we look at for the long-term future? The President tells us he is going to cut the deficit in half. And the budget which he presents sports roughly to do that. But he conveniently omits from his estimation of what will be incurred in the way of cost over the next 5 years major items such as the cost of the war. We have 140,000 American troops stationed in Iraq and Afghanistan. More in Afghanistan. That war cost is not going away or tapering off any time soon. And any budget that is straightforward should include some estimation of the likely cost now that we have been over there for 2 or 3 years and know what the costs should be based upon.

Secondly, there is nothing in the President’s budget to account for fixing the Alternative Minimum Tax, which by now is a political inevitability. His own Treasury Department has told us if we do not fix it, it will go from four million tax filers to 30 million tax filers by the year 2010. It will have to be fixed in the near term. There is not a thing in the President’s budget that accounts for that. Even though he asks for additional tax cuts, he leaves out that $940 billion item.

And then the cost of fixing Social Security, privatizing Social Security. The President would like to see workers take 4 percentage points off their FICA payments and put it in a private account. Well, if you do that, you are taking money out of public trust funds, putting them in private trust funds; and, therefore, money will have to be borrowed to meet the obligations of Social Security; to wit, $754 billion beginning in the year 2009 and extending to the year 2015. That is not my number. The White House gave us that estimate. And yet they did not put it in their own budget.

When you add all of these things together, what you get is not a deficit that is going to be cut in half over the next 5 years, or the next 10 years, for that matter. What you get is a deficit that moves from $427 billion next year to $621 billion in the year 2015. Let me just show you in three simple lines what this means looking backward over the immediate last 3 years. When all Republican colleagues passed the President’s budget and his tax cuts in the year 2001, his offices at OMB told us in earnest, we will not be back here in hand to hand to increase the debt ceiling of the United States, the legal limit on what we can borrow, again until 2008. So confident are we that these tax cuts will be replenished, we do not think we will be back here until 2008.

They were back here in the year 2002, asking for an increase in the debt ceiling of $450 billion. The next year, 2003, they came and asked for a debt ceiling increase of $384 billion. Let me tell my colleagues for reference purposes how big the President’s debt was back and said, we need more; we need more. And consequently, before we adjourned last November, the Congress increased the debt ceiling by $800 billion. That was May 26, 2003. Within 15 months, Secretary Snow from the Department of Treasury was back and said, we need more; we need more. And consequently, before we adjourned last November, the Congress increased the debt ceiling by $800 billion.

That means in 3 fiscal years, 3 of the 4 fiscal years represented by the Bush administration’s first term, the debt ceiling of the United States had to be raised by $2,224 trillion in order to accommodate the budgets of the Bush administration.

Today, we have before us a budget resolution which was crafted by the Republicans and by the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman Nussle). Very little collaboration. A lot of civility. We have a great relationship, but little collaboration. They did their thing; we did our thing. Basically, what they have done is a take-off on the President’s budget. It is very similar to the President’s budget.

So instead of taking my word for what the consequences of this budget are, let me show something that every Member has in his or her office right now. Table 15: an analysis of the President’s budgetary proposals for the fiscal year 2006, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office, which, as everybody knows, is neutral and nonpartisan. Members do not have to read the whole thing, although I would commend it to their reading. They just have to read to the second page. Table 1.1 on the second page, if they read there, they will see the implications of what they will be putting in train if they vote for this budget resolution, which is basically the President’s budget request.

And that is, according to CBO, we will add to the debt of the United States $5,135 trillion over the next 10 years. Another $5 trillion on top of the $2.2 trillion that I have just shown will be added over the next 10 years as a consequence of passing this budget. That is not cutting the deficit in half. That is letting the deficit soar and soar and soar.

To mitigate the problem, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Nussle) and his colleagues on the Committee on the Budget have prepared some cuts in domestic discretionary spending. The irony here is they and the President both go to one sector in the budget that has not been growing over the last 3 to 4 years, and they take their cuts almost exclusively out of these domestic programs, programs like education and veterans health care and the environment.

Yet where the real cost increases, spending increases, are coming is not in those accounts, which constitute about $350 billion and have basically been flat for the last 3 years. The irony here is they and the President both go to one sector in the budget that has not been growing over the last 3 to 4 years, and they take their cuts almost exclusively out of these domestic programs, programs like education and veterans health care and the environment.

We have offered a substitute that we think is better fiscally and better in terms of our core values, the values
that we support and we think the American people share: the education of our children, for which we do more; the health care of our veterans, for which we are committed and do more; the development of our communities; and the quality of our environment. We do this simply by bringing spending in the domestic discretionary accounts back to baseline, that is, to current services, enough to prevent them from being eroded away by inflation, but not by an unaffordable increase.

Those changes plus the plan we lay out will bring our budget to balance by the year 2012. We think that ought to be the effort and aim of every budget that is presented here in the well of the House, getting back to balance as soon as possible and will incur less debt than the budget resolutions being offered to us.

So we have got plenty to debate here today, but we have got an alternative on our side that protects our unique priorities, the education of our children, the health care of our veterans, the development of our communities, the quality of our environment, and one also that is fiscally responsible. Ours is a plan that will move us to balance sooner in time more assuredly than the Republican resolution.

We look forward to the debate. We believe that we have the better choice, the better resolution; and we will be presenting in the course of the day the reasons why.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to have our Members talk a little bit about our continued strength as a Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), a member of our committee, to talk about national defense.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me time, and want to commend him for his hard work in crafting this fiscally responsible budget which fulfills Congress’s commitment to protecting American citizens. As the chairman just stated, the driving force of this budget is to make sure, first and foremost, that our most critical priorities are met, and there is no greater priority in this budget than making sure that America’s continued strength and security are intact. Our number one commitment to the American people continues to be the protection of their security.

Five years ago when I decided to run for Congress, I decided because I looked at our history, I saw that it was underfunded. I saw that it was overdeployed. In fact, in the late 1990s, the service chiefs had warned Congress that our Nation was on the brink of a hollow military, with inadequate funding for troop training and maintenance of equipment.

This became painfully clear when we were attacked on September 11. Our Nation had severe defense and homeland security deficits that had to be addressed immediately. Since that day, Congress has shown that we are more than willing to spend whatever is necessary to protect and defend our Nation and support our troops.

Since September 11, we have spent $1.9 trillion, almost $2 trillion, to provide for the defense and homeland security of this Nation, and that does not include the supplements that we have already passed, which add up to $298 billion for the whole lot of counterterrorism and homeland security deficits that had to be addressed. And we acted quickly, deliberately, and in a bipartisan way to address those needs. I am glad to say that this year’s defense and homeland security budget builds on the substantial progress we have already made.

Our national defense base budget continues the multiyear plan to enable us not only to fight the war against terrorism today, but to transform our military to counter some of the unconventional threats that will come in the future, and Congress has shown that we are more than willing to do whatever is required.

I am going to show you a chart, and this shows that since 2000 we have increased spending for the military by 66 percent. You can see it goes from $287 billion to $175 billion these last 5 years. That is quite an increase.

Now, this budget accommodates the President’s request for the Department of Defense and increases our spending this year up to $419.5 billion, almost $420 billion. That is an increase over last year of 4.8 percent. It also proposes a sustained average increase of 3 percent over the next 5 years.

I think we all know that the most important part of our defense funding is for the people, the men and women who serve our country, the finest military personnel in the world. To support them and to allow the Department of Defense to continue to recruit and train first-rate forces, this budget builds on the critically needed funding increases of the past few years for military personnel.

Since President Bush took office, we have increased spending in military personnel accounts by approximately 40 percent, providing such quality of life advancements as, number one, an average increase in military pay of 21 percent. We have reduced the average out-of-pocket housing expenses for military people from 18 percent down to zero. They do not have to pay on average any out-of-pocket expenses for their military housing. And we fully funded the health benefits for active duty members, for retirees and their dependents as well.

We spend money in operations and maintenance. That is the area where our readiness to fight this global war on terrorism. This budget provides for increases in training and education, operations and support for the military forces, maintenance of field weapons systems and equipment, and operation and maintenance of facilities. In total, operations and maintenance has gone up by 20 percent over the last 4 years.

To continue our effort to replace worn out or obsolete equipment, we provide for procurement of new ships, aircraft and vehicles, as well as the purchase and initial fielding of weapons systems, ammunition and other combat-related systems. Over the past 4 years, funding for procurement has increased 29 percent, and Congress has shown that we are more than willing to do whatever is necessary to provide our men and women who serve our country, the finest military personnel in the world.

I am proud to say that this budget does just that. I urge its adoption.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN) to talk about homeland security.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I want to compliment the gentleman and the staff for putting together what I consider an excellent budget. Your work will be recognized as we move this.

Continuing our progress in providing for homeland security, this budget provides for a total homeland security spending of $49.9 billion, an increase of 8.6 percent. About 55 percent of that would go to the Department of Homeland Security or other homeland security-related funding spread through the government, including the Department of Defense, Health and Human Services and Justice as well.

These funds will work to meet the needs in three key strategic areas of homeland security, including, first of all, preventing attacks. We provide for increases in funding for homeland security programs and agencies specifically designed to help prevent attacks from occurring, including border security, counterterrorism and counterintelligence.

Secondly, we reduce other vulnerabilities. Our budget works to reduce and eliminate the risk of attacks at our ports, rails, in the skies, our food supply and roads by allowing for increases in many of the programs and agencies that help prevent attacks from occurring, including border security, counterterrorism and counterintelligence.

Thirdly, ensuring preparedness. This budget also helps to ensure that our first responders have the necessary material and equipment to handle emergencies as well as adequate disaster preparedness through the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Key initiatives of the President’s proposal supported by this include: $40.4 billion for total homeland security spending, excluding the Department of Defense homeland security spending; $98.3 billion for the Department of Homeland Security, a 177.5 percent increase for agencies moving into the department from fiscal year 2001;
Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, who is one of the able and honorable Members of this body. I also want to congratulate the gentleman for having put together a budget that reaches balance.

The other side talks a good game. They do not produce. Every year the ranking member's budget has a lower deficit than the Republican budget.

My point today is simple: On the floor of this House, there are two pictures and two pictures only: One is George Washington to my right, and the other one is a gentleman people in the galleries have trouble identifying. Who is he? He is a Frenchman, the Marquis de Lafayette. Why is he here? Because during the American Revolution, they loaned us money to help us beat the British.

There is always a race between the creditors and the citizens. Well, under the Republican budget, the creditors start winning in the year 2009. This is it. During the American Revolution, America's will is not the way to balance the budget.

The Congressional Budget Office predicts that the administration's policies expressed through this budget will result in deficits of $250 billion or more each year over the next 10 years. The programs I just cited represent a small portion of the discretionary budget. Targeting environmental, veterans health care, education, basic scientific research and housing programs for cuts, while advocating permanent tax cuts that benefit the highest income tier, is not the way to balance the budget.

These discretionary programs represent only 16 percent of the deficit but are charged with nearly 100 percent of budget cuts. While the tax cuts represent the cause of the majority of our deficit, they will not be pared back but instead are made permanent.

The Bush administration's House leadership proposes to make tax cuts permanent even though this policy would cost $1.5 trillion over the next 10 years. Mounting debt and enormous interest obligations will be borne by current and future generation. Equally troubling, most of our new debt is being purchased by foreign nations, Japan and China, for example, hold nearly $1 trillion in American debt. A decline in the dollar's value against the Euro during the last year has not gone unnoticed by foreign governments that finance U.S. deficit spending. Financial ministers have conveyed concerns about American's unwillingness to reduce deficits. Asian nations, including South Korea, are now balancing their currency portfolio with Euro purchases. Without a historical comparison it is difficult to adequately predict what impact these trends will have on American economic and national security. Some of us are growing increasingly concerned by the administration's lack of a comprehensive strategy for reducing our reliance on foreign financing, even acknowledgment of the problem would be helpful.

The President has insisted on cutting taxes during a time of war. You don't finance two wars with five tax cuts. President Bush is the only president ever to do so, and his stubborn proposal, without additional revenue (such as the multi-trillion dollar Social Security privatization plan) seriously imperils America's ability to compete in the future against emerging economies in Asia and the European Union. Our economy, particularly in my home district on Northern Virginia, is currently in pretty good shape. But our standard of living and growth cannot be sustained if we insist on deferring enormous debt and interest obligations to future generations. The House leadership's blind acquiescence to the President's policies is reprehensible.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Republican leadership's budget, which basically rubber stamps the President's budget. I strongly support the Spratt alternative Democratic budget, a much more responsible and morally defensible budget.
on our debts. There will be no national defense, there will be no Social Security, there will be no Medicare, there will be no government left. The Republicans have put us on a road to ruin.

One of the speakers recently just said, well, we have a strong defense. That is wrong. We are borrowing more and more of the money from the Chinese. Who do you want pictured on the wall of the House of Representatives in future years? Do you want the Marquis de Lafayette, or do you want Hu Jintao of China, or do you want Tony Blair of Great Britain? Because these creditors have more and more power over this country because we are borrowing more and more of their money.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE).

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us an introduction to what is happening today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us a pretty good introduction today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us an introduction to what is happening today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us a pretty good introduction today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us an introduction to what is happening today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us a pretty good introduction today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.
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Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us a pretty good introduction today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us an introduction to what is happening today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us a pretty good introduction today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.
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Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us a pretty good introduction today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us an introduction to what is happening today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us a pretty good introduction today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us an introduction to what is happening today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us a pretty good introduction today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us an introduction to what is happening today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us a pretty good introduction today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us an introduction to what is happening today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us a pretty good introduction today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Tanner) gave us an introduction to what is happening today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee ( Mr. Tanner) gave us a pretty good introduction today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee ( Mr. Tanner) gave us an introduction to what is happening today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.
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Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee ( Mr. Tanner) gave us a pretty good introduction today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.
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Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee ( Mr. Tanner) gave us a pretty good introduction today to express my disappointment about the way things are going.
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The director of GAO was before the Committee on Ways and Means last week. Do you know what he said? He said if we continue on this course, if we do what the administration and this Congress recommends, and that is make the tax cuts permanent, and spending on the federal government has increased by 43 percent during the previous 10 years. You could walk into any Legion Hall or VFW complex in America and be proud of that number. Since 1995, we have increased VA medical care funding from $16.2 billion to almost $30 billion. And in 1995 and 2005, the ability for medical care and as a result the number of veterans utilizing VA care has nearly doubled.

The Montgomery GI bill. Those veterans who return home to improve their lot and develop their education skills, since 1995 Montgomery GI education benefits have gone from $405 to $1,004, an increase of 147 percent. And I will also note that prior to the Republican take over in 1995, under 40 years of Democrat control, there was no progress whatsoever on concurrent receipts. Now military retirees injured in combat or while training for combat who are 50 percent or more service disabled, are able for the first time in over 100 years to receive retirement benefits at the same time as their veterans disability benefit.

About a month ago, the Charleston Gazette ran this quote, and I will share it: ‘Bush increased VA spending by 27 percent in his first term. As factcheck.org pointed out, funding for veterans is going up twice as fast under Bush as it did under Clinton. And the number of veterans getting health benefits is going up 25 percent. The bottom line is that domestic discretionary needs have been met and continue to be met under this blueprint that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Nussle) presents today.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) to talk about automatic spending or mandatory spending. We do not need a tax increase. We need to control spending.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding me time. I thank him for saying what he did earlier about tax increases. I have been watching these budget debates for 11 years now as a Member of Congress, 3 years as a member of the Committee on the Budget; and year after year the argument is the same. Our colleagues from the other side of the aisle criticize our budgets in two respects. They say Republican budgets do not spend enough, and they say that would be hopeless. It would be a pretty much the gist of their complaints against our budgets. So I am glad to see the chairman pointing out his opposition and join him in adding my opposition to tax increases.

Now, I do want to talk as the chairman has asked me about mandatory spending. And I appreciate this opportunity as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, as well as a member of the Committee on the Budget.

As the chairman has noted, Congress spends a lot of time talking about discretionary spending, that part of the budget that makes up only one-third of total spending. The last time we made

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) to talk about the discretionary part of the budget.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman’s leadership in this effort. As he noted in his opening statement, we have spent a great deal in these past few years to secure our Nation in the wake of the September 11 attacks. But at the same time we were directing a huge new spew of resources to those urgent needs, we were also continuing to keep pace in our domestic nonsecurity programs like education, health care, veterans, agriculture, a whole host of other issues outside of defense and homeland security that people associate with their government.

On 9/11, our priorities shifted as a Nation, but our fiscal priorities remained the same. We kept growing our domestic programs by the same levels we had before 9/11. That would have been unsustainable even without a September 11. Over the past decade, we have increased programs almost across the board, and in many cases doubled, tripled or even quadrupled the rate of inflation.

I say that because out of one side of the mouth the opposition comes a plea for fiscal restraint and out of the other side comes a hue and cry at the devastating terrible cuts that are being beset upon the American people. Let me look at what the impact of domestic spending has been over the past decade. A Mount Everest of increases in discretionary spending. As we can see, overall discretionary spending grows since 1994, a very steep line. With the exception of last year which was the first time in a long time that we began the process of slowing growth, on average we have increased discretion spending by 6.1 percent per year for over a decade.

Let us look at some of the key areas that make up that portion of the spending. In the last 5 years, the Republican Congress has increased education funding by an average of almost 12 percent per period of time, spending for the Department of Education has increased by 75 percent, almost doubling our commitment. In fact, aside from the newly created Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Education has grown faster than any other Federal agency or Department during this period.

Let us look at some of the key programs that make up two-thirds of the President’s budget for fiscal year 2007. Title I, since 2000 title I funding for low-income schools has increased by 55 percent. Pell grants which help provide lower-income students with funding for college has increased by 57 percent over the past 5 years. As you will be able to see when the authorization committee, the President’s budget request called for increasing that amount that students are eligible to receive under this program.

Let us look at funding for our special needs students. IDEA, the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA, provides for those needs of our most important and sensitive children in the school system; funding has increased by 87 percent in the past 5 years.

In addition to increased funding, Congress also passed the No Child Left Behind Act which demands results in exchange for dollars. It works to forge a link between funding and classroom achievement while focusing resources on underperforming schools.

Now let us look at veterans, those men and women who have done so much to secure the freedoms and liberties that we enjoy and take for granted on a regular basis. I think that everyone should be proud of the commitment that we have made and continue to make in the area of veterans benefits.

Since Republicans took control of the Congress in 1995, tremendous strides have been made in improving benefits for our Nation’s veterans through hefty increases. Budget authority since 1995 has increased 77 percent, beginning at $38 billion, ending up at $67.6 billion. A tremendous increase. In fact, that 77 percent increase compares to only a 40 percent increase over the previous 10 years.

Spending per veteran. Let us get right down to the veteran in your district. Spending per veteran since 1995, increased payments per veteran have gone up 103 percent compared with 43 percent during the previous 10 years. You could walk into any Legion Hall or VFW complex in America and be proud of that number.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) to talk about automatic spending or mandatory spending.
any real effort to restrain the bulk of our spending, that part on auto-pilot, was back in 1997 and before that 1990.

Now if we look at this pie chart, we can see how much of our total spending has come to be mandatory spending: 48.7 percent. In 1995, it was 54.3 percent. And if we do not get a rein on it, by the year 2015, the portion of the budget over which we have little control or have chosen to have little control will grow to 62.1 percent.

Eventually this spending will crowd out other priorities which we also need to address.

Let us look at the other chart if we might. This one deals with student loans. We address much of our student spending with discretionary money, but student loans are mandatory programs. Expenditure on student loans has increased by 64 percent, with loans increasing by $31.4 billion to $80.7 billion today. This represents an annual growth rate of 16.5 percent at a time when our economy has grown by approximately 5 percent per year.

The next chart deals with Medicare spending. Medicare, of course, as we all know, is the Federal Government’s nationwide health care system for 41 million senior citizens and disabled persons. That is 14 percent of the population. Since 1995, Medicare spending has grown 88 percent. This year alone we will spend $293 billion on Medicare. Over the next 5 years, CBO estimates that Medicare will amount to $2 trillion, and as my friend from Tennessee pointed out, $1 trillion is an awful lot of money.

Our next chart deals with Medicaid. Medicaid provides medical and long-term care services to more than 40 million low-income families, elderly and disabled individuals. This is one out of seven Americans who benefit from this program. It serves as the cornerstone of America’s health care safety net. Since 1995, Medicaid spending has grown an astonishing 211 percent. Let me repeat that. Since 1995, Medicaid spending has grown 211 percent. According to CBO, this year the Federal Government will spend $193.2 billion on this important program, and over the next 5 years that spending will grow by over $1.1 trillion, an enormous rate of increase in this mandatory program.

So why have we allowed it to get to this point? And why are there still so few people who are willing to admit there is a problem, let alone trying to tackle the problem?

The first reason, mandatory spending is difficult to control. This spending is tied to factors Congress’s control, demographics, economic conditions, medical prices and so on. In addition, we have an aging population, with longer life expectancy—that is a good thing—increasing benefits and ever increasing medical expenses. Of the health care generation, my generation, is about to retire, adding huge strains to the resources of these programs.

Secondly, these programs address critical needs that must be met. Medicare payments, Social Security payments, commitments to our veterans. Almost everyone is affected by one or more of these programs, either ourselves, our children, our parents, our grandparents, or someone we know. People associate these programs with the ones that they receive with their name on it.

Now, all of these factors make it especially difficult to control entitlement spending but even to discuss getting it back under control without causing concern to good, deserving people who worry that their benefits will be changed. So we have a big problem to deal with, not only to get our hands around the problem, but to do in a way that is fair for today’s recipients and tomorrow’s recipients.

The President’s budget addressed this problem by including savings in mandatory programs, just slowing the rate of growth. As part of our effort to get the growth rate under control and to help reduce the current deficit. Our budget, while not an exact duplicate of the President’s proposals, begins the process.

It is important to remind everyone that this is not happening in a vacuum. As the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) pointed out, we have already taken the first steps toward getting a grip on discretionary spending.

Specifically, what does this budget do? It provides, for the first time since 1997, reconciliation instructions to the authorizing committees. It directs each of them to find a specified amount of savings. What it does not tell them to do is where to find those savings. That will be left up to the committees. The budget has a number that is given to each committee, and it directs the committee of jurisdiction to find that amount of savings. This is a critical step toward getting our mandatory spending back to a sustainable level, simply slowing the rate of growth of programs such as the one demonstrated on this poster.

It is a critical step, and I ask all of my colleagues to support this effort by supporting the budget, and I thank my chairman again for putting together a resolution that addresses the very needed mandatory spending restraint that is going to be necessary for our future economic prosperity.

Mr. SPRATTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time.

It has to be tough. I am a good friend of the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and a friend of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM). It has got to be tough for them and the chairman.

Back when they were on the committee a few years ago when this President fled in office, we had surpluses, and it was easy to go before the committee and debate how we would spend money we actually have or actually had and projected we would have. But today we are out of it, so much out of it that we have to come to the floor and almost pretend that we are doing something that we are not.

As much as I respect the gentleman from Tennessee, Governor Bredesen, and I know he has left the floor, he should call his own Governor, Governor Barbour, and ask him his feelings about the Medicare increases he bragged about here on the floor.

Governor Bredesen in Tennessee was faced with an enormous shortfall, as most Governors are. I might add that the Governors were here not long ago, Democrats and Republican, and expressed their outright opposition to President Bush’s budget as it related to Medicaid and even this budget as it relates to it.

The thing that is clear today, Mr. Speaker, is that our priorities are just very different than theirs. They accuse us of wanting to spend more. Yet the two most previous speakers bragged about how much spending they have done over the last several years. I would, too, if I was actually cutting budgets.

The VFW Hall that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) said I should be proud to go into and explain what we have done over the last few years, it is funny. They were here passing out ribbons and arm bands, urging us to do more because this budget here actually cuts the budget for the Veterans Affairs Department by $740 million when we consider keeping up with inflation.

We ask those returning from Iraq to pay higher copayments for their drugs, and we even ask them to pay a $250 dollar entry fee.

All of these numbers we use here could be confusing to people back home, but here is the short of it. We are going to do less for those who need it the most, and we are going to do more for those who need the least in this budget.

I would be embarrassed if I had to vote for this budget. Thankfully I do not, and frankly I do not even know if I am going to vote for all the things we are going to present on our side, for one reason. It is not balanced. Ours is more balanced than my colleagues, and as much as my colleagues may want to pretend that they are doing something different when what the increases, ask any State education commissioner how far off we are with our numbers for the No Child Left Behind Act, how far we are off for the poor children in this country. If my leadership is proud of making those kinds of cuts, go for it, vote for that budget.

The last point I would make is on Medicaid and Medicare. We want to say to poor people in this country that we are taking care of them and doing all the things we can. Yet we will not say to drug companies in the country that we want them to negotiate directly with Medicare so we can ensure we get the
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best price for seniors, for the disabled and for the poor working people across this country.

Vote no if my colleagues care about America and care about our future.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me time, and I, more importantly, thank him for his tremendous leadership, for his leadership on the Committee on the Budget. He has presented budgets that are statements of our national values, that are balanced in terms of their priority and balanced in terms of their fiscal soundness. He has been a great teacher to the country and the Congress on this issue. We are indeed blessed by his exceptional leadership.

Mr. Chairman, with today's vote on the previous question, Republicans told their constituents exactly where they stood on Social Security. They want to privatize it. Defeating the previous question would have ensured that payroll contributions of millions of Americans are protected and are not diverted away from Social Security to fund private accounts, but Republicans voted unanimously to undermine Social Security with private accounts.

Even though Social Security privatization is the President's number one priority, the Republican budget hides the cost in and the harmful effects of Social Security privatization by refusing to include any details on the plan in the budget.

The Republican budget also continues the Republican raid on the Social Security Trust Fund by spending every penny of the Social Security Trust Fund over the next 10 years, totaling $2.6 trillion.

The previous speaker or colleague the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD) referenced that when President Bush came into office he came in at a time of surplus. Indeed, for the last 3 years of the Clinton administration, there was zero deficit. In fact, there were surpluses, and that tightening of the government's budget under President Clinton enabled the Clinton administration to pay back over $350 billion of our indebtedness, reducing the national debt. We were on a course of action in the budget of being debt free by the year 2008, debt free for our country, and what that means in terms of the budget and the debt service is remarkable.

Yet, President Bush came into office with his reckless tax cuts for the superwealthy. Not all of them were for superwealthy. We supported those for the middle class, but because of the size of the tax cuts for the superwealthy has driven us deeply into debt at the end of the year 2009, if we include the supplemental, of about a half a trillion dollars in debt for 1 year, this is unconscionable.

The course of action that the Republican administration is on makes it nearly impossible for them to pay back the Social Security Trust Fund, the money they have taken from it to date. Secondly, the private accounts and the transition costs of around $2 trillion for the transition over the next 10 years, is huge and, again, undermines Social Security.

So the deficit in the budget is directly related to undermining Social Security. It is essential that the President be stopped in creating these private accounts which drain money out of the Social Security Trust Fund, thereby weakening Social Security. It is essential that the President and the Republicans be stopped from their reckless deficit spending, their raid on the Social Security Trust Fund and their further deficit spending with their tax cuts for the superrich that will make it impossible for them to pay back the money to the trust fund. This is where the United States workers have placed into the trust fund, that American businesses have matched by placing into the trust fund for retirement insurance. This money belongs to the American people. It is not a slush fund for President Bush to give tax cuts to the superwealthy at the expense of working families in America.

Democrats are committed to addressing the challenge which faces Social Security down the road. The first step to strengthening Social Security is ensuring that Social Security contributions are used only to pay for the guaranteed benefit that American workers have earned through a lifetime of work, for retirement; for disabilities if, God forbid, that happens, a tragedy befalls their family; and again, for survivors and families who have lost a loved one.

Privatization makes the challenge facing Social Security worse by slashing benefits 40 percent for future retirees, the people with disabilities, if we know of the President's plan, indexing to prices rather than wage, is proceeded upon, saddling our children and grandchildren with massive debt and jeopardizing the retirement lifeline provided by Social Security's guaranteed benefit.

Rather than diverting trillions with a T-R, trillions of dollars from the trust fund to fund risky private accounts, Democrats are committed to strengthening Social Security. Once privatization is off the table, Democrats want to work with Republicans in a bipartisan way to make any adjustments to keep Social Security solvent.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the issue is what we do about Social Security from the year 2050 to the year 2100. Contrary to what President Bush would have us believe, there is no crisis facing Social Security. There is a problem down the road. We have time to deal with it in the right way, in a way that does not slash benefits, that does not increase the deficit, does not rob our trust fund of its funds and does not burden our children with all of that debt.

So we will go to the table and say, with the amount of money that should be in the trust fund, and if the administration honors its moral and legal obligation to pay the trust fund back the money it has taken out, then the trust fund and interest on it should take us well into 2050. And after that, the benefits would be at 80 percent, and that is what we have to deal with. We can deal with it soon. We can deal with it in a bipartisan way. Just as President Reagan did working with Speaker Tip O'Neill in 1983, we can work it out in a bipartisan way to strengthen Social Security.

Some say that the private accounts are an end in themselves. There are people who believe in private accounts. Others believe that the private accounts are just a decoy, just a Trojan horse that looks appealing to people because it is a new idea, that once they get it past the gates of the city that rotten underbelly of huge deficits will destroy Social Security.

Either way, private accounts have got to go. They take money out of the trust fund, and this administration has no visible means of paying that money back.

Today, again, the Republicans said with their vote that they want to undermine Social Security by privatizing it, while Democrats voted unanimously to strengthen Social Security for future generations. Let us honor our responsibility to future generations, to our children, also to America's workers. Morally and legally we are bound to give them the promise of America to provide Social Security and retirement insurance; and, in time of tragedy, their disability and survivor insurance as well.

Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. Chairman, we do not need a Democratic tax increase. We need to keep the economy growing. And this budget certainly does not do that.

Mr. Chairman, to speak about that issue, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), vice chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for yielding me this time, and I am delighted to have the opportunity to talk about the importance of keeping the economy growing. And this budget certainly does not do that.

But let me take a moment, if I could, and respond to some of the comments by the minority leader with regard to the Social Security system. First, to say the criticism that your budget, Mr. Chairman, does not fund Social Security, is kind of an unusual one, given that as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) knows, under the Budget Act of 1974, Social Security is off budget. And even if the Budget Committee, in all of its wisdom, decided we were going to reform Social Security, we would not have the ability to. You cannot do it in the budget.
And, secondly, although we heard a lot of criticism about some of the President's ideas and some of the other ideas to indeed modernize and save Social Security, we did not hear even outlines of a plan on the other side. So it is kind of put a burden on us to work together, even if you could under the Budget Act, when there is no plan.

There is lot of denial about the problem we just heard. And there is a lot of criticism about those who would like to add to our debt. The sooner the solution is to do something sooner rather than later because the sooner we put aside this notion that everything is off the table and criticism and denial do it on a bipartisan basis. We need to continue to provide those benefits working to pay in those benefits. Therefore we will have fewer people about to retire, my generation, the baby boom generation, and because we have more people who are about to retire, my generation, the baby boom generation, and because we have more people who are about to retire, my generation, the baby boom generation, and because therefore we will have fewer people who are about to retire, my generation, the baby boom generation, and because therefore we will have fewer people working to pay in those benefits.

We need to do something. We need to do it on our basis. We need to put aside this notion that everything is off the table and criticism and denial, and, instead, address the very real problem we have. And the very obvious solution is to do something sooner rather than later because the sooner we do it, the less impact it will be on our economy, on our budget, and on our young people.

The gentleman from California (Ms. Pelosi) talked about the reckless tax cuts that have driven us into debt. Well, what have we seen over the last 4 years? It is not tax relief that drove us into debt. Over the last 4 years we have seen remarkable changes in our Nation’s future and our country. Income growth has declined, the corporate scandals, a recession, the terrorist attacks and their aftermath and, of course, the uncertainties of an international war against terrorism, including our conflicts in Afghanistan and now in Iraq.

These things have resulted in two things. Number one, because of the recession, less revenue. And of course that is the number one reason we find ourselves with a growing deficit over the last few years. And all the data supports that, from CBO, from OMB, all the nonpartisan actuaries looking at this issue. All those who analyze it say the same thing: you have less revenue coming in, lower capital gains, lower corporate income tax, lower individual income tax because of recession, that is the number one reason.

The second reason is increased spending. And, yes, there has been increased spending, and in a few areas as has been talked about earlier today, it was necessary. One, of course, is Homeland Security. Once again, this budget provides for substantial increases in our Homeland Security budget because we need it to protect our country against the terrorist threat.

Second is with regard to defense. We inherited not only a recession over the last 4 years, but also a deficit in terms of our defense real reals. And again today we will vote on a budget, or this week on a budget, that will increase substantially our commitment to the defense of our country. So some spending has been increased in areas as well. Tax relief is specifically focused on growing that economy, getting us out of that recession, moving us to a point where we have increased revenues coming in. And you know what? The strength and growth with which our Nation has responded to the challenges I talked about earlier, the recession, the terrorist attack, the stock market bubble, the corporate scandals, has been incredible. And it has been because of the tax relief. The tax relief, as opposed to the less revenue from the recession, as opposed to the increased spending, the tax relief has actually enabled us to move out of a recession into economic times where we see good economic growth.

We have put together to address those deficits in our Homeland Security, our national security, and also put in place through tax relief the necessary incentives to grow our economy. Because of that, we are in a very different position today than we were 4 years ago.

In fact, the general consensus of both public and private forecasters is that the US economy is in a sustained expansion growth period, with real solid GDP growth over the last year and a half going forward, real growth and payroll jobs, low unemployment and very low historical inflation.

This chart shows the GDP growth. Starting in 2003 going up, real GDP growth has increased for 17 consecutive quarters. In 2004, our real growth was 4.4 percent. That makes us the envy of the world. It is the strongest performance in 20 years. The Dow Jones Industrial Average has increased 50 percent. We are now seeing the new signs of life, renewed growth in real employment and payroll jobs over the past 7 years, shipments of nondefense capital goods, which is a key measure of private business investment, has rebounded very strongly.

Homeownership has also increased dramatically. We are now seeing the best homeownership rates that we have seen in our country’s history. Housing construction is at its best in 20 years. This shows a record high in home ownership, including among minorities.

Unemployment is also a good story. If we look at what has happened since the tax relief was put in place, payroll employment has increased by 2 million jobs over the past 21 months. Just last week we saw job gains of 262,000 new jobs, more than a quarter million new jobs in February. Again, that is something that we should be proud of as a Congress, something we should be very pleased about. Significant improvement in jobs and labor markets has occurred and is expected to continue as new claims for unemployment insurance are at their lowest level in over 4 years.

Even the stock market is rebounding. Despite all the problems we have gone through with the markets we talked about earlier, the Dow-Jones Industrial Average has been at its highest level in 4 years. The Dow has nearly tripled in value over the last 4 years. These are not just numbers; these are real jobs for real people we represent. It means we have higher investment in plants, in business, and equipment. It means we have higher take-home pay; we have higher wages, higher take-home salary. This is happening in America right now. We need to be sure that continues.

Expanding job opportunities and solid income growth is what this budget is all about. We are seeing all over this American who wants to work can work and find a job. That is what makes this a Nation of opportunity and prosperity. Today, because we have an improved economic picture, things are better; but we are not finished. We need this momentum to continue. We need to be sure we continue to see the kind of economic growth we have seen, and that means maintaining the tax relief we passed in 2001, 2002, and 2003.

The minority leader earlier talked about the reckless tax cuts that caused the deficit. We talked about what caused the deficit. Here is what has resulted from those reckless tax cuts: 3 million jobs in the last 21 months. There are a lot of factors in the economy; but the one we can control is the
In the interest of full disclosure, we ought to acknowledge that advice was given to us three times, and it is in our budget resolution. We recommend it in two places in our budget resolution. The one discipline proven to work that we ought to institute at the very least is PAYGO, parallel to entitlement spending increases and to additional tax cuts, per the recommendation of Chairman Greenspan.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Pascrell).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, while the majority cynically tells America that they will cut the deficit in half by 2009, here we go again. A simple review shows that the budget will add $127 billion in 5 years from now and make the situation even worse.

This is the legacy we are giving to our kids. We are telling them, “We’ve got a deal for you. We’re going to privatize part of Social Security.” They are going to need the money to pay the interest on the debt. They better save their money.

My friend from Ohio has presented probably the best defense of deficit spending that I have ever heard. Along with the false claims and the budgetary sleights of hand, remember, these are the same folks who since 2001 have converted a $5.6 trillion surplus into a deficit of $1 trillion. A $9 trillion turn-around. Defend that.

It really takes a special talent to underfund education, to underfund veterans’ programs, to cut Medicaid, to purchase $20 billion of Humvees which we disgracefully said were going to be paid for by oil revenue. Just this week, we found out that Halliburton has overcharged the Pentagon more than $108 million in excess billing, a sum that would pay for 592 up-armed Humvees which we disgracefully did not provide for our troops at the beginning of this war, or 2,250 explosive device jammers for our troops in the field. We are going to hear these conversions of costs over and over and over again. Mr. Chairman, get used to it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. Capps).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Nussle budget. This budget cuts $20 billion from Medicaid. Our friends on the other side of the aisle claim that this is not a cut, just a reduction in growth.

But it is a cut. When prices increase, and they surely have in health care, and spending does. And if you are not increasing costs in the program, you are reducing the program’s purchasing power. You are cutting the program. This budget is going to deny States, health care providers and low-income working families $20 billion for the health care services that they have to have. And there is evidence that closing loopholes or fighting waste, fraud and abuse would save anywhere near this amount.

Medicaid provides health care, irreplaceable health care, to 52 million of our poorest children, poor pregnant women, parents and the elderly. It is a critical source of acute and long-term care for 13 million elderly people and disabled people. These are real people who would be affected by cutting $20 billion out of Medicaid.

Mr. Chairman, since the President took office, the number of uninsured has increased by 5.2 million. Without Medicaid, this number would surely have grown much higher. Medicaid enrollment grew by 6 million over the same period, covering many people who would otherwise have been uninsured. Even so, Medicaid costs have grown about half as fast as private health insurance premiums have grown. Between 2000 and 2003, Medicaid per capita spending grew at 6.9 percent while private insurance premiums shot up over 12.5 percent. The growth we have seen is a result of the skyrocketing health costs that the President has allowed, not Medicaid itself.

If these cuts in Medicaid are made, the ranks of the uninsured will surely increase, the economy will become weaker, and health care costs would skyrocket even more because fewer people would be able to afford regular checkups and preventive measures but would be stuck by going to the emergency room as a last resort. That is why the National Governors’ Association opposes these cuts. It is why faith-based organizations oppose these cuts. And it is certainly why organizations, which I have a list of here, like the March of Dimes, the National Association of Children’s Hospitals, the American Academy of Pediatrics and the AARP, all of these groups and many more oppose the cuts that this budget puts into Medicaid.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this budget and these draconian cuts in Medicaid.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PORTMAN) having assumed the chair, announced the adoption of the amendment of the Chair from the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. H1558 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE March 16, 2005 fiscal side, and that is our spending and our tax relief.

What this budget does is it says we need to continue that tax relief. We are not going to increase taxes just now as our economy has finally gotten back on track. We believe we have finally seen the kind of opportunity we all want them to have. We are not talking about new taxes; we are talking about keeping the tax relief that was in place in 2001, 2002, and 2003 by the end of this Congress, so we can continue to have good economic growth.

The speed and the strength of the economic recovery of the past several years has been due in large part to this tax relief. We cannot forget that as we look at this budget. We also need to keep spending under control.

Earlier this month, Alan Greenspan told us that the notion of raising taxes in response to deficits “posed significant risk to economic growth and the revenue base” and that in his judgment we should aim to “close the fiscal gap primarily, if not wholly, on the outlay side.” That is what this budget does. It makes tough choices in defense discretionary spending, some tough choices in terms of our entitlement growth. Our entitlement programs are growing well beyond inflation.

As the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman Nussle) has laid out today, this budget calls for a lot of responsible ways for Congress to help itself to control spending, controlling discretionary growth, becoming discretionary spending to defense and homeland security priorities, as we talked about earlier, and calling for reconciled reductions in the amount of growth on the mandatory spending side. None of it is going to be easy.

A lot of us here in Congress have gotten pretty comfortable in signing off on big spending increases and free-flowing new spending. But success at keeping taxes and spending down is critical to a strong economy and with it higher standards of living for our Nation’s workers and our families.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. Pelosi) talked about the good old days in the 1990s when we did have an opportunity to get the deficits down and get some surpluses. We did it very simply by keeping taxes under control and keeping spending under control. That is what this budget provides for, so we can reduce the deficit in half in 5 years and see that opportunity continue.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To respond to the gentleman, I would say this. Mr. Greenspan has told our committee three times that we should borrow from the experience of the 1990s, reinstate the so-called pay-as-you-go rule, and apply it both to entitlement spending increases and additional tax cuts, including renewal of expiring tax cuts as a means of diminishing the deficit and improving the bottom line.

The speed and the strength of the economic recovery of the past several years has been due in large part to this tax relief. We cannot forget that as we look at this budget. We also need to keep spending under control.

Earlier this month, Alan Greenspan told us that the notion of raising taxes in response to deficits “posed significant risk to economic growth and the revenue base” and that in his judgment we should aim to “close the fiscal gap primarily, if not wholly, on the outlay side.” That is what this budget does. It makes tough choices in defense discretionary spending, some tough choices in terms of our entitlement growth. Our entitlement programs are growing well beyond inflation.

As the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman Nussle) has laid out today, this budget calls for a lot of responsible ways for Congress to help itself to control spending, controlling discretionary growth, becoming discretionary spending to defense and homeland security priorities, as we talked about earlier, and calling for reconciled reductions in the amount of growth on the mandatory spending side. None of it is going to be easy.

A lot of us here in Congress have gotten pretty comfortable in signing off on big spending increases and free-flowing new spending. But success at keeping taxes and spending down is critical to a strong economy and with it higher standards of living for our Nation’s workers and our families.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. Pelosi) talked about the good old days in the 1990s when we did have an opportunity to get the deficits down and get some surpluses. We did it very simply by keeping taxes under control and keeping spending under control. That is what this budget provides for, so we can reduce the deficit in half in 5 years and see that opportunity continue.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To respond to the gentleman, I would say this. Mr. Greenspan has told our committee three times that we should borrow from the experience of the 1990s, reinstate the so-called pay-as-you-go rule, and apply it both to entitlement spending increases and additional tax cuts, including renewal of expiring tax cuts as a means of diminishing the deficit and improving the bottom line.
Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO OFFER AMENDMENT OUT OF SPECIFIED ORDER DURING CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration in the Committee of the Whole of H. Con. Res. 95 pursuant to House Resolution 154, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), or his designee, be permitted to offer amendment numbered 2 in House Report 109-19 out of the specified order.

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

There was no objection.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 154 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 95.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the budget is a reflection of our values and priorities as a Nation. Congress should support a Federal budget that will make us more competitive in the global economy, spread prosperity to more Americans and reestablish fiscal discipline to ensure a better future for our children. This budget resolution takes us in the wrong direction. In order to cover up the President's mismanagement of the economy and the resulting mountains of debt, the Republican budget sacrifices important domestic priorities like Medicaid. This budget resolution cuts Medicaid more deeply than the President's proposal, as much as $20 billion over 5 years. Slashing Medicaid will have a devastating impact on the most vulnerable in our society. Medicaid is the safety net for impoverished children, elderly and the disabled. Reductions to Medicaid will cause lasting harm to current Medicaid beneficiaries and make the system less viable for health care providers.

Exactly who will be affected by cuts to Medicaid? Thirty-nine million low-income children and parents, including one in every five American children; 13 million elderly and disabled individuals who are receiving acute and long-term care coverage.

This budget would set back the quality of nursing home care. With Medicaid funding half of the Nation's nursing home care, cutting or block granting the program would set back efforts to improve the care and provide to seniors and people with disabilities in the Nation's nursing homes. This budget would unroll an already fraying health safety net, jeopardizing support for providers like hospitals, clinics, doctors and health plans that serve low-income families.

This budget would increase the number of uninsured which has already risen to 45 million people under the President's watch. Sick people cost more when they are uninsured and receiving care in emergency rooms than when they are covered by Medicaid.

This budget would put children at risk. If children have less health coverage, they are more likely to compromise their health by to learn in schools that are not safe and to grow into healthy, contributing members of society.

Cuts to Medicaid will shift costs to States, increasing their already significant fiscal burdens. Cuts in block grants do not address the real challenges States are facing. Medicaid enrollment increases which have occurred as a result of more people losing their health care coverage. Shifting additional costs to the States will likely drive them to cut Medicaid coverage and services.

This administration has provided huge tax cuts to the highest earning households in the Nation over the last few years. Now we see the rest of the plan. To reduce or eliminate health care coverage for poor, elderly and disabled people in order to finance tax cuts for the wealthy is inequitable and not in line with our Nation's values.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from South Carolina for yielding me this time, and I also want to thank him and commend him for the leadership that he has shown during the course of the Budget Committee work and for the alternative Democratic substitute which we will talk about a little bit later today.

Chairman, there are few moments during the legislative year here in Congress which really define who we are as a Congress, who we are as a Nation and where we are going with our priorities. It is one of these moments today when we have a discussion about our budgets and the priorities that we place in the budget.

For some reason, the Republican budget that we have before us only is budgeted for 5 years rather than the typical 10 years. I submit that one of the reasons I think they are doing a 5-year budget instead of a 10-year budget is because of the complete breakdown in fiscal responsibility and what the costs of their budget will entail and the explosion of budget deficits in the second decade that starts that we want to talk about during the course of these next couple of days during the budget.

We, on the other hand, will be presenting a Democratic alternative, one that does, I believe, reflect the values and the priorities that we share as Americans in this Nation.

Our budget will reinstate the pay-as-you-go rules to instill budget discipline again in the decisions that we are making in these budgets. We achieve a balanced budget under our plan by 2012, just when the massive baby boom retirement wave really starts to hit, and we protect important investments, in defense, in veterans' programs, education and health care to keep America strong and to help us grow the economy and create jobs. By reinstating the pay-as-you-go rules, we will be in a better fiscal position to better preserve and protect the long-term solvency of the Social Security program.

This chart that demonstrates next to me is the result of budget decisions over the last 14 to 15 years. This green line which shows an upward trend that resulted in 4 consecutive years of budget surpluses is Congress operating under pay-as-you-go rules. The red lines that show the plummeting of the surpluses into historically large budget deficits shows Congress without pay-as-you-go rules. What is hard to understand about reinstituting pay-as-you rules is what hard to understand about reinstating pay-as-you-go rules as part of budget discipline and the decisions that we have to make to right the fiscal ship again?

With pay-as-you-go rules, it gave us 4 years of budget surpluses, 2 in which the Congress was not raiding the Social Security Trust Fund and using that money for large tax cuts or other spending priorities and enabled us to start reducing the national debt which was an incredible economic dynamic at the end of the 1990s.

This chart demonstrates the current raid on the Social Security Trust Fund under the Bush administration. Every dime in surplus that is being run in the Social Security account right now is
being diverted, to help finance large cuts for the most wealthy or to help finance large new spending programs, a 30 percent increase in Federal spending over the last few years alone. That will continue throughout the duration when the new surpluses disappear. 

Social Security Trust Fund under their budget proposal. What this has meant was increased borrowing cost, year after year after having to raise the debt ceiling in order to finance the breakdown in fiscal discipline in this place.

Why is this important today? It is important because we do not owe this debt to ourselves anymore. Ninety percent of the new debt that was purchased this last year alone is being purchased by foreign countries, Japan, the number one purchaser, soon to be surpassed by China as the number one holder of our debt.

I do not believe, and Democrats do not believe, it is in our best long-term economic interest to be so dependent on foreign interests to be financing these deficits.

The President has been out campaigning on a new Social Security plan lately. It is kind of tough to engage in a meaningful discussion since he has not offered a detailed proposal; but from what we understand, he is calling for more new borrowing in order to set up these privatized accounts that he is fond of. In fact, Social Security runs a deficit of $3.7 trillion over the next 75 years. What the President is proposing to do is to borrow $5 trillion for these transition costs to set up private accounts over the first 20 years alone in order to fix a $3.7 trillion problem. And that is probably one of the reasons why he is having such a hard time selling his plan out in Middle America. People know intuitively with this huge new borrowing that it is going to hurt economic growth prospects for our Nation; it is going to jeopardize our children and grandchildren's future by leaving a large legacy of debt for them. That is why, once we can get past the whole idea of privatizing the Social Security system, we can try to get together as Americans and work on a bipartisan solution that will be fiscally responsible and that will keep the promise to future generations.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, the budget declares our Nation's priorities in black and white, and this budget makes America black and blue.

Republicans have squandered the surplus, forcing America to go country to country in search of money to prop up what cannot stand on its own fiscal integrity. They present charts and graphs. They talk about acting in America's best interest when, in fact, we have before us a budget that rewards America's special interests. We are deep in debt and growing deeper because Republicans have so many special interests to thank with your money.

The price tag is mind-boggling, but that is outdone by the people Republicans have targeted to bear the burden of their fiscal recklessness. The rich get the gain; America's most vulnerable get the table.

As ranking Democrat on the Human Resources Subcommittee, I asked my staff to examine where past Republican practices might be in this politically engineered budget. $1.57 billion is coming out of the Committee on Ways and Means. None of it out of Social Security. None out of Medicare. What is left? Poor people and children.

Two million of our Nation's poorest families can be summed up in Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. Child care assistance for low-income working families could be eliminated. Social service block grants could be cut 60 percent, and Federal assistance for those can be slashed by 80 percent. And if that is not enough, let us take $5 billion worth of food stamps out of children's mouths. It is America's most vulnerable who will pay for the Republican intention to extend tax breaks for capital gains, with 75 percent of the benefit going to people earning over $200,000 a year.

What in the world is going on? Do Republicans intend to starve the poor so they can feed the rich? Budgets reflect values. We heard a lot about values, family values, all this stuff. I guess feeding kids is not a value. And I suppose this budget reflects the Republican majority. Those values can be summed up in one word, bankrupt, just like this budget.

I urge a "no" on this resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK). Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank our ranking member for yielding me this time.

This is a bad budget. The very safety net that we hoped to help American families is being shredded. The Republican budget is wrong; and the prescription is wrong for Medicaid, over 52 million children, women, elderly, seniors, disabled individuals, 52 million in America. The largest health care program and the only health care program for many.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce has been instructed to cut $20 billion from the Medicaid health care program for so many vulnerable citizens. This Republican budget cuts Medicaid even more than what the President sent to Congress. We can do better.

I just left a meeting with my Governor in our Michigan delegation, both Democrats and Republicans. Unfortunately, the Republicans wanted to blame our Governor for Medicaid, and they said cut Medicaid back. When one is unemployed, when they have no income coming in, when they have lost, unfortunately they need Medicaid. And it is unfortunate that this budget does not restore Medicaid, help the most vulnerable, and not ask for $20 billion cut for the elderly, for seniors, for the disabled.

The budget is bad. It kills Medicaid. We can do better.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, to talk about the importance of our communities and our cities, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

As a member of the Save Our Cities Caucus, which is chaired by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), I rise in strong support of full funding of the Community Development Block Grant and Community Services Block Grant. Cities are charged with solving the tough social problems of this age: poverty, drug abuse, underachievement. And I am proud to say that Republicans have long understood that the Federal Government has a responsibility to support our cities. They are the lifeblood of our commerce, and locally controlled Federal dollars are far more powerful than arbitrary Federal programs.

It is extremely important that we fully fund these critical programs because they preserve the local power of local governments to fix holes in the safety net, to assure the services that people need. In New Britain, my hometown; in Meriden or Danbury, Connecticut; or in Waterbury, the largest city in my district, Community Development Block Grant funds and Community Service Block Grant funds leverage several times their value to provide child care, elder care, literacy programs, substance abuse treatment programs, after-school programs. They help those cities demolish buildings that are a blight or that harbor drug dealers. They help clean up brownfields. They improve fire stations. They improve parks. They rebuild sidewalks. They reconstruct streets. They work to make our cities attractive to the development that provides jobs and a healthy urban environment.

So between the Community Development Block Grant and the Community Services Block Grant, the Federal Government has traditionally contributed, and under Republican leadership, generously, to assure the safety net in the cities and the economic strength of our urban communities.

I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUNN) for recognizing, as the majority of Republicans do, the importance of these flexible block grant programs to our urban communities.
Mr. NUSSELE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), the chairman of that coalition, to talk about the same subject, the importance of our communities and the Community Development Block Grant program.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman indicated, I chair a working group appointed by the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) called Save America’s Cities. This working group has 29 of the Republican conference who have backgrounds in urban issues, either having served as mayors or members of city councils or otherwise in local government, or who by their districts have a natural affinity for urban issues by working closely with their communities and seeing the difficulty of urban revitalization and redevelopment and the commitment to bringing jobs back to our cities.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Committee on the Budget in adding $1.140 billion in fiscal 2006 in the President’s request for programs under the community and regional development function in the budget, which includes the Community Development Block Grant. The budget document itself specifically lays out that when looking at restorative programs, the clear intention of supporting the Community Development Block Grant program, or CDBG.

It goes on to state that the resolution makes no assumption regarding implementation of the President’s proposed Strengthening America’s Communities Block Grant or transferring the Community Development Block Grant program from the Department of HUD to the Department of Commerce. This is an important notation because it is very important for national associations that support urban issues, like the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, that have had a great deal of concern about the consolidated programs, some of which are currently located in HUD, to Commerce and the reduction in overall spending, which was proposed of 30 percent.

This House, in taking the action of supporting the Committee on the Budget’s resolution, does not accept the President’s level of funding and looks to restore functions for CDBG that go to important issues in our community such as taking abandoned housing, rehabilitating them, demolishing abandoned buildings where they cannot be rehabilitated, taking abandoned lots that might have been strewn with broken grass or be places where criminals congregate and turning them into community parking lots that can help support areas of local community business districts.

Looking, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) was saying, to the area of brownfields, we have abandoned factory sites throughout our urban core which make it difficult for us to bring jobs to those areas of our cities, to find ways to environmentally clean up those sites, and to demolish the buildings, bringing jobs back into them. The Community Development Block Grant program supports those functions.

I also serve as chairman of the Federalism and the Census Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Reform, and I recently held a subcommittee hearing on the administration’s proposal to consolidate existing direct grant economic and community development programs within the Department of Commerce. We heard information from the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities where they told of the success of these programs.

I want to thank the chairman for listening to the great degree of success that they have had in the past and looking to ways that we can continue to support this program.

So I appreciate the addition of the $1.140 billion and the notation of the support for the Community Development Block Grant program.

Mr. NUSSELE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Just to punctuate what the gentleman from Ohio and the gentlewoman from Connecticut said, we believe, as the restorative programs, we want to be partners with these communities in solving problems. We disagreed with the President in his budget with the changes that were made to the Community Development Block Grant; so we made that value judgment and change in this budget. We are supporting our mayors. We are supporting our communities. We want to be good partners, and we believe in local control in solving those problems. The big Federal Government cannot solve all these problems that these local folks are dealing with. We want to give them the opportunity to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa. Despite some occasional overheated rhetoric, the fiscal year 2006 budget resolution is, in fact, a modest attempt by a reasonable majority to hold down the growth of government spending. This is one of the strongest budgets I have seen since coming to Congress.

True, it makes tough choices. Imagine, it prioritizes spending, and it starts the long process of modernizing the Federal Government while rooting out waste, fraud, and inefficiency. But, in this budget, American taxpayers deserve no less, especially today. We are at war with an enemy who threatens us here at home and on the other side of the world.

Our security spending must therefore take priority, and in turn we must make difficult but necessary choices about non-security spending.

That is exactly what this budget does. It meets our needs at home and abroad without raising taxes, which would stifle our economy, or wasting money which undermines the hard work the American people did to earn those tax dollars in the first place.

Of course, for some people, regardless of the fiscal and international crises, taxes and spending are never high enough. This year, every year, they have warned us about the dire consequences of trusting the American people with their own money.

Last year, the same critics made the same criticism of our efforts, which we now know ultimately slowed the growth of non-security discretionary spending to about 1 percent. These critics assured us that our budget would bust a hole in the deficit projection. They thought it would, specifically because of the increased economic growth directly attributed to Republican tax relief passed since 2001.

Millions of jobs were created last year. Indeed, more than 3 million of them have been created since the House took up President Bush’s similarly criticized Jobs and Growth tax relief package 21 months ago.

So, in short, Mr. Chairman, the economic data coming in every month speaks to the wisdom of the fiscal policies of the Republican majority. The critics were just wrong, and they are wrong again this year.

The principal mantra against this budget is that it will explode the deficit, despite the evidence of last year’s shrinking deficit projections. What, our wonderful, do they think that the $67.1 billion in additional spending that they propose at the Committee on the Budget markup would do?

The balanced budgets of the late 1990s were passed by Republican Congresses, without much help from our friends on the other side of the aisle. Hardly any of them voted for it. How anyone takes credit for policies they opposed is beyond me, but I guess that is politics. But, again, so is the idea that raising $392.4 billion in new taxes, as Committee on the Budget Democrats propose, would somehow help the economy to create jobs.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the facts are indisputable: Democracy is on the march around the world; the war on terror is being won; the economy is growing; jobs are being created; deficit projections are shrinking; and the looming demographic crises facing Social Security and Medicare are being addressed, all thanks to the courage, the policies and the leadership of President Bush and this Republican Congress.

That the same people who have criticized us all along are criticizing our
budget today, Mr. Chairman, only suggests we must be doing something right.

So I urge all my colleagues to give more momentum to our success and support the budget resolution before us.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the gentleman.

I would point out that when the Bush budget summit agreement came to the floor of this House in the fall of 1990, after many arduous months of negotiation with the Bush administration and the Democratic leadership and the Republican leadership in the House, only 88 Republicans supported the passage of that bill, which had the President’s support behind it.

In 1993, when we passed the Clinton Budget Act and began the unprecedented march towards lower and lower deficits, eventuating in a surplus of $236 billion in the year 2000, not a single Republican in either House voted for that deficit reduction effort.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from South Carolina, our ranking member on the Committee on the Budget for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I had enough time to respond to the Majority Leader’s problems with this budget, but, in all honesty, the War on Terror, we just passed the supplemental that was not part of this budget, and most of us, in fact I voted for that supplemental because it was the War on Terror.

But I rise to oppose the drastic cuts in Medicaid in this budget resolution.

Medicaid is not the problem child of our health care system and should not take the fall for this administration’s inability to balance the budget.

Medicaid’s cost per capita growth is lower than Medicare or even private insurance, despite the fact that Medicaid has absorbed an increased beneficiary population due to gaps in Medicare coverage, an economic downturn and the decline of employer-sponsored health insurance. Medicaid is a success story in this country, not a program that belongs on the Federal chopping block.

As a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, I cannot support this budget resolution instruction to my committee to cut $20 billion out of Medicaid.

The robust Medicaid program is critical for the health care delivery in my home State of Texas. Forty-five percent of all infants born in Texas are covered by Medicaid, 45 percent. Nearly 50 percent of all children receiving care in our children’s hospitals are Medicaid beneficiaries. Medicaid is the single-largest health insurer for our Nation’s children, and the only program nerable in our society, our children, and still consider ourselves looking out for the least of this society?

To paraphrase the Bible, let us not suffer the little children. That is not our job here in this Congress. If Congress goes forward with these ill-advised Medicaid cuts, the States will be left holding the bag and their only option is to further cut back on vital services.

Mr. Chairman, 45 million Americans currently are uninsured. It makes no sense to slash Medicaid spending, which will virtually guarantee an increase in the number of uninsured in our country. Medicaid cuts will not benefit our troops; in fact, it will only make our problems worse.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak very briefly about an aspect of fiscal responsibility, the rule called pay-as-you-go, because there is a connection between our lack of fiscal responsibility and how we are caring for our military in vital services, like the $20 billion that people who are poor and dependent on Medicaid will be forced to endure.

Our colleagues in the majority have consistently opposed Democratic efforts to reinstate pay-as-you-go rules for both entitlement spending and new tax cuts. In fact, they just denied the House the ability to vote on such a proposal offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) and the Blue Dogs.

These PAYGO reforms were put in place in the 1990s and were essential to the successful effort achieved then to balance the budget. PAYGO reforms have been endorsed in their entirety by Alan Greenspan, but the Republicans do not want them applied to tax cuts. Why? Because doing so would require that they identify specific revenue measures, most likely spending cuts, which would provide the offsets, vital spending services being cut, such as Medicaid.

So we should reinstate PAYGO. We should not support this budget, that destroys so much which is a part of our health care delivery, Medicaid.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the alternative budget resolution that will soon be offered by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). I do so in light of the fact that the Republican budget resolution mirrors the President’s request for defense and the Spratt alternative matches this funding dollar-for-dollar, but the Spratt budget is better because section 401 of his resolution calls on the Congress to address serious shortcomings in both the President’s budget and the House Republican budget resolution.

Let me explain why I favor the Spratt alternative budget. The Republican budget only temporarily increases the death gratuity and the Service Members Group Life Insurance coverage. The Spratt budget would make these increases permanent. That is important.

The Republican budget omits targeted pay raises and enlistment bonuses for enlisted personnel. We know right now we are having a great deal of trouble enlisting young people, and because of some of the things you know, you enlist a soldier, but you retain families. These issues are critical to retaining experienced troops and maintaining readiness. The Spratt budget makes it a priority.

The Republican budget fails to increase funds for Family Service Centers to support the families of deploying troops. The Spratt budget takes care of that, and takes care of our military families.

The Republican budget shortchanges community-based health care organizations that care for the injured service men and women. The Spratt budget takes care of that. It pluses up the program.

The Republican budget does not aggressively fund nuclear nonproliferation programs. Both sides of the aisle, and as a matter of fact during the last campaign both the candidates for President, said that stopping a nuclear weapons threat was one of their top priorities. The Spratt budget supports that with dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the budget to be offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, a budget says a lot about our values. What this budget says to America’s veterans is that Congress does not value your service to your country. It makes a mockery of the American value of shared sacrifice in time of war. How does it do that? Let me explain.

This budget says to the person sitting there safely at home who makes $1 million in dividend income this year that you can keep every penny of your $220,000 tax break that the House Republican leadership has given you recently, every penny of that tax break.

But, on the other hand, it says to millions of America’s veterans that we are going to direct a $14 billion cut in veterans’ programs over the next 5 years. This budget even goes so far as to say they have to cut $798 billion out of disabled veterans’ monthly pensions, low income veterans compensation checks and veterans GI benefits, their education benefits, unless of course they want to go raise fees or, perhaps most likely, how about all of the troops, you know, you enlist a soldier, but you retain families.

Where is the American value, the American family value, in those priorities? To a millionaire, making every
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Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject the
values of this budget; reject the slap in
the face of millions of American veterans while codding the wealthiest in
our society, who are going to enjoy that $220,000 tax break they are making
by their riskless dividend income of $1 million this year.

Let us stand up for America’s veterans today when it counts. They may
appreciate our speeches on Veterans Day, but they need our voice.
That is the value that counts. Vote no on this unfair slap in the face to Amer-
ica’s veterans.

Mr. NUSSEL, Mr. Chairman, I yield 5
minutes to the gentleman from Indiana
(Mr. BUYER), a veteran and the chair-
man of the Committee on Veterans’ Af-

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to
congratulate you on this budget. I think
the American people are smart enough to recognize truth and dema-
goguery. That is what you hear on this
House floor is demagoguery, and that
is contemptuous of our country.

I believe that ensuring that the dis-
abled, the injured, the low-income and
special needs veterans are given the highest attention. That is the priority of
our Nation.

In establishing priorities of care for veterans’ health care, this Congress also
believes that the same military values that guided servicemembers on active duty should define how services
and assistance are provided to them as veterans. It is why we established the
priorities of care, one, two, three, four,
five, six, seven, eight.

This budget takes into consideration
the present budgetary constraints, the aging population, as well as the
influx of veterans into the system as
the Nation continues to fight the
war on terror throughout the world.

As chairman of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, I seek an increase in
$12.6 million for the medical and
professionals. I look forward to the
President’s budget request. We also in-
creased by $293 million for State nurs-
ing home partnership. We increase
about $300 million discretionary fund-
ning for veterans health care, despite
the demagoguery you will hear from
some Members on this floor.

To ensure that our national ceme-
terries are maintained as the shrines
that they are, my subcommittee chair-
man, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MI-LER), and I recommended an addi-
tional $45.6 million in construction to
begin a 5-year $300 million national
shrine commitment project to repair
and restore the existing national ceme-
terries. But while our greatest attention
ought to be on the veterans who have
served us and can no longer fend for
themselves, there is another group of
veterans that needs our help: our sol-
diers, sailors, airmen and Marines who
need assistance in returning to the
workforce or entering the workforce
for the first time after serving their
country.

This budget will also ensure that the
VA benefits take care of the young sol-
der coming home, as well as the older
soldier who may already have a family.
We need to make sure that the VA is
flexible and personal in its delivery of
health care and benefits, such as train-
ing and education.

This is a wise investment, harnessing
the same budget that has won our
Nation’s battles, to contribute to
our Nation’s workforce and to sustain
our national competitive edge. To fa-
cilitate this investment, I created a
new subcommittee solely devoted to
this effort chaired by the gentleman
from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSEL), as chairman of the Com-
mittee on the Budget, has done an out-
standing job. He has led Congress
through some challenging budgetary
years, but his efforts can now be seen
in the meaning of the attacks upon our
country on September 11. It was an
attack upon our freedom, upon our way
of life. It was devastating to our econ-
omy. That economic growth has re-
turned, but we also now need to man-
age that economic growth smartly.

There is a lot of rhetoric, but let me
return to some facts. Under this Presi-
dent, spending for veterans has in-
creased by 47 percent in 5 years versus
22 percent in the 8 years under the
Clinton administration.

If I turn to the chart to my left, as
the chart shows, over the last 7 years
discretionary spending has grown 39.5
percent under the VA-HUD appropri-
tions bill. That is a 4.9 percent average
increase for every year from 1998 all
the way to the present. So despite all the
rhetoric that America and my col-
elleagues will hear, the reality is this:
The President’s budget continues to increase, maintaining our com-
mitment to veterans in America.

I also would like to turn to a second chart I think is very interesting. On
this chart it shows what happened under the Democrat control of Con-
gress. Congressional spending per vet-
eran was flat. For 10 years a meager
$400 increase for 10 years from 1984 to
1994.

Can everybody see this? It was flat. To my colleagues on this side of the
aisle, do you see this? It was flat for 10
years. You did not hear demagoguery
on the House floor. What you had at
the time were individuals on both sides
of the aisle working together in a bi-
partisan way and dealing with veterans.

So what do we have under the Repub-
lican control the last 10 years is from
1995 to 2006 Congress increased spend-
ing by $1,400 per veteran, that is from
$2,773 to $4,176 per veteran. I think this
chart is very clear.

What has occurred under Democrat
control is flat-lined budget for vet-

s deficit.
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commitment to honoring the commitment of our Nation’s veterans.

The second chart that I have specifically talks to veterans medical care which has increased from 1995 to 2005, over a 10-year period, nearly 85 percent. And in the last 5 years, medical spending has increased from 68 percent, which is a commitment to our Nation’s veterans.

Let me talk about some other specific areas of improvement that we have made. We have allowed Guard and Reserve units to enroll in medical benefits. We have increased the GI benefits. We have made. We have allowed Guard and Reserve units to enroll in medical benefits. We have increased the GI benefit. We have made.

The reconciliation, Mr. Chairman, under the gentleman’s mark is $155 million. I believe that we can find that reconciliation number without enrollment fees, without drug co-pays because the Senate is funding, but better focused than the House who has probably some of the House committee division. And in turn, that same world wants us to make sense out of balancing our budget. These gentlemen are faced with that horrendous and impossible task of us and them owe a great debt of gratitude.

As the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) suggested, I have now the responsibility of chairing the Committee on Appropriations where, as they help us struggle with the budget, we spend money that has a propensity to violate that which is their guidelines for sensible budgeting. But in turn, over the years as I have observed this process there has been far too little communication, between those on the staff level but also the professional level within the committee itself, between the appropriations process and the budgeteers.

I must say that in the time I have had this job, the short time, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has gone out of his way to say time and time again, we want to work with you.

I have committed myself to trying to have that meaningful communication, that is their guidelines for sensible budgeting. But in turn, over the years as I have observed this process there has been far too little communication between those on the staff level but also the professional level within the committee itself, between the appropriations process and the budgeteers.
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Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

Mrs. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his leadership on this budget matter.

Shame, shame, shame. I cannot believe the Republican budget. Our men and women that serve this country are putting their lives on the line, and what are we doing? Cutting benefits and refusing service. I am reminded of the words of the first President of the United States, George Washington, whose words are worth repeating over and over again.

"The willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, especially the poor and the easy to govern, will be in direct proportion as to how they perceive the veterans of earlier wars are treated and appreciated."

The independent budget puts support by the veterans community as $360 billion. Unfortunately, that President Bush's budget and the House Republican Bush budget should be dead on arrival. Let me repeat that. I said that Bush's budget and the House Republican budget as it relates to veterans should be dead on arrival.

On top of all of this, this budget tells the Veteran's Affairs Committee, which I am on, to find $800 million in cuts over the next 5 years for savings. You know, the Republicans practice what I call reverse Robin Hood, robbing from the veterans to give tax cuts to the rich. The President keeps telling us what I call reverse Robin Hood, robbing from the veterans to give tax cuts to millionaires while the American people, given the enormous costs that have been left out of the budget. It is past time for this House to be honest and restore fiscal responsibility to this process and to the Nation, the same fiscal responsibility that each of our constituents face when they try to balance their household and business.

Unfortunately, this budget shows that the Republican Congress does not share the values of the American people. What type of values would cut funding to the Fire Act Grant Program which helps small communities improve new firefighter pay by 10 percent? Firefighters on the front lines of the war on terror in New Jersey stand to lose $4 million under this resolution, which means they will have less protective clothing, fewer portable radios than they need to protect our citizens.

What type of values would slash funding to the COP program by 95 percent, a program that has put over 4,800 police officers on the street in New Jersey? Would the Republican budget dismantle a critical instrument in New Jersey's fight against crime?

What type of values would raise health costs for many of the over 620,000 veterans in New Jersey, increasing enrollment fees that will cost veterans more than $11 billion over 5 years and drive more than 200,000 veterans out of the system entirely?

What type of values would cut discretionary health programs by 6 percent and slash Medicaid by billions of dollars?

New Jersey would lose more than $100 million per year in Federal Medicaid funding, enough funding to provide health coverage to 6,400 seniors or 34,000 children. And what type of values would underfund education and, specifically, the No Child Left Behind Act by over $12 billion, creating a 4-year deficit between what was promised and what was actually delivered of $39 billion?

If this budget passes, over 53,000 children in New Jersey will go without promised help in reading and math and $34,000 will no longer be able to enroll in the afterschool programs that not only keep kids safe but also boost academic achievement. That is why the Democratic substitute will restore fiscal responsibility to secure our homeland, provide for America's seniors and veterans, fund education initiatives to ensure the children's future success in an ever increasingly competitive world and lay the foundation for a society that truly reflects our values and our commitment to a better more prosperous and stronger America.

I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic substitute and vote down the woefully inadequate Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), a veteran of the United States Marine Corps, the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
priorities that matter to the everyday lives of all Americans: creating and keeping jobs, supporting community development and providing for a safe and secure homeland. Specifically, I led the effort to better ensure adequate funding for police, first responders and security at home.

Democrats and Republicans alike agree that our Nation’s top priority is keeping Americans and this Nation safe. After all, nothing else will matter if we cannot protect the people of this country right here at home.

Yet, at the same time, fire departments, police forces, ports and rail stations across the Nation are ramping up efforts to implement safety measures and better prepare for any kind of terrorist incident or extreme emergency. This budget proposes cutting the very programs that will help them meet these responsibilities.

Despite these dire warnings of security at our ports in particular, this budget proposal is $2.3 billion short of what the Coast Guard estimates it would cost to secure our ports.

Despite the fact that we cannot afford our first responders to be unprepared, this resolution recommends a reduction of $600 million in first responder funding.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that we must do better, that we have to make sure that our first responders at our ports meet the obligations to all Americans, that we do all that we can to make sure that our government, the Federal Government, helps our local communities be strong and be safe.

Mr. SPRATTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY).

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about who wins and who loses in the Bush Republican budget.

Three hundred thousand working poor who have children will be cut from the LIHEAP Program. I received a call today from a constituent from Lithonia, Georgia, complaining that her children depend on the food stamps she gets to stretch the family food budget.

LIHEAP is the Low Income Heating Assistance Program that makes sure our working families do not freeze during the winter, and the Republicans propose to cut that program even as heating costs rise.

While Republicans want us to believe that they really care about our children, the proof is in where they choose to put taxpayers’ money.

The Pentagon cannot account for $2.3 trillion. Halliburton walks away with over $100 million undeserved dollars. Secretary Rumsfeld says the U.S. can afford record defense expenditures, while the President proposes to cut all vocational education at the high school level, the Safe and Drug Free Schools program, the Upward Bound program and prevention. What could be more important to the Education President than to make sure that our young people graduate from high school with an education that has prepared them for life.

Well, I know the answer to that question. Not the mom and pop businesses on Main Street and their families, but the wealthy scions of industry on Wall Street.

Even chairman of the Federal Reserve System Alan Greenspan, lamented before our committee the growing wealth and education disparities in our country. Republicans will talk about growth, but they will not talk about how our country is growing apart.

They tell us that homeownership is on the rise, but they will not tell us that three-quarters of white families in this country own their homes while the majority of Asian Americans, Native Americans, Latinos and African Americans remain renters.

According to just about every reputable study, the disparity between black quality of life and white quality of life is not narrowing nearly as fast as we would like it to. In the last 6 years, wealth for white families grew by 37 percent while wealth for families of color fell. These numbers represent real people who have not felt one bit of Republican growth.

Mr. Chairman, too many Americans, especially African Americans and Latinos, cannot afford health care, housing and even a college education.

We have two choices: we can grow together, we can work. When we invested it in our people like Social Security, the GI bill, civil rights laws, affirmative action, America grew and we all grew together. But now because of the policies coming out of Washington, D.C., today’s wealthiest 10 percent own 70 percent of America’s wealth. It is clear that Americans are growing apart. The Republican budget ought to provide opportunity for all to experience America’s coming prosperity, but it is also clear that it does not.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

(Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate with great interest, and I keep hearing about cuts in the budget. Yes, they are real. All of the specific cuts are just not there. They do not exist in this budget.

What this budget does do, however, is it fulfills our Federal obligations while at the same time it reduces the deficit in half by the year 2009. We all know why we have a deficit. We have a deficit because when President Bush got elected, he inherited a recession. He inherited the burst of the Internet bubble, he inherited Wall Street scandals, and they still fall by 7 percent. These numbers, which is 911.

Despite that, because of the Bush policies and economic policies of this House, the economy is doing well again. If it was up to the Democrats, they would have raised taxes massively and destroyed the economy. Luckily we prevailed; the Democrats did not. And, therefore, we reduced taxes and the economy is once again doing well.

But I just hear about the Democrats all concerned about the deficit. Yet let me show Members what the Democrats, who tonight have been talking about how concerned they are about the size of the deficit and spending what they proposed just a few days ago.

They proposed in committee amendments that would have again increased spending by $67.1 billion, and yet they give us lip service tonight and continuously state they are concerned about the deficit. To borrow a phrase from a very well-known Democratic leader, Democrats are concerned about the deficit, they support reducing the deficit before they are against reducing the deficit. Democrats cannot have it both ways.

We have a deficit that is caused by too much spending. We have to reduce the deficit, so lip service and lip balm is fine; but when push comes to shove, they cannot comply. You cannot cut the deficit and then try to increase spending.

What the budget that the chairman is proposing does, it does address our responsibilities while reducing the deficit and while responsibly spending the taxpayers’ money.

I also heard, Mr. President, put your money where your mouth is. It is not our money, it is the taxpayers’ money.

That is the big difference. We remember it is not our money. That is why we are not willing to throw it away. It is the taxpayers’ money. This budget spends it responsibly. I thank the chairman for this very responsible budget and urge adoption of the budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATTS) for presenting a budget that has a better vision for the American people, and for the gentleman’s hard work that he does for the American people.

Mr. Chairman, the third year that I have been in the Congress. There has been a similar routine every year I have been here. We debate the budget and our side says it is a statement of our values, and we say it is a statement of who we are. I would add one observation to that. This is a process that tells us a great deal about whether we are who we say we are, because there is an irony that I see with my friends from the other side of the aisle.

As we move into the year and move into the holiday season, we spend a lot of time talking about shared benevolence, but they will pass a budget tomorrow that will cut $5 billion from
food stamps, and only 2 percent of people who are eligible receive food stamps. It is not a program filled with waste and fraud.

A lot of our friends on the other side of the aisle will talk about benevolence and the things they do in families and families having strong values, and yet they will vote tomorrow night to cut child care assistance. A lot of our friends on the other side of the aisle will talk about cutting taxes, and yet they will vote tomorrow night to raise taxes on people receiving the earned income tax credit.

And the other side of the aisle will talk about their belief in Social Security and their faith in that program and their refusal to touch it, and then they will cut SSI payments which are a major part of Social Security. A lot of our friends on the other side of the aisle will talk about their commitment to housing, and then they will vote to eliminate one of the most effective housing programs and the fair-trade-off.

And finally, a lot of our friends on the other side of the aisle will talk about their commitment to children and helping families raise their children with the right values, and then they will either freeze or leave virtually frozen child care services and day care services.

I am not one who likes to call names, but the word “hypocrisy” means you say one thing and you blatantly endorse another set of practices.

This is a debate about exactly who we will ask to sacrifice in this country. There is no question we have asked our veterans to sacrifice an enormous amount, and they belong in a category of their own; but there is another class of Americans who we also ask to sacrifice in this budget. We ask the most vulnerable people, the people in our society who are working and living by the sweat of their brow every day. We ask them to pay taxes to freeze or leave virtually frozen child care services and day care services.

I simply end by saying the Spratt budget presents a better vision for the American people and introduces a six-letter word into this debate that we have not heard all day, a word called “equity.” That is what separates our approach from theirs.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, colleagues will remember the Biblical story of the prophet Nathan coming to the mighty King David. Nathan told David a story about a rich man who had many sheep but took the one little ewe lamb of a poor man to feed a visiting friend. David flew into a rage at the rich man and proclaimed that anyone who should do such a thing deserved to be put to death for abusing his honored guest and eating so little compassion. Then Nathan said to David and said, “You are that man.”

This story should lead us to look into the mirror. Are we in danger of becoming “that man”? The Republican budget remedies poverty, education, Medicaid, community development, and small business lending. It raises taxes on the poor. And it does all this so the Republicans can afford new tax cuts for the wealthiest among us. If ever there were a moral issue before this Congress, surely it is this one.

One might expect that these cuts would at least result in significant decreases in our deficits, but this is not the case. On the contrary, we face the worst-of-both-worlds scenario in which we suffer both devastating cuts and dangerous increases in the deficit. We continue to borrow from our children to pay for tax cuts, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the President’s Social Security privatization.

As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to be good stewards of the resources of our government, not simply to look at our immediate desires, but also to the needs of our children and our children’s children, including their need to be free of a crippling debt.

Republicans claim to be a party of moral values, but their budget belies that claim. The Democratic alternative maintains current funding levels for our country’s critical domestic and security programs while also providing meaningful tax relief for middle-class Americans. Furthermore, the Democratic budget recognizes that fiscal responsibility is also a moral value by reinstating a real pay-as-you-go rule and by balancing our budget within 7 years. The Republican budget, on the other hand, continues to run up record deficits for as far as the eye can see.

Mr. Chairman, the budget process provides each party with a chance to put its money where its mouth is, to act on the rhetoric we all hear around here year round. A budget is a statement of moral priorities. May we do justice to those imperatives in the vote we cast tomorrow.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for an opportunity to speak out in appreciation of the work the gentleman has done to provide a balanced approach to meet our requirements in a fiscally responsible manner. I particularly appreciate the work done by the Democrats on the committee to deal with the environmental priorities of America.

I am saddened by a party-line vote that these proposals were rejected to be a part of the proposal brought forward by the majority. This budget is stunningly out of sync with where the typical American is in terms of protecting our environment and our natural resources. From oceans to brownfields, we have found environmental cleanup to be the obsession of misplaced budget priorities and an obsession with more tax cuts.

In areas of clean water, every independent outside organization, and most of them within government, have identified that we have a serious problem with the Nation’s aging water systems required to ensure safe drinking water; yet the President’s budget and what we have here today reduces almost $700 million for water quality responsibilities.

In the land and water conservation fund, we are breaking the promise that was negotiated here in the year 2000 where the conservation trust fund was established that should by now by incorporated into a result of both a bi-partisan, bicameral agreement be moving funds in the neighborhood of $2 billion for this fiscal year. But, unfortunately, this budget would turn its back on that responsibility.

Another important element is the land and water conservation fund authorized at almost $1 billion; yet this budget includes only $147 million for actual programs to help preserve parks, forests, wildlife refuges and open spaces, programs that are the parts of where they live at home, garnering broad bi-partisan support. This year the President and the Republicans go even further by eliminating the land and water conservation State grants programs which have provided critical funding to States and local communities to preserve open space and develop recreation facilities.

And one of the most significant broken promises is in the area of conserving the agricultural sector. One of the elements that was negotiated as part of the farm bill, there were going to be investments in farm conservation; and yet this budget takes something that is so critical to America’s farmers, particularly small and medium-sized operations, and cuts more than a half billion dollars from these vital farm bill conservation programs that unite rural America, conservation interests, people who care about natural resources.

There is currently over a $4 billion backlog of producers waiting to participate in these critical farm conservation programs. It is a travesty as far as the environment is concerned; and it is a sad, sad story for America’s farmers who deserve better. I strongly urge the rejection of the majority proposal.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to amplify on what the gentleman from Oregon has just stated.

Our budget would be $2.9 billion above theirs for the year 2006 for resources and the environment. That
makes a big difference when it comes to EPA, safe drinking water, the Land and Water Conservation Act; and over 5 years, our budget is $23 billion in resources and environment better than their budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 1/2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the shameful Republican budget. Yet again the Republican leadership neglects the needs of low and middle income families in order to provide hundreds of billions of dollars in tax cuts to the wealthiest of Americans. We should not be supporting this unfair budget that leaves people without adequate housing, without opportunities for a decent education or job training, and which passes billions of dollars of debt to our children.

I am especially concerned about the Community Development Block Grant. Mr. Chairman, the Community Development Block Grant is the only source of funds that some of our small towns and cities have to deal with housing, to deal with programs for seniors citizens, at-risk youth or to deal with the infrastructure. Many of the small cities just do not have the money to deal with some of the problems of the sewer systems and roads and other kinds of things. But with the Community Development Block Grant, they have the flexibility. This is a very, very respected program. They have the kind of extensive community planning that brings in all of the community groups and organizations, the 501(c)3 nonprofit organizations, and they actually go through all of the programs and they decide which of these programs will be funded. To talk about cutting this is very, very cruel. I have received just hundreds of calls from mayors and city council members who say, "Please, whatever you do, don't cut CDBG."

Since the President initially proposed consolidating CDBG and other development programs into one grant program, have I received one of these letters from members of city councils and mayors, they have basically said without this program, many of their cities will simply collapse.

In addition to these cuts, the President has already proposed to cut public housing by 10 percent, section 811 disabled housing by 50 percent, housing opportunities for persons with AIDS by 14 percent, and other HUD programs. Yet the Republican budget resolution promises to make even more draconian cuts to these programs. We simply cannot afford to do that.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget and to support a budget that invests in the future of our country. This is shameful and unconscionable that they can even bring this budget to the floor. I ask for a "no" vote on the Republican budget and an "aye" vote on the Democratic budget.

Mr. NUSSELE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the budget brought forth by the gentleman from Iowa and the Committee on the Budget. We have not only, I think, the right but the duty as the legislative branch of government to perform the oversight function of the executive branch. As the gentleman from Iowa pointed out before the Committee on Rules yesterday, we really have not done that since 1997. The reality of the matter is that everything has been on automatic pilot basically since 1997 and I think we must perform our oversight duty.

We have heard the word "draconian" with regard to supposed cuts being proposed in this budget. I think it is important to look at what the budget proposed by the Committee on the Budget calls for with regard to what constitutes the most dangerous threat on the horizon to our economic well-being, strength in this country, the great, extraordinary growth that is referred to as mandatory spending, spending that is built into the law, that the appropriators do not have anything to do with because it is built into the law, this budget initiatives a process of review and of study, oversight, so that the growth in what is almost 60 percent of the budget and projected to continue to grow and continue to grow, the growth in the mandatory spending will be reduced from 6.4 percent to 6.3 percent, one-tenth of 1 percent. Not a cut, a reduction in the growth.

We have an obligation to perform oversight, Mr. Chairman. I commend the gentleman from Iowa and the Committee on the Budget as I strongly support this budget. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process of the Committee on Rules, along with our full committee chairman the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the rest of the House leadership and the gentleman from Florida, I will be doing our part to carry forth what we consider our legal obligation, oversight. We will be studying the budget process and seeing how it can better be enforced.

This is a responsible budget, it is a reasonable budget, it is one meant to contribute to the continued economic health of the United States. I strongly support it and urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. Chairman, before yielding to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), I yield myself such time as I may consume because he is going to address education. I would like to make it clear that education is one of those areas in our budget where we have made a decided improvement and have a notable advantage over the Republican resolution.

Our budget resolution rejects their education cuts. Our budget resolution provides $4.5 billion more for next year, 2006, and over the next 5 years $41 billion more than their budget resolution. In a kind of fundamental way, if funding, cannot only preserve current education programs such as vocational education, funded at $1.3 billion which the President and their resolution would simply exterminate, wipe out, it also builds increases in priority programs like special education. The additional funding we are providing can also help close the gap in funding for No Child Left Behind. $12 billion below this year and next year below where it was authorized to be when the act was passed.

Our budget rejects the reconciliation instructions to the Education Committee calling for $21 billion in savings over 5 years. We do not know where this is coming from. It include the President's student loan proposals that would raise loan fees. We do not end the students' ability to consolidate their student loans at fixed interest rates. We do not eliminate Perkins loans, for goodness sake, and we do not force colleges to repay prior Perkins contributions. We do provide the funding to raise the Pell grant, not just $100 every year for 5 years but $100 every year for 10 years. The Bush administration and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSELE) and the Republicans claim that is provided for, but that can only be funded in their budget through reconciliation; that is, through taking it out of other student loan programs.

I have a different approach to education, a much greater emphasis on education. It is one of those things in our budget which we have singled out as deserving of additional funding. Even though we keep everything at the level of current services, a few things we plus-up to the detriment of other things, but education is one of those things we emphasize and plus-up.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I believe very strongly in balancing our budget and reducing our deficit, but I think we need to set certain priorities that are important to our families. My hope is that we do this in a bipartisan approach, that we develop a consensus, and I do want to thank the gentleman from Iowa and the committee for allowing us to put some committee report language dealing with education in the budget and with results-oriented budgeting which I believe we need here at this House.

We need to balance the budget, but I think we need to protect our families and we need to make sure that we ensure that we are not trying to fix the
deficit on the backs of the country’s working class.

The budget includes the termination of 150 programs. Nearly one in three of them are in education. It eliminates programs essential to our children’s futures. Start, Bilingual Education, Talent Search, Gear Up, Perkins loans, Pell grants and LEAP programs. It also does not allow us to give the full funding for special education. It also eliminates certain programs, such as rural education, narrowly $1.3 billion in cuts. The safe and drug-free schools State programs which are so vital to our communities is eliminated.

And I believe in education. In my life, education has been one of the most invaluable tools that has made it possible for me to open up doors, move forward to attain higher goals and make my dreams a possibility. I feel very strongly about financial aid. In fact, I think that is how we fund the funding to these vital education programs, especially increasing the $100 maximum Pell grant award. This fulfills the President’s request of increasing the maximum Pell grant by $100 without paying for it by taking from other parts of the education budget.

As a member of the Committee on the Budget, I think we should ensure that the Federal Government investment is available to fulfill our commitment to helping low income students get into and graduate from college. College enrollment is slated to grow by almost 19 percent between now and 2015. This group increasingly will be comprised of full-time, nontraditional students, college age, first generation, low income and minority students. Most of these will likely need and will qualify for student financial aid.

My test for considering any budget proposal is whether it will make our families stronger. This budget proposal in my opinion does not make our families stronger. I urge our colleagues to vote in favor of strengthening and protecting our classrooms and for our kids with special needs, I am proud of what we have done. These green charts do not mean anything compared to what it has meant in the lives of the kids that are receiving a quality education and it has unlocked opportunity for them that is boundless. That is because we have invested there.

I just want to end with this. It is not only about the money. We come down here with these green bar charts as if to say, if I spend this much it means that I don’t care and if I spend this much it means that I am caring a little more, or here I am caring a little more. Watch out, here I am caring some more. It is getting higher. I am caring even more.

And the more we spend, the more we care. And the more we invest, the more we care. And we measure by green charts the compassion, the caring, the value, as if money alone is the only measure.

I have got to tell my colleagues something. Take special education. Go talk to any one of their teachers back home in the special education classroom and ask them whether they have seen these increases in their classrooms. Do the Members know what is going on, Mr. Chairman? The States are taking that money, and it is not getting through their bureaucracy. We are getting the money to Washington, but it is not getting to the classroom teacher teaching our child.

So their chart may look a little bit bigger; our chart may look a little bit bigger, and our charts look great, and it doesn’t do it.

And that is the last chart I want to show you. For all of the chest beating about education and the priority, see that little red line of the total amount spent on education in our country? That is what the Federal Government kicks in. We are talking, on any given day, like about 6 percent. The people who are doing the work here are our local school boards, our local State legislators, our local parents and community leaders. They are kicking in all this amount right here. That is what is being kicked in. It is this little red part that we all of a sudden think is so important and that we beat our chests about.

The Federal Government is not going to solve education, Mr. Chairman. Not with a big red line or a little red line or the amount of money. It is not about the money. It is about the results. We have got to focus on results in education, and this budget accomplishes that.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I have a great deal of respect for the chairman of the Committee on the Budget. He is a friend of mine. He has got a tough job, trying to bring forth a budget priority that reflects his caucus’s wishes in that.

But let us set the facts straight here. The Democratic alternative does a lot better when it comes to support of the education programs than our Republican counterpart. We also in our budget proposal reinstitute the pay-as-you-go rules so that if we are proposing a spending increase or a tax cut in one area, we are going to find an offset in the budget to pay for it. Their budget does not do it.

Our budget is also out for 10 years that shows that we come to balance by 2012. Their budget is a 5-year proposal. And the reason they do not do it at 10 years is because their deficits explode in the second 5 years. But their budget has also hidden the true and real cuts that are occurring in their education programs, ones that affect real people, students, who are real-life conditions that will not help improve the condition of education or access to higher education, which we desperately need in this country.

Their budget proposal actually calls for eliminating $4.3 billion worth of education programs in the next fiscal year alone. They completely wipe out vocational education, the Federal commitment to that. They completely wipe out all the Federal education technology programs that exist. They wipe out Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Grants programs. They also get rid of TRIO and GEAR UP, targeting low-income students who want to go on to
post-secondary education opportunities. They wipe out Even Start Family Literacy programs. And their proposals also hurt students by raising fees for student loans for higher education, ending students' ability to consolidate the loan at a lower interest rate, and not only eliminating the Perkins loan program, as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) indicated, but also forcing colleges to repay prior Federal Perkins contributions.

The Democratic alternative is better than that. We restore these funding cuts as well as $4.5 billion in the next fiscal year alone. Talk to any administrator, any teacher throughout the country wrestling with implementing the unfunded Federal mandate called No Child Left Behind, and they will say what these requirements are doing to their school districts with the lack of funding to back up those requirements. Talk to special education teachers, and they tell you the lack of education commitment at the Federal level, only 18.6 percent of the 40 percent cost share that we promised for special education funding is putting student against student in our public classrooms throughout the country.

We can do a better job. The Democratic alternative does do a better job, while staying true to fiscal discipline and fiscal responsibility by reinstituting the pay-as-you-go rules that worked very well in the 1990s and led us to 4 percent surplus, while also maintaining a crucial investment in education programs.

As a Member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I am heading to China in a couple of days in order to visit their colleges and universities. Guess what? China and India are making a major education investment in the future of their countries. They are graduating more engineering students than we are today. They are emphasizing math and science and engineering programs while we are starting to cut back in these crucial education areas. Do people want a recipe for economic disaster? The Republican budget and their lack of commitment for education is a sure way of getting us there.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For the purposes of entering into a colloquy, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. ANN DAVIS).

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Over the past decade, funding for NASA's Aeronautics Research and Development has declined by more than half, to about $900 million. The President's budget promises to cut aeronautics research by 20 percent over the next 5 years.

I am concerned that the United States is losing critical expertise in aeronautics and development. This degradation will have a tragic impact on military and civilian aviation, which contributes significantly to our national defense and our economy. I believe that the President's funding levels for aeronautics programs should be reassessed and that the House should give priority to restoring these vital programs.

Will the gentleman commit to bringing the conference report language that will clarify that the resolution makes no assumption regarding the President's proposed funding level for NASA's Aeronautics Research programs?

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the answer is yes to start with. First and foremost, I appreciate her leadership and concern about the research programs that we have for NASA. She does an excellent job there, and we really appreciate the leadership she takes in that.

The gentlewoman knows that the resolution, while it tracks the President's overall number, it does not make any specific decisions about the different funding levels for NASA, as we have it in some of these major categories. It goes actually back to what the gentleman was saying on education. We cannot find in the budget any of what the gentlewoman from Wisconsin just talked about in education. It is a great speech, but we cannot find it in the budget.

And the same is true with so much of this.

So the Committee on Appropriations is the one that is going to make these determinations. The same is true for NASA. And we appreciate that her advocacy and mine is going to have to be brought to bear as we work on that.

So that being the case, I do commit to the gentlewoman to bring back from the conference language clarifying that the budget does not make these specific assumptions regarding the President's proposed level for these programs and urging that the levels for NASA should be reassessed. There is no question that RD&D is important, and I know that appropriation is with that. I know the gentlewoman from Virginia agrees with that. I agree with that, and I have no doubt that they will bring back a bill with that in mind.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for his answer.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT of South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), a former mayor, to talk about community development programs in our budget resolution versus theirs.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Members on the Republican side of the aisle this evening to find one Republican mayor in America, one who favors what they are about to do to the Community Development Block Grant program.

And what is it used for? Overwhelmingly, it is used for housing. The number one standard unit of housing in America that have been brought back to life because of CDBG allocations is most impressive. And then let us throw in the next part of what CDBG does. It provides ample opportunity for economic development and expedites the paving of a roadway to an industrial park so that there can be new business growth and new job opportunities in cities and towns across America.

And what else might they do with it? There are all kinds of public parks across this country that have succeeded because of Community Development Block Grant programs. Some of them in the lowest income neighborhoods of America. And do my colleagues know what else? Some of them in great middle-income neighborhoods across this Nation as well.

As a member of the alumni association that is exceeded in size in this Congress, called Former Mayors, I might point out that if we assembled mayors across America, the United States Conference of Mayors, we would be hard pressed to go into that room and find one mayor who supports what they are about to do to the most popular domestic urban program called Community Development Block Grant money.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

In response to my friend from Massachusetts, he is right and I agree with the Community Development Block Grant program has been extraordinarily successful. It has had broad bipartisan support for as long as I can remember. And we ask, how that did come about? It came about because Republicans Governor in America, a Republican named Richard Nixon who created what he believed to be the new federalism, and there were overwhelming majorities of Democrats in the Congress who accepted that leadership. It was a simple idea that Washington, because from time to time they exacerbate problems at the local level, and in that was to be the case, how would we funnel some resources to the local government but allow, and listen to the people it is called a product of the Community Development Block Grant program, local decision-making, meaning that the problems that confront the citizens of America, regardless of political philosophy, it is a great speech, but we find it in the budget.

And the same is true with so much of this.

So what does this Congress decide to do with this extraordinarily popular and successful initiative? They are going to cut it. They are going to cut it back. I do not think we can find a Republican Governor in America who supports what they are about to do with the Community Development Block Grant program.

And what is it used for? Overwhelmingly, it is used for housing. The number one standard unit of housing in America that have been brought back to life because of CDBG allocations is most impressive. And then let us throw in the next part of what CDBG does. It provides ample opportunity for economic development and expedites the paving of a roadway to an industrial park so that there can be new business growth and new job opportunities in cities and towns across America.

And what else might they do with it? There are all kinds of public parks across this country that have succeeded because of Community Development Block Grant programs. Some of them in the lowest income neighborhoods of America. And do my colleagues know what else? Some of them in great middle-income neighborhoods across this Nation as well.

As a member of the alumni association that is exceeded in size in this Congress, called Former Mayors, I might point out that if we assembled mayors across America, the United States Conference of Mayors, we would be hard pressed to go into that room and find one mayor who supports what they are about to do to the most popular domestic urban program called Community Development Block Grant money.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

In response to my friend from Massachusetts, he is right and I agree with
Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the budget resolution and in support of the Democratic substitute. In the last 3 years, the Republican Congress has enacted three tax cuts, resulting in the three largest deficits in history, all the while on top of the record $400-plus billion deficits and $2.4 trillion of additional debt. This budget does not account for the $300 billion of the Iraqi-Afghanistan war, the $900 billion for the prescription drug benefit they passed, and the $1.9 trillion needed to privatize Social Security.

If this is an example of what a conservative philosophy is, we cannot afford this fiscal mess any more, and one thing we can always say about the Republican budget is we will be forever in your debt.

The CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, has attested to all of these figures, but nothing honestly reflected in this resolution.

But while leaving a sea of red ink for future generations, what does this budget do to the middle class, who are facing rises costs in health care and college education? This budget cuts the health care professional training by $300 million, it cuts community health by $280 million, it cuts extended health care facilities for veterans by $105 million, and it eliminates the Preventive Health Care Block Grants. It also underfunds the National Institutes of Health Care Block Grants. It is a devastating approach to investing in America's future. Who knew when George Bush declared he was against nation building, it was America he was talking about?

We need a new direction and a new set of economic policies to put the middle class families and their economic interests at the heart of our economic policies. To think that the policies or the stewardship of the Republican Congress over the last 4 years has led to $2.4 trillion in additional debt, three consecutive years of the largest deficits in the history of the country, and all under the rubric of being a conservative, it is a fascinating approach, and all the while we are cutting health care, investments in America, cutting college tuition assistance to middle class families, opening doors to their future, it is a fascinating approach nobody has ever really thought of as a way to build America's future as one that is brighter. Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just respond and say it is fascinating. It is fascinating how we got into this situation. And if you heard the gentleman who just spoke, if you wondered whether or not he may have been reading the newspaper and may be forgetting all of the things that have been happening to our country over the last going on 4 years, you might wonder if he was paying attention, because he is correct.

On September 10, 2001, we were running a surplus. There is no question that that was a good thing, something was very positive about that. But, unfortunately, we learned the very next morning that we had a homeland security deficit, that we had a national defense deficit. Our economy was already in a recession, and we found out we had an economic growth deficit. So even though there was more cash in the Federal Treasury than we were using, and you can call that a surplus, that did not mean we were meeting the needs of our country. There were many other challenges that we had to meet, and the next morning we found out.

And all of the votes, all of the spending votes, I will go back to the record, all of the spending votes that the gentleman was just talking about under our management, the gentleman from Illinois voted for; voting for our troops, voting for homeland security, voting for education. I will go back to each one of those appropriations bills and the gentleman from Illinois voted for each one of those. The only one he does not like, if you take away all of the clutter, is he wants to increase taxes. He did not like that part. But all of the spending he voted for.

So, let us just boil it down: There are people who want to increase taxes, and that is fine, and there are people who want to control spending, and that is also fine. But it is not all of this mismanagement.

People say Republicans did all of this mismanagement. I think Osama bin Laden had a lot more to do with where we are today with the deficit than anybody else, than anybody else.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of me taking this time was just to remind everybody that it was not just Republicans that were here voting for those things, and there were probably a lot of reasons why we got into this situation that had nothing to do with JIM NUSSLE or the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL). It probably had more to do with Osama bin Laden than just anybody else.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, democracy is sweeping the world and we should be proud that our country has become the greatest force for dignity of men and women in history. But if you look back at history, at past democracies, you will see that many collapsed because they could not pay the interest on debt. Athenians and the French republics, the budding democracies in Latin America, all collapsed in debt, which led to dictatorship. But that should
never happen here. This is a hard line budget, because the threat to freedom is also overspending, debt and instability.

In America, the Federal Government made a basic promise in the 19th century to provide for the common defense. Including the War on Terror, this promise to defend America is very expensive. It is expensive to send armies to Afghanistan or to stand watch across the demilitarized zone in Korea. But we must do this, and we must fully support Americans in uniform.

In the 20th century, the Federal Government made a second promise, to ensure retirement security for Americans who worked hard and played by the rules. The Social Security and Medicare programs face real challenges as the baby-boom generation retires. We are now expecting the number of people under Social Security and Medicare to rise from 40 million to 90 million.

Social Security recipients used to live, when Roosevelt created the program of only 11 months, but now people are on Social Security on average 22 years. So the size of meeting the retirement promise at present is extremely large, in fact beyond the current means of this government.

We are commanded to be fiscal conservatives to meet the needs of our common defense and the 20th century’s promise of retirement security. We cannot start new programs, because we should honor these promises first.

Some say we should borrow more; we already borrow too much and we have seen past democracies drown in debt. Some would like us to raise taxes, killing economic growth, but we cannot kill economic growth. Our growing economy right now is already yielding the revenue to meet the Nation’s needs, but for the foreseeable future those new dollars should be used to support Americans in uniform and to already honor the retirement security promises that the Federal Government has made.

Our chairman has done a good job, a budget that stands for restraint, that continues the course of a free people being free, that grows our economy. We could say yes to everyone. We could say yes, and then we would be much more popular in the short run. But in the long run there would be more debt, a smaller economy, a smaller future for our children. I am for less debt, rather than more. I am for more economic growth, rather than less. I am for honoring the basic promises the Federal Government has made to provide for the common defense and the retirement security of older Americans.

That should not be done on borrowed money, on borrowed time. It should be done with a growing economy. It is understandable, with this discipline, that this budget comes before the House, and we should honor that work.

Mr. SPRAT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget that we are considering assumes funding for the Community Development Block Grant Programs that for this coming year is $1.5 billion below last year’s level adjusted for inflation. And while I am permitting to some to hear the words of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget tell us that they like local control of Community Development Block Grants, they seem to like it $1.5 billion less than they did last year. And when they tell us that they like Community Development Block Grants so much that they are funding it more than President Bush proposes, that just means they are pok- ing it with one fist instead of with two, because his is a really draconian cut, and he told the American people, in terms of the child, to have a little less painful than what he proposes to do.

Community Development Block Grant is a mouthful, but in a little town like Freer, Texas, it is concerned with the holes of abandoned septic systems for the children and the families that have drowned, and they do not have a reliable sewer system there, so they have used the Community Development Block Grant Program for the health and safety of that community.

In McAlester, Texas, in Austin, Texas, it is the principal source of funding to help with affordable housing for seniors, for those with disabilities, for poor people, to have a chance to share in rehabilitated housing, some new housing.

In many of these communities, the dollars are going to food banks, they are going to assist in a variety of social programs that are stretched and strained that municipalities could not do without the Community Development Block Grant program.

The reason we are faced with this kind of challenge, as with the other challenges in this budget, it does not have anything to do with Osama bin Laden; it has to do with the decisions that were made down the street on Pennsylvania Avenue and that were implemented by this Republican Congress.

Indeed, with the budget that we are considering tonight, this administration says to those who are poor, who are uninsured, essentially what Leona Helmsley said, that only the little people pay taxes. Well, this administration thinks that only the little people, like the folks in Freer, Texas, only the little people ought to bear the burden of its fiscal irresponsibility.

We have never had a more fiscally irresponsible administration than the one we have in office today, that has driven the deficit to the highest level in American history and then turns to poor people in Freer, Texas, to kids that are trying to get a decent education, to our veterans, and says you bear the burden. You dig us out of this hole we dug into with your little shovels to make up for the big shovels where we shoveled out all the revenue to those at the top of the economic ladder.

It is unfair, and that is why this budget ought to be rejected.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I found the rhetoric on the budget particularly interesting over the course of a wide variety of issues. One near and dear to my heart is the issue of veterans care. I can speak to this issue with a great deal of authority that very few of my colleagues in this body can as a member of the American Legion, a member of the 82nd Airborne Division Association, a member of the Army Ranger Association and a member of the Association of Graduates of the United States Military Academy.

Being both a former soldier and an officer who served here and abroad, I am concerned that we keep our commitment to our veterans, those who have laid their lives on the line and in many cases borne a great price to protect our freedom, the price that we have here to have this dialogue.

Unfortunately, there is a tremendous amount of misinformation that is going around the public right now. I found this unfortunately being passed on, to veterans in my own district, that not only factually, the facts in favor of what I would consider a shameless play at political power.

The facts speak to themselves. As a former numbers person, I would like to point out that in the chart that we referenced, that spending per veteran has increased dramatically. Indeed, total veterans spending in the 2006 budget is $68.9 billion. There are considerable monthly payments for veterans, and the budget provides $31.7 billion, an increase of $777 million, for veterans’ medical care and other discretionary spending.

These increases in this budget carry on a commitment to our Nation’s veterans that, over the past 11 years, has been reflected in veterans spending since 1995 when Republicans took control of Congress.

We can see that the rhetoric from the past is hollow from when there was a Democratic majority in this body and also a Democratic administration.

What we have seen since Republicans took control of the House is a steady increase, particularly after President Bush was elected, in making sure that our veterans’ needs were cared for. Spending for veterans’ medical care increased 88 percent, from $16.2 billion to $29.9 billion. Indeed, the number of veterans receiving care has increased from 2.5 million veterans to 4.8 million, a 92 percent increase.

The facts speak for themselves. And, again, the shameless rhetoric is hollow.
Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to be here on the floor speaking on this subject since some may know I left this place for 16 years, and coming back to the floor of the House and having an opportunity to serve on the Budget Committee has given me a perspective that I did not have before. Being away from this place for 16 years gave me a little bit of a bird's eye view of how the rest of the public views what we do here. And I just must say that during the several years that I was embarking on my endeavor to return to this House, I was constantly reminded by the people that I came into contact with in my district as to the spending spree they believe the Congress has gone on and been involved in over the last number of years. The amount of discretionary spending that we have had in terms of its increase is remarkable. I wish they could go back 16 years from when I left this wonderful institution back in 1989 to show what we are talking about. This chart merely goes back to 1994, but it shows us spending $513 billion in 1994, and we are talking about now stretching our way to $900 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I was in my office watching some of this debate, and I heard what appeared to me to be crocodile tears expressed by some on the other side about how much we are cutting. And I guess only in this institution is a little restraint in the amount that we are spending in addition to what we did in the past considered a cut. Where I come from, cut is not a four letter word. Most American citizens, most of the people in my district believe that if you spent too much, maybe you ought to look on the side of spending restraint.

The response we got in committee time and time again from the other side was, why do we not just raise taxes? And I cannot even calculate the increased number of veterans you could cover all the programs they want. As part of the requirements under the budget act, the Budget Committee gives an opportunity for any Member in the House to appear for 10 minutes to talk about the matter within the province of the Budget Committee and I was privileged to accept that duty for perhaps the last hour. And I remember those coming up to talk about the Community Development Block Grant program which has been tested time and again with little other than a promise of more funding. There were effective in citing a quotation from the mayor of the town in which I was born, someone whom I know.

And in response to that, I said, I think it is a worthy program, but could you please tell me, if we do not cut this, where we should find the money to fund it? And the response I received was, that is not our job; that is somebody else's job. And that is the problem with the Congress, at least as I see it. And in response to that, I said, if you are always asking for a tax cut on a series of things that would save if you did not provide that tax cut on a series of things that would save you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you don't have if you cut the amount that a budget is about making choices.
straightforward, and we will be asking our Members to make those choices.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague and good friend for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to support the Congressional Black Caucus fiscal year 2006 budget substitute which has three main focuses.

First and foremost, it restores fiscal responsibility to the Federal budget process. Secondly, it keeps our Nation’s promises to our veterans and provides the equipment and materials needed to support our men and women on active duty. Thirdly, this budget funds efforts to close gaps and eliminate disparities in America’s communities and among its citizens.

We restore fiscal responsibility by closing tax loopholes and eliminating the repeal of the limitation on itemized deductions, the phase-out of personal exemptions scheduled to take place between 2006 and 2010. We get rid of abusive shelters and tax incentives for offshoring jobs. This budget reduces the deficit by $167 billion over the House majority budget over the next 5 years which reduces our interest payments by $27 billion.

Mr. Chairman, our colleagues on the other side are fond of talking about supporting and respecting our troops, but they do not put their money where their mouths are. The Republican budget resolution mandates almost $800 million in cuts to veterans mandatory programs. These are reductions in disability compensation, pension benefits, education benefits, and death benefits.

The President also proposes to increase fees and drug payments on veterans benefits. The Congressional Black Caucus budget provides $500 million more for HOPE VI. All these programs are crucial to ensuring the economic security of the most vulnerable Americans. The CBC budget also restores approximately $50 million in funding to the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program. It allocates an additional $880 million for the Minority Health Initiative and $500 million for Community Health Centers. These programs are vital to providing primary health care for our minority communities.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget punishes people. It punishes them by making them choose between their health or their housing. The CBC budget allows people to have access to both.

The Republican budget erodes our economic security. It weakens our community. It leaves our infrastructure crumbling. The Republican support of outdated weapons systems, wasteful defense programs, reckless tax cuts, and irresponsible deficit spending relegates economic security priorities to the back burner.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, first, let me just thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and for his leadership; also to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, and to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SCOTT) for their leadership in spearheading this very responsible alternative budget.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget does not only fiscally responsible but it also reduces our Federal deficit by $167 billion. It rescinds the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts for individuals making more than $200,000. It re-invests in our communities, especially our children. The CBC budget fails to adequately support homeland security priorities.

Our budget strengthens economic security priorities by easing disparities in housing and health care for example. The President’s budget eliminated the Community Development Block Grant program which provides financial assistance towards improving housing and economic conditions in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods. That is why I am very proud to support the CBC budget that provides $1.12 billion more than the Republican budget to the CDBG initiative. The President’s budget cut and closed the Brownfields Redevelopment Program, but our budget adds $24 billion. The Brownfields Redevelopment Initiative provides important incentives for hazardous site cleanup and redevelopment. It is crucial to the health and safety of our communities, especially our children.

The CBC budget also provides an additional $880 million for Section 8 housing and $500 million more for HOPE VI. All these programs are crucial to ensuring the economic security of the most vulnerable Americans. The CBC budget also restores approximately $50 million in funding to the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program. It allocates an additional $880 million for the Minority Health Initiative and $500 million for Community Health Centers. These programs are vital to providing primary health care for our minority communities.

As a Member representing one of the largest ports in the country, it is clear to me that there needs to be significant increases in port security funding. The CBC budget provides $500 million more for port and container security. At a time when our ports remain one of our most vulnerable targets, allocating funds in this area is essential. Unfortunately, the Republican budget fails to adequately support homeland security priorities.

The President, on the other hand, has increased funding for Pell grants by taking needed funds from programs such as the school lunch program for low-income children.

Mr. Chairman, there is no greater betrayal or broken promise to the American people than that which can be found in the President’s budget for rural America.

The President recommends cutting agricultural programs by $9 billion over 5 years, and the Republican budget has suggested cutting the program by only $5 billion. On the other hand, the CBC budget increases funding for programs that benefit rural communities by more than $2 billion for agricultural issues by more than $300 million; increase funding for community and resource development by more than $1.5 billion, Community Development Block Grants by $1.1 billion.

In addition, the Republican budget cuts funding for 17 different community and economic development programs that provide housing, water and sewer improvements and small business loans.

Mr. Chairman, in this budget we maintain tax cuts for wage earners making less than $200,000 a year, and we roll back cuts on the top 2 percent of Americans, and by doing so, we have saved almost $47 billion that we have used to invest in the human assets of this country, the American people.

I thank my colleagues so much for yielding me the time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, first, let me just thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and for his leadership; also to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). I yield the balance of my time to my colleague from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).
bill, and there were several amendments that had to do with veterans’ catastrophic health conditions, and unfortunately, in the bankruptcy bill markup we did not succeed in supporting veterans, those of us who supported that, particularly Democrats. So I stand as well support the Democratic alternative over the Republican budget—because both the CBC Budget and the Democratic Budget supports people.

Let me spend some time on the Congressional Black Caucus budget and really focus on why this is so very important, what it means for us to rise on the floor of the House and to argue a certain focus, and I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) for leading us in this direction and, of course, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who will offer this amendment tomorrow.

Let me start out by saying something that I am not making up, but let me just take it out of fiscal year 2006. The President’s budget shows that the President’s mark, the administration’s mark, his first thought was to cut $60 billion out of Medicaid. There is some plussing up, $15 billion, and so someone said there is a net in cuts because we have got a little increase, but let me just say the intent of the administration was to cut $60 billion out of Medicaid. That goes to the very heart of health care for the uninsured, the disabled, those in nursing homes, and we are to pass a budget with that kind of insult, if you will, to the needs of Americans around this Nation?

In addition, the budget that was offered cut the community block grants $1.5 billion, and here is where the Congressional Black Caucus budget comes into play.

We understand the need to protect the troops. We have provided dollars for armor. In fact, Mr. Chairman, we have appropriated over $6.7 billion, or $6.7 million for body armor, $10 million for ammunition for the Marine Corps and small arms for Army, $1 billion for building maintenance and $5 million for studying instances of waste, but at the same time we provide $1.12 billion back into the Community Block Grant Program which helped to reinvest in our local communities and helped to provide for affordable housing. We believe in investing in America. The community is the most important element of the press, the rural community, the urban community, and that is what the Congressional Black Caucus does.

So we restore the Medicaid funds. We ensure that in restoring those Community Block Grant funds we answer the question.

In the President’s budget, child care funding, losses in purchasing power, billions of constant dollars, we will see in that budget the inability, up to 2010, to be able to provide real child care for those who need it, and if there is anything that I get asked about when I go home, it is the parents, single parents and young parents, with low income who cannot afford to provide child care, and as we can see the purchasing power will go down, down up to 2010, and we will not have the ability to purchase child care in America for those who need it.

So the Congressional Black Caucus recognizes that and provides that funding. In addition we also, if you will, take care of Social Security.

In the President’s mark, there is a mention of a Social Security transition cost, but there is no accounting for it. There is no money for it. So the Congressional Black Caucus budget takes into account affordable housing, Medicaid, the needs of our troops, investment in security and as well a provision for the Border Patrol agents and the Customs agents.

It is a comprehensive budget. It is a budget that should be passed. The Congressional Black Caucus budget is a budget for all America.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today being very disturbed with the direction that the Republican Proposed Budget and this Administration is taking our great nation. The prime reason for my concern is the billions of dollars the White House is proposing to cut in this body today. The Nussle budget clearly does not improve upon the severely flawed Bush Administration budget. The needs of average Americans are still ignored. The interests of a wealthy few outweigh the needs of an entire nation in this budget. I say this not out of parlor games, but it is a statement of the facts. I want to highlight a few areas in this budget that are particularly egregious.

This President and the majority party in this body have spent so much time talking about their record on education and as hard as I try I can not see what they have to be proud of. It is one thing to address areas of critical need with rhetoric, but to advocate a policy and then not fund it sufficiently is plain irresponsible. This budget eliminates 48 education programs that receive $4.3 billion this year. These eliminations include wiping out $1.3 billion for all vocational education programs, $522 million for all education technology programs, and $29 million for all civic education programs. The budget eliminates other large programs including the Even Start family literacy program ($225 million) and state grants for safe and drug-free schools and communities ($437 million). The President’s budget cuts 2006 funding for the Department of Education by $1.3 billion below the amount needed to maintain purchasing power at the current level, and this year’s situation is the 2005 enacted level of $56.6 billion. This is the first time since 1989 that an Administration has submitted a budget that cuts the Department’s funding. This Administration and the majority in this Congress promised to leave no child behind, but clearly they have reneged on their promise.

Our brave American veterans are another group who were outraged by the President’s budget and will unfortunately be disappointed with the Republican House Budget. I hear so much in this body from the majority party about the greatness of our Armed Forces, and they should be proud of their right, but again its just empty rhetoric on their part. Those brave men and women fighting on the front lines in our War Against Terror will come back home and find that the Republican Party looks at them differently once they become veterans. Almost all veterans need some form of health care, some will need drastic care for the rest of their lives because of the sacrifice they made in war, but the Republican budget continues to look at the needs of our veterans and their families with a cold eye to their needs. The fact is that $3.2 billion more than the current budget proposal is needed just to maintain the current level of health care programs for veterans.

The entire Department of Veterans Affairs is going to suffer because of the Republican agenda. I have heard from veterans groups throughout my district in Houston and I am sure each member of this body has heard from groups in their own district because veterans are one group that come from all parts of this nation. These brave veterans have told me their stories of how they are suffering now with the current state of Veterans Affairs. I am going to have to tell them that not only will things continue to stay bad but if this budget passes this body things will only continue to get worse. That is not what our return on tax cuts provides. Americans should have to look forward to, a future where their needs are not only unprovided for, but are in fact ignored.

Education and Veterans Affairs are not the only two areas where the Republican budget fails America. The truth is there are many other programs and services vital to our nation that are at risk because of the Republican agenda. At this point, an average American may be asking why the Republican leadership finds it necessary to cut so many fundamental programs that are part of our daily living. The majority is cutting important programs in order to finance all their irresponsible tax cuts. They will continue to make the argument that tax cuts provide stimulus for our economy, but millions of unemployed Americans will tell you otherwise. In fact the Congressional Budget Office itself said “tax legislation will probably have a net negative effect on saving, investment, and capital accumulation over the next 10 years.”

While the Republican leadership continues its move for irresponsible tax policies they allow our national deficit to grow increasingly larger. When President Bush came into office he inherited a budget surplus of $236 billion in 2000. Now, however, this Administration has raided those surpluses and its fiscally irresponsible tax policies have driven the country ever deeper into debt. A $5.6 trillion ten-year projected surplus for the period 2002–2011 has been converted into a projected deficit for the same period of $3.9 trillion—a reversal of $9.5 trillion. Much like the President’s budget, this Administration before our short-term economic needs and the long-term costs of either the war in Iraq or fixing the AMT, yet still tries to make claims of reducing the deficit. It’s clear that the Republican Party is hiding from the American people. This President and this majority in Congress have yet to advocate a fiscal policy that helps average Americans. Special interests have become king in this budget at the price of sound fiscal policies.

This body was made to stand for the will of all Americans; if we allow this budget proposal to take effect we will have failed our mandate. I for one will not stand by silently; I have a duty to my constituents and indeed to all Americans to work for their well being and I will continue to honor that duty.
Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume to just respond gently, firmly in some respects to some of the characterizations I disagree with of the budget that I am presenting and the Republicans are proposing.

I definitely respect the Congressional Black Caucus in their effort to put together a budget. I admire anybody who tries to go through this process and comes out of the other end with an actual work product that they can come to the floor to defend.

So, as a result of that, I am pleased to yield time so that they can present that budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) so that we can continue this discussion.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding these 4 minutes to me. One of the hazards of being one of the lowest in seniority on this side of the aisle is that we run out of time so quickly. So thank the chairman for yielding this time, I want to thank the ranking member for the work he has done in the process.

Mr. Chairman, I represent North Carolina’s 1st District. We are the 15th poorest district in America. We are working very hard to lift our communities in meaningful ways and it is difficult.

The one area in which we are succeeding is in the area of making higher educational opportunities more available to minority and low-income students. I am so proud of the fact that we are beginning to eliminate the educational disparity that exists between black, white and brown.

One program, Mr. Chairman, that has significantly contributed to this success is the TRIO program. TRIO programs are working. This program is serving 6,200 young people in my district, a total of 17 projects. Across the country 270,000 low-income Americans are being served.

TRIO has a Talent Search Program which serves young people in grades 6 through 12. In addition to counseling, participants receive information about college admissions, requirements, scholarships and various student financial aid programs. This early intervention program helps people from families with incomes under $24,000 to better understand their educational opportunities and options. Over 357,000 Americans are enrolled in 471 Talent Search programs. The President’s budget and the Republican budget eliminates these programs entirely.

TRIO has an Upward Bound Program which helps young students to prepare for higher education. Participants receive instruction in literature, composition, mathematics and science on college campuses after school, on Saturdays and during the summer. Currently there are 251 Upward Bound programs throughout the country. This program, Mr. Chairman, is scheduled for extinction.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) to close the debate.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) for providing the Congressional Black Caucus a little extra time to talk about the CBC budget, and I want to summarize what our proposed budget restores for TRIO.

It will roll back the tax cuts on people with adjusted gross incomes of less than $200,000 per year. Most of the revenue raised in the CBC budget will be used to answer the challenges in America’s communities. A substantial portion is reserved to reduce the deficit.

On the military side, we would roll back $7.8 billion in ballistic missile defense spending leaving $1 billion for research to continue researching the ballistic missile defense system. All of these funds are spent on other defense items to support our troops, homeland security needs, and veterans program and benefits. The total for defense, homeland security, and veterans is equal to the Republican budget.

The bottom line is that the CBC budget addresses critical domestic challenges and supports our troops. The CBC budget reduces the deficit by $167 billion compared to the House majority’s budget over the next 5 years. This fiscal responsibility is rewarded by a reduction of $27 billion in interest payments, compared to the House majority’s budget over that 5-year period. We will have a responsible budget, and I look forward to having the support of our colleagues in this body and look forward to discussing the proposed CBC budget in more detail tomorrow when our substitute is presented to the House.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time for the purpose of closing general debate.

Mr. Chairman, we have put before the House a substitute resolution as an alternative to the resolution supported by the Republicans and reported by the committee.

What does our resolution do? First of all, in the realm of fiscal discipline, we would reimpose a rule found to work and well during the 1990s, a rule that was first implemented by a bill signed into law by President Bush, the first President Bush, in 1990 as part of the Bush budget summit agreement, which laid the foundation for the phenomenal success in which we finally moved the budget out of intracausal deficits into a surplus in 1998 and into a monumental surplus of $236 billion in the year 2000.

Part of the budget process changes that helped us achieve those impressive results was a rule of thumb that simply stipulates that before anyone can increase an entitlement or mandatory spending program, add to its benefits, they have to either pay for the benefits by an identified revenue source, or they have to offset the increased expenditure by decreasing expenditures elsewhere.

In addition, it provides when anyone wants to cut taxes, when we have a deficit, must offset the tax cut so it will contribute to the solution to the deficit; it will not further enlarge the problem on the bottom line so we first of all would reinstate the PAYGO rule. As I said earlier, this is not just some notion we have concocted. Three times Chairman Alan Greenspan of the Federal Reserve has testified before the Committee on the Budget that he would reinstate the PAYGO rule and he would apply it to expiring tax cuts that are renewed.

On the spending side of the ledger, we have sought spending back to current services, in many cases restoring deep cuts made by the Republicans. We have brought it back to current services, but we have held it at that level. Current services is basically today’s spending level carried forward with inflation.

What do we do by instituting those two practices? What do we accomplish? Well, our budget moves to balance in the year 2012, which the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) cannot even imagine, with respect to his budget resolution.

Secondly, we incur less in deficits each year and over the 10-year period of time that we run out our numbers, even though we provide current services funding.

Thirdly, we protect Medicare and Medicaid. The Republicans would cut Medicaid by $60 billion. I met with Governors, Republicans and Democrats, who have told us a cut of that magnitude would mean professional—— and we should not cut. Medicaid by any significant amount so that when the program is revised, it has to be revised in pursuit of some arbitrary savings number.

Finally, we match funding for defense, function 050, dollar for dollar the same as their resolution. We match funding for international affairs, function 150. There is no difference between us there, but we have made some changes in our budget resolution which recommends that resources within the defense budget be shifted to personnel benefits and in particular to see that the $400,000 life insurance increase just money.
provided in the supplemental will be carried forward and that the $100,000 increase in death gratuities will also be carried forward and funded in the future.

So we have a budget resolution with many things to it, but also with fiscal discipline. A signature element is that in the year 2012 it gets to balance, but it gets there with balanced priorities.

Mr. NUSSELE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, but also with fiscal discipline. A signature element is that in the year 2012 it gets to balance, but it gets there with balanced priorities.

Mr. Chairman, first let me say to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), there is absolutely no one on the Democratic side that I admire more than the gentleman and the partnership we have in working on these budgets. This is the culmination when we come to the floor and have these debates, and I really respect the way he handled the debate. We appreciate that.

We disagree how we are going to accomplish the goals that our Nation needs to set, but we know the goals are pretty important. We have to keep the country strong. There is no question about that. It is really nonnegotiable.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), there is absolutely no one on the Democratic side that I admire more than the gentleman and the partnership we have in working on these budgets. This is the culmination when we come to the floor and have these debates, and I really respect the way he handled the debate. We appreciate that.

If Members think about it, we have all seen that. If I spend just a little bit more from one year to the next, I must care, I must be solving problems, dealing with real solutions. If I just spend a little bit more money, I will solve all of the problems in the country. Every problem that every family ever addressed around their kitchen table can be met with just a little bit more Washington spending. That is the fallacy of what we are debating tonight, and that is if we believe, truly believe that all we have to do is take more money to Washington in the form of taxes and just spend that money in one or two more programs that hires a number of more bureaucrats, that builds maybe a few more office buildings to be filled with those bureaucrats, and they drive in from Virginia or Maryland or wherever they drive in from, so that they care more about what is going on than the families back home, if we really believe that is solving problems, then Members are going to have a budget to vote for.

It spends more money, it increases taxes, and it purports to solve problems. Unfortunately, we are not solving those problems by doing that. My favorite saying that I heard on the floor, and I do not remember who said it, a long time ago, if you always do that, that you are going to have the first reduction in non-security spending since Ronald Reagan was in town back in 1980. That is good news. We also know that we have to start tackling what we call the mandatory spending, or the automatic spending. And so we have said that because we know that mandatory spending, this is the yellow part, the part here that back in 1995 was half the budget and now is more than half the budget and is growing to even more than half of the budget. We have the two-thirds of the budget if we do not start controlling our spending in these accounts.

I want to give you an example of what we would have to do. As much as there will be all sorts of discussion today, and there has been, and tomorrow about Medicaid, you cannot find the word Medicaid in the budget. The reason is because what we do is we say the committees of jurisdiction, in this instance the Committee on Energy and Commerce, should be given responsibility to look through the programs and see if they cannot only find savings but reform the program, to do a better job of delivering the product to the people who need it. If it is true that people sit up at night worrying about how they are going to pay their bills, how they are going to meet their health care needs, then let us help them figure out that. But let us not continue to do a program that every year, the Director of the budget, the Director of the budget, is not seem to go away. Last year we decided to put the brakes on spending. We said yes, we had the excuse of September 11, of the war on terror, of needing to deal with homeland security and needing to deal with our economy; but it is time to be done with all of that. And so what we did was we said let us put the brakes on spending just a little bit.

What happened? When the economy grows, and we have control spending, just like the Republican Party was in the late 1990s when we got back to balance, and President Clinton can take credit for anything he wants, that is fine. But everyone who has studied government knows that the buck stops here when it comes to spending. When it comes to fiscal responsibility and article I of the Constitution, we are the ones in charge of the budget. Members know that. As a result, last year with fiscal discipline and a growing economy, we were able to reduce the deficit 20 percent in 1 year. That is good news, but we need to build on that.

What our budget does is it says, let us continue to build on that success every year with more and more deficit reduction. That is what we accomplish with the spending discipline within this budget. We say not only should we hold the line on discretionary spending, that is the spending we will argue about every day out here during the appropriations process. We want to actually reduce some spending there. We have the reduction in non-security spending since Ronald Reagan was in town back in 1980. That is good news. We also know that we have to start tackling what we call the mandatory spending, or the automatic spending. And so we have said that because we know that mandatory spending, this is the yellow part, the part here that back in 1995 was half the budget and now is more than half the budget and is growing to even more than half of the budget. We have the two-thirds of the budget if we do not start controlling our spending in these accounts.

I want to give you an example of what we would have to do. As much as there will be all sorts of discussion today, and there has been, and tomorrow about Medicaid, you cannot find the word Medicaid in the budget. The reason is because what we do is we say the committees of jurisdiction, in this instance the Committee on Energy and Commerce, should be given responsibility to look through the programs and see if they cannot only find savings but reform the program, to do a better job of delivering the product to the people who need it. If it is true that people sit up at night worrying about how they are going to pay their bills, how they are going to meet their health care needs, then let us help them figure out that. But let us not continue to do a program that every year, the Director of the budget, is not seem to go away. Last year we decided to put the brakes on spending. We said yes, we had the excuse of September 11, of the war on terror, of needing to deal with homeland security and needing to deal with our economy; but it is time to be done with all of that. And so what we did was we said let us put the brakes on spending just a little bit.

What happened? When the economy grows, and we have control spending, just like the Republican Party was in the late 1990s when we got back to balance, and President Clinton can take credit for anything he wants, that is fine. But
and State legislators are put in a position where they actually have to figure out how to game the system, how to manipulate the system so that they can get more money from the Federal Government. I have heard of situations that they have had to deal with from around the country where we actually have a situation where kids, teenagers who are eligible for foster care, good kids, good teenagers, that are difficult to find families for so that they can integrate and become part of a family again, but the State, a couple of States in particular, what they have done is they have devised a way to lock those kids into mental health residential treatment centers. Why? So they can get more money from the Federal Government. If you are a foster parent or you are someone who is thinking about adopting, opening up your heart, your family, your home to a child, to a kid, to a teenager and giving them a life, there is a stigma of being part of that State program, not because they were helping the kid but because they wanted more money. We are hurting people with these programs. I realize if you measure your compassion from one year to the next with spending. I cared at $92 billion this year. Oops, there I went and I cared a little bit more that year. Then I really cared at $108 billion. Boy, my caring and compassion is going up. That is not how we should measure it. We should measure it on results. Are these programs working? Are they helping families? Are they helping kids? Are they helping communities? Are they solving the problem that Medicaid ought to be solving for people with long-term health care concerns, people with disabilities, people who require indigent care? That is what we ought to be asking.

What do we do in this budget? We say, Commerce Committee, go to work. Invite the Governors to come to Washington to give us their proposal. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. STRATTMAN) and I sat in a room with Governors where they said, “Don’t arbitrarily let the number drive the policy.” That is exactly right. The number should not drive policy. This number should drive policy any more than it ought to determine compassion. But there is only one way to get the Governors to come back to Washington. They were here the first time. The only way to get them back the second time is to have a process that requires reform and that is exactly what this budget does. It says, by September, we want you to come back with ideas for reform. Just as a result of this, they have committed to come back by June with a reform proposal that I am sure are going to make sure that we can work together with the administration to try and come to a solution and try to come to some agreement on. That is a positive step forward. That helps us with a program that most people think is unsustainable and that helps us solve the problem of making sure that this goes to people who cannot help themselves.

What does the so-called reduction in growth look like? We have heard all the complaints on the floor today. One would think we were just eliminating the Medicaid program. I want to show Members how it looks like after we are all done. This is what the Governors would complain about. This is what some of the advocates are complaining about. In other words, we are asking for just a little sliver, just slow down the growth. But it is growing every year. Every year it grows. We are just asking for a little bit of change, just a little bit of reform, make the program work better, less it help seniors, let it help people with disabilities, make sure it is solving the problem for families that have the resources to meet their health care needs. Let us also instill some personal responsibility. Do not just hand it out and give people first dollar Cadillac coverage without saying in return, Folks, you have got to be healthier, you have got to go to preventive care, you have got to be personally responsible. That is what reform can give you and a budget without that reform will not give you.

I understand that between today and tomorrow, there is a decision to be made. The decision as it boils down to me is very simple. Do you believe that taxing a little bit more, taking a little bit more out to Washington from all of these hardworking families across the country and hiring more bureaucrats and inventing more programs and trying to solve more of these problems from Washington, if you believe that is the solution, you need to vote for the Spratt budget. You need to vote for the Democrat alternative budget because that is what they always do, increase taxes, increase spending and you will begin to solve these problems.

But there is another alternative and it is the majority. What the majority is saying, Stop the madness. It is the spending. We have got to get the spending under control. We know the other body left to their own devices may not do it on their own. We have already seen in a kind of a disappointing way that they have not really stepped up the way they have and how we believe the way I have.

In closing, let me just say that we will be able to give, I believe, our kids and our grandkids the opportunity of a debt-free world if we begin with a small step again this year. I have big decision to make. The Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is a real privilege to rise tonight to take on the role of discussing the statutorily required Humphrey-Hawkins economic report on the State of the Economy. It is a real privilege to consider how this budget fits into the overall economic policy of the United States. We have heard so far a very engaging debate, and may I say, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget has done an extraordinary job of defending the details of this budget. He has been powerful and persuasive and intelligent and, I think, has made a compelling case. The argument that we are going to make in the next hour has to do more with how this fits into the overall economic priorities of the United States. This in my view is perhaps one of the most important reasons for passing this budget, because as we look at America today, as we look at the economic challenges we are facing, it is clear that we need to have a strong and responsible fiscal policy that encourages economic growth, that controls spending, and by controlling spending brings down our deficit over time, reassures capital markets and sends the message that the American economy continues to be the safest place in the world to invest. If we continue on the path directed by this budget resolution, I have an opportunity, I think, to lay the groundwork for an unprecedented expansion and to create opportunity and economic growth in the American economy that is so badly needed in many of our communities, including many parts of my district.

There is no question, Mr. Chairman, that the challenges we are facing today are substantial, the deficit is a serious problem and the proposed remedy contained in this budget resolution in not some very very small and, for many individual Members of the House, some very, very difficult policy decisions. We need to pass this resolution because the broad parameters of spending that are the real budget resolution, the blueprint that is the substance of this budget resolution is precisely the vehicle we need to move in the right direction to make sure that we control spending and create the opportunity to continue the economic expansion which is only now just beginning.

Over the past few years, America has gone through a challenging time economically. Nowhere is that more evident than in my district, but at the same time there are very encouraging signs. We know that we have been running a deficit. We know we have been running a deficit because, first of all, understandably, we have been in the throes of a recession and we have never run a surplus during a recession. Second, we have run a surplus in wartime. And even as we have been undergoing a very difficult episode, a combination of a slowdown which
began during the last administration coupled with the substantial damage to our economy that occurred in the wake of 9/11, at the same time we have had to take on a war on terrorism that was not of our choosing. The combination of those losses would explain why because of the slowdown of the economy and at the same time the challenge of meeting the war on terrorism have been a substantial drain on our resources. Yet our underlying economy continues to be sound and clearly we have a path that we can pursue that brings back toward a balanced budget and providing the kind of policy in place that will continue to meet the needs of America.

This budget resolution is precisely what we need. We recognize that an uncontrolled deficit can put pressure on interest rates, increasing the cost of borrowing and putting the brakes on economic growth and investment. Without economic growth, we are not going to be able to generate the revenue to get back to a balanced budget. We also recognize that a lax fiscal policy could further weaken the U.S. dollar in global markets and undermine its standing as the reserve currency of the world economic system. This has been one of the core advantages that America has retained relative to our global competition. That is why the decision we make with this budget is going to be very, very important.

This budget is designed for injecting spending restraint while encouraging economic growth and stability. Its adoption will signal to the financial markets that a fiscally conservative Congress once more is prepared to rally forth to make difficult decisions necessary to control the Federal deficit and maintain our economy on a growth path. This budget vehicle provides fiscal discipline that will strengthen investor confidence in the renascent economy and provide a powerful tool to continue on the path of economic growth. It provides for controlling spending without raising taxes, which is precisely the formula that has worked for us and can continue to work for us.

Mr. Chairman, we recognize that we need to maintain a pro-growth tax policy. That is essential to move America toward a balanced budget. This budget resolution allows us to continue and make our successes look successful with policies that have allowed us to grow the economy. What it does in a nutshell is it cuts the deficit in half over a 5-year period. Perhaps more importantly, Mr. Chairman, it shrinks over time the national debt relative to the economy. That is the burden on the national economy that the capital market understands. If we have a national debt that is growing relative to the economy, it will roll capital markets over time if it grows excessively. But what is the absolute size of the debt, is it the size of the debt relative to the economy.

If we can continue to grow the economy and grow the economy faster than the national debt, then that will be a source of confidence and a source of growth in the economy. Mr. Chairman, that is precisely what this budget resolution does in a sound, responsible way. It maintains our strong commitment to economic growth and pro-growth tax policy by controlling discretionary and mandatory spending.

Mr. Chairman, I will have further remarks in support of this resolution.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a member of the Joint Economic Committee, I am pleased to speak on the economic goals and policies reflected in the budget.

When it comes to the economy, this is a record-setting administration. The problems are pressing. The budget is setting records for debt and deficits. We now have the largest debt, the largest budget deficit, and the largest trade deficit in the history of our Nation. Republicans have become the party of debt.

Even worse, the administration continues to repeat the same economic mantras even as experience continues to prove them wrong and more wrong.

This administration has turned a surplus projected in January of 2001 to be almost $400 billion by 2004 into a budget deficit of over $400 billion. And, Mr. Chairman, there is no end in sight. The budget deficit for last month set another record as the first time the budget deficit has gone over $100 billion in a single month in the history of our country.

This week the lead story is our Nation’s trade deficit; and to no one’s surprise, this deficit is breaking records too. Data released today by the Department of Commerce shows that the trade deficit in 2004 was at an all-time high, nearly $666 billion, 5.7 percent of our GDP. Another unfortunate record.

The all-time monthly trade deficit of more than $59 billion was set in November, and the total for January was just barely shy of setting a new record.

The administration always says that the ever-weaker dollar will correct our trade deficit for the last several years, and this has proven to be wrong. Our deficits are soaring because it is the policy of this administration to spend far more than we have and to borrow from foreign sources to cover ourselves.

Since the administration is content importing money lent by foreign banks to cover the cost of foreign goods, we are increasingly at the mercy of our overseas benefactors. As of January, foreign governments own $1.2 trillion of our public debt, the highest it has ever been. What if one day they decide to stop propping up our spend-and-borrow habit? We had a tiny taste of that recently when South Korea hinted that they would not buy more dollars and the markets trembled.

America is the largest economic engine in the world. We should never build our economic system on a foundation of foreign loans. Any day that foundation could become a house of cards. There is absolutely no evidence in the budget resolution before us in this case or in the case that you publicans have become the party of deficit.

This budget uses smoke and mirrors to give the allusion of cutting the deficit in half, but it leaves out necessary actions such as fixing the alternative minimum tax, which is hurting the middle class more and more and must be dealt with sooner rather than later.

This budget is also mean spirited. In order to preserve the Republican tax cuts, the budget cuts programs for Americans who are struggling just to make it in what for them is a very difficult economy.

Mr. Chairman, this President continues to have the worst job record since President Hoover and the Great Depression. Even worse, the gains the economy has made benefit the bottom line of large corporations at the expense of ordinary hard-working Americans. The budget has increased the federal minimum tax, which is hurting the middle class more and more and must be dealt with sooner rather than later.

The administration’s budget does not even address the biggest and largest budget buster of them all: the President’s plan to privatize Social Security. As a new study by the Joint Economic Committee Democratic staff shows, the President’s plan for private accounts would create $5 trillion of new debt in the first 20 years, but it would do absolutely nothing to address Social Security’s solvency and would do nothing to increase national saving. In fact, it would weaken the solvency of Social Security and probably reduce national saving, exactly the opposite of what is needed.

Mr. Chairman, I think the President’s plan for Social Security is a perfect example of what is wrong with the economic goals and policies of this administration. It manufactures a false crisis around a real, but manageable, problem and then offers a proposal that makes things worse without even addressing the problem itself.

As I have seen in my own town meetings, Americans understand that privatization of Social Security is a bad idea.
We need honest budgeting and an honest economic policy if we are to foster true economic prosperity to ordinary hard-working Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), a fellow member of the Joint Economic Committee.

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much this opportunity to talk about the budget. In listening to the debate today on both sides of the aisle, there has been a lot of expression of concern about the deficit; and, of course, I am very concerned about the deficit as well.

But I would like to make a suggestion that we are not facing primarily a budgetary crisis or a budgetary problem. I see this more as a philosophic problem, dealing more with the philosophy that we ought to believe in rather than the suggestion that we can tinker with the budget, dealing with this as a tactical problem when really it is a strategic problem.

So as long as we endorse the type of government that we have and there is a willingness for the people as well as the Congress to finance it, we are going to continue with this process and the frustrations are going to grow because it is just not likely that these deficits will shrink.

And the gentleman from Pennsylvania rightly pointed out the concerns this might have in the financial markets. I am hoping that his optimism pans out because, indeed, if they do not, there could be some ramifications from these expanding deficits and what it means to our dollar.

But I would like to suggest that in dealing with the budget itself, I see only one problem that we have. And that problem to me is the budget is too big, and I would like to shrink the budget. I have toyed with the idea over the years to introduce and offer a constitutional budget to the House floor.

That would not be too difficult because the budget would be so much smaller. It would mean essentially that if one is a strict constitutionalist that they would cut the budget approximately 50 percent.

What would that mean to the economy? It would be a boost because we would be injecting $2 trillion back into the economy, allowing the people to spend their own money. But being pretty realistic, I know that is not likely to happen or be offered or even be able to present that on the House floor. Besides, it could be rather embarrassing to bring something like that to the floor. It is embarrassing to me, because I am accustomed to voting in a small group of people on many occasions; but it could be embarrassing to others because, for the most part, most Members would not even conceive of the idea of having a strict interpretation of the Constitution and severely limiting the budget. So we would not want to put everybody on record for that.

The other day I heard an interview with one of our Members, and he was asked about a particular program where the authority came from in the Constitution for that program. And his answer was very straightforward and agreed that in the Constitution there was no prohibition against that program, so therefore it was permitted. In his mind, as it is in the minds of many Members of Congress, if there is no strict prohibition, it is permitted.

And that is just absolutely opposite of what was intended by the authors of the Constitution that we would only be able to do those things which are explicitly permitted in the Congress, and they are spelled out rather clearly in article I, section 8.

And then we are given the permission to write the laws that are necessary and proper to implement those powers that are delegated to us. Those powers are not delegated are reserved to the States and the people. So it means that those things that are not prohibited are permitted, but I would say that the conventional wisdom today is that people accept the notion that we can do anything that we want as long as it is not prohibited by the Constitution.

I think this improper understanding and following of the Constitution has brought us closer to a major crisis in this country, a crisis of our personal liberties, a crisis in our foreign policy, as well as a crisis in our budgeting.

But it is not simply the ignoring of the Constitution that I think is our problem. I think our other problem is our philosophy, and if we have a program that we follow and this philosophy we followed prompted our Federal Reserve to create $620 billion in order to finance the system. That is the reason that the dollar becomes less valuable because we just print too many to accommodate the politicians and the people who enjoy the excessive spending.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), a member of the committee and a very outstanding colleague.

Mr. HINCHEY. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me the time. Mr. Chairman, this budget of course is a clear statement of the economic objectives of the people who have put it together, and it is illustrative of where they want this country to be over the course of the next year.

In understanding that, it is important for us to look back at previous budgets that they have constructed and the effect that those budgets have had on the economy of our country.

We have here in Washington today, and have for the last 4 years, a monolithic government. In other words, the Republican Party controls both Houses of the Congress, the House and the Senate, and the White House. So they are in complete control of the budget operation, how we take in money, and how we spend it, allegedly, on behalf of the American people.

Let us just take a look at the effects of their budgets and economic policies over the course of the last several years. First of all, the economy has endured the most protracted job slump since the 1930s. Last year we had some increase in jobs. Government payrolls, in fact, have expanded. And it is interesting, because our colleagues in the
Republican Party talk about shrinking government. But what their budget policies have managed to do is to expand government.

At the same time, there were 544,000 fewer private nonfarm payroll jobs and 2.8 million fewer manufacturing jobs. The difference in the hourly payroll by an average of 3.9 percent per year.

Over that same period, the unemployment rate jumps to 9.3 percent.

Four years ago America enjoyed a $5.6 trillion 10-year projected budget surplus. Today our country is facing a $3.3 trillion 10-year projected budget deficit. That is a heroic accomplishment over the last 5 years by these Republican budgets, nearly $9 trillion in negative results.

The public debt has almost doubled and we approach each $5 trillion before the end of this year, all of that as a result of these budgets, and this particular budget that we are addressing tonight continues these same policies.

One consequence of the low national savings and large budget deficits is that we are running now a very large trade deficit. In January, for example, the last month for which we have figures, it was $58.3 billion in trade deficit just for the month of January.

Last year we accomplished a record trade deficit. The trade deficit for the year 2004 was a record $617 billion. This budget continues those same policies. But those deficits are unsustainable. Our children will not survive if we continue along the same road.

American workers are becoming more productive, but that productivity as a result of these budgets is not showing up in their wages. Private nonfarm industries’ wages have fallen .6 percent, after being adjusted for inflation.

This year, this past year alone, typical households will make $1,500 less than they did 4 years ago as a result of the economic policies reflected in this and the previous budgets of the Republican Party.

Since November 2001, output per hour has increased from the average worker by an average of 3.9 percent per year. Over that same period, the hourly wages and productivity of the workers producing that increased output has increased by only 1.6 percent per year.

The current account deficit, which measures the amount we have to borrow from the rest of the world to finance our international trade imbalance, reached a record of over $600 billion. Increasingly, foreign central banks purchase U.S. treasury securities, and that means that we are increasingly deeper and deeper in debt to other foreign countries. That is also a result of these budgets. If foreigners become nervous about the falling value of the dollar, they could stop buying our treasury debt, which would cause the dollar to plunge. The consequence could be an international financial crisis, sharply higher inflation and interest rates, and also stop any economic recovery.

So the debate today on this budget resolution is critically important. The question is, are we going to continue the policies that have put us in this very difficult position where we find ourselves today as a result of the previous four budgets passed by this monolithic government, or are we finally going to wake up, realize the consequences of these policies and begin to take a new course? That vote will come tomorrow.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the immediate past Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time. As a member of the Joint Economic Committee, I rise today to speak on the economic policies of the budget resolution.

Mr. Chairman, both the Bush and Republican budgets suffer from the same infirmities, fiscal irresponsible and self-serving and out-of-touch priorities. Both are wholly inadequate to meet the needs of our Nation and will pass along mounting deficits and debts to generations yet unborn.

First, the 5-year Republican budget will result in a deficit of $376 billion in 2006, $44 million over the President’s projection.

The Republicans’ budget proposal also has many cost omissions, because they know that their deficit numbers explode after 5 years. As such, this budget does not take into account the cost of fixing the AMT, which will cost at least $562 billion. It does not take into account the $774 billion needed to pay for the President’s much-talked about but yet unveiled Social Security privatization plan.

I support the CBC budget proposal deserves a little credit for hiking its deficit projection as it at least includes $50 billion in 2006 for the wars in Afghanistan and in Iraq. The President’s budget proposal contained zero dollars. As a matter of fact, it reported that the costs could not be known. However, both figures are fantasy. The realistic figure over the next 10 years, in addition to the $80 billion that we just passed in the supplemental, is likely to cost, at the least, $1 trillion.

To pay for its misguided policies, the House budget resolution cuts non-defense discretionary spending by $12 billion below the amount needed in fiscal 2006 just to maintain current spending levels, and it cuts spending on mandatory domestic programs by $3 billion.

To add insult to injury, the Republican budget provides $18 billion in additional tax cuts. These misguided tax cuts will actually expire more when the tax cuts actually expire in 2010. In fact, 97 percent of these tax cuts will benefit taxpayers with incomes above $200,000. I think most reasonable people can agree that these priorities are not America’s priorities.

While little good can be said about the Bush administration’s budget, it at least provides detailed information on the programs it seeks to cut. The resolution shreds its cuts in darkness, leaving the American people to wonder what vital programs will find their way to the chopping block next.

Both the Republican and Bush budget proposals are travesties. When the Bush administration took office, the Nation was experiencing record surpluses. It has managed to turn a $521 billion surplus into a $367 billion deficit.

In contrast, the Spratt alternative budget, as well as the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget that we will consider tomorrow, focus national spending on priorities that benefit all Americans and get us on the road to economic recovery. They do this by funding key domestic priorities which address the needs of working families while fully supporting the national defense and protection of our homeland and preserving Medicaid, Social Security, pension programs and student loans.

Let me speak particularly about the budget developed by the Congressional Black Caucus which corrects the irresponsible fiscal and economic policies contained in the House budget resolution by supporting existing programs that are essential to closing disparities, creating opportunities and helping our citizens build their future. It will get our country out of recession, while funding meaningful national priorities for our children, for our seniors, for our veterans and for our communities.

Importantly, the Congressional Black Caucus budget supports these priorities, while also meeting our obligation to our troops in Iraq and in Afghanistan.

The CBC budget funds community development programs, including restoring funding to the Community Development Block Grant Program and supporting increased funding for elderly and disabled housing programs.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget will also restore funding for veterans’ health care, rather than imposing new copayments on them for essential services and prescription drugs.

Importantly, the Congressional Black Caucus budget will restore the budget deficit by $167 billion during the next 5 years below the deficit that will be produced by the House budget resolution.
Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget cuts educational, housing and health programs for our children, while breathing to them a public debt that has increased by $1.268 trillion over the last 4 years and that will exceed $4.6 trillion even before we begin fiscal year 2006.

These actions are not only irresponsible, they are unconscionable. In the end, one can only conclude that the Republican budget balances itself on the backs of Americans who can least afford it.

I urge the administration to reconsider its ill-conceived economic policies. The Congressional Black Caucus budget is the ultimate expression of our national priorities; and our priorities must be our children, our families, our elderly and our veterans and, of course, our soldiers.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. Grenstene).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget this evening.

This budget would not only add funding to close the glaring and shameful disparities which have existed too long for African Americans, but it is fiscally responsible. Our budget would provide additional protection for our troops today and provide more funding to honor our debt to our Nation's veterans, including those who are returning as we speak. It also protects us at home by adding funding to address unacceptable deficiencies in homeland security.

But our investment in homeland security goes beyond the important funds we provide for first responders, for fighting bio-terrorism, and providing interoperable communications. Our homeland security also depends on a well-educated citizenry, and so we fully support the concept of Leave No Child Behind. TRIO programs as well as increased Pell grants.

Our homeland security depends on a healthy citizenry. The Congressional Black Caucus budget restores much of the funding for minority AIDS, Health Professions Training, and the Office of Minority Health, as well as provides funding to help close gaps in the Caribbean and Africa. And, Mr. Chairman, we do all of that and reduce the deficit by an additional $167 billion over 5 years; $167 billion more than the major budget resolution does.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget would make us more economically secure.

Mr. Chairman, the CBC alternative budget, like the Congressional Black Caucus itself, speaks to the conscience, not only of the Congress but to the conscience of our country. It is a budget that reflects our values and seeks to create not just a stronger America but also a better America.

The Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget is a morally and financially responsible budget, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it when it comes to the floor tomorrow.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman yields 4 minutes to herself for yielding me time.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Watt), the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Let me just go through some of the things that the Congressional Black Caucus budget will do in various areas.

We are planning to submit this budget tomorrow, and we will be adding an additional $1 billion in the international affairs category for foreign aid to Africa and the Caribbean, Global AIDS Initiative in the Defense Department, Public Health and Preventable Illness Initiatives.

We will be adding half a billion dollars in general science, space and technology in the following areas: NASA Research and Development, NASA Space Shuttle Safety, restore research and development funding for the National Science Foundation, Department of Energy. We will be adding an additional $50 million in the natural resources and environment, historically black colleges and university preservation program.

We will be adding $300 million in the agriculture budget in support of the 1890 land-grant historically black colleges and universities, expanded food and nutrition education programs, the U.S. Department of Agriculture Office of Civil Rights. And we will be restoring and modifying some of the Draconian cuts in agriculture programs that affect minorities in particular.

We will fully fund Leave No Child Behind, TRIO programs as well as increased Pell grants.

Our homeland security depends on a healthy citizenry. The Congressional Black Caucus budget restores much of the funding for minority AIDS, Health Professions Training, and the Office of Minority Health, as well as provides funding to help close gaps in the Caribbean and Africa. And, Mr. Chairman, we do all of that and reduce the deficit by an additional $167 billion over 5 years; $167 billion more than the major budget resolution does.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget would make us more economically secure.

Mr. Chairman, the CBC alternative budget, like the Congressional Black Caucus itself, speaks to the conscience, not only of the Congress but to the conscience of our country. It is a budget that reflects our values and seeks to create not just a stronger America but also a better America.

The Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget is a morally and financially responsible budget, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it when it comes to the floor tomorrow.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman yields 4 minutes to herself for yielding me time.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Spratt).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, when Lem Keysserling wrote the Full Employment Act of 1946, an avowed Keynesian, and he believed that the government had a major role to play in stimulating an economy, in seeking to maintain full employment. And if he believed that theoretically, he believed it even more deeply after the war when the enormous demand generated by the war for once made this a full employment economy. The whole country supported the concept.

Keynes believed in deficit financing when the economy was still stuck in a liquidity trap and could not get loose. But he did not believe in the kind of deficit financing that we are running today. I think he would be appalled both by the current account deficit which we are running, $618 billion, more than nine times what economists thought was sustainable. It exceeds 5 percent of the GDP. And certainly I do not think he would find at all pleasing to his understanding of economics a budget deficit expected this year to be $427 billion. Nor even Maynard Keynes would look approvingly on that.

We have come so far from the year 2000 when after 6 or 7 straight years of...
fiscal discipline, we finally put the budget in surplus, a surplus of $236 billion. We had a meeting on the Democratic side of the Committee on the Budget with Mr. Greenspan about what is the best approach we should take to this surplus that we find ourselves enjoying, and I think we found ourselves one there and among Democrats and Republicans in the House that one thing surely we should do since we now have the resources to do it is no longer borrow and spend the Social Security trust fund or certainly have the kind of budget deficit that we mitigate the effects of it. Do not feel, do not see the consequences, and therefore do not feel compelled to do anything serious about it. We could debt to foreigners and that mitigates the effect.

These are not good vital signs for the economy of the United States. And surely one of the things we should do about now is the adoption of a resolution which will take us back to where we were in the year 2000, back to surpluses because we need to be saving, not spending as the baby boomers begin to retire.

Mr. English of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am particularly grateful for the opportunity to be here to make this presentation as required under law by Humphrey-Hawkins because I think it is very important perhaps that the record be set straight.

Any Member of the House who is serious about reducing the deficit, about maintaining the forward movement in the economy, growing jobs, and the social justice that could only come through economic growth should be prepared to strongly support this budget resolution.

Mr. Chairman, a couple of points I think need to be made in response to the interesting presentations that were made on the other side.

First of all, on the issue of jobs. We have heard that our friends on the other side of the aisle try to blame President Bush for an economic slowdown that he inherited from the Clinton administration that was exacerbated by 9/11. The truth is economic policies that have been adopted by this Congress, working with the Administration, have been successful in helping the U.S. economy rebound from the recession into a sustained expansion, with strong growth in the gross domestic product and payroll jobs.

Despite all of the problems that this President inherited, the tax relief policies of the past 4 years that our friends on the other side of the aisle are striving to sabotage have helped to restore economic growth and job creation.

During 2004, real GDP grew 4.4 percent, the strongest annual performance in 5 years, one of the strongest growth performances of the past 20 years, belying the glooming forecast we have heard on the other side.

Private forecasters’ projections for real GDP growth for this year are being revised upward. Growth for 2005 is expected to be at a 3.7 percent robust rate. More Americans, Mr. Chairman, are working today than at anytime in our Nation’s history, and employment is at a record level of more than 140 million. The unemployment rate in February was 5.4 percent, lower than the averages for each of the last three decades. Payroll employment rose by 22 million jobs during 2004. It is more than 3 million jobs since May of 2003. Last month, saw employment gains of 262,000 jobs, more than a quarter of a million new jobs in the month of February alone. This suggests that we are clearly forward motion in the economy.

Mr. Chairman, let us compare that to some of our trading partners. Those who last year invoked the Great Depression in describing recent economic conditions have been, after all, often favoring policies that would increase government intervention in the economy. Yet some of those countries where those sorts of policies are applied are not doing as well as we are.

Economic growth in Europe is generally slower than that of the United States. The unemployment rate in Europe is much higher than in the U.S. In January of 2005, Europe had an unemployment rate of 8.8 percent, substantially higher than our U.S. level of 5.4 percent.

The fact is, by following on a path of high growth and low taxes, we are moving the economy in the right direction, and ultimately, if we are prepared to put in place fiscal policies that restrain the deficit, that will allow us to grow the economy in the right direction.

I have heard a couple of extraordinary claims on the floor of the House that we are facing a record debt. I suppose that is true if we look at this in a purely static, green eyeshade perspective, but what really matters with the national debt, as I said before, is its size relative to the economy. The fact remains the national debt today is significantly lower, relative to the economy, than it was in the early 1990s when our party controlled Congress and controlled the reins of spending.

We have heard about record deficits, but here again we propose in our budget resolution to cut the deficits in half relative to the size of the economy. That will send the right message to global markets.

We have heard a little bit tonight about the trade deficit, and I must say that I take some sympathy with the critics. Our trade deficit is much too high, but those who are making these claims tonight perhaps should be questioning whether they supported the Clinton-era trade policies that this administration inherited, in part by putting us firmly on the path to large trade deficits.

We have also heard from the other side that they are concerned that there is not enough room in this budget to do anything with the problem of the AMT. As cochairman of the Joint AMT Caucus, I have to be sympathetic with their raising the issue, but the fact remains eliminating the AMT is only going to
be possible as part of fundamental tax reform. This budget puts lays in place, creates the groundwork for us to go forward later this year and take a look at fundamental tax reform.

We also, notwithstanding this budget, have opportunity to move forward later this year and consider the issue of Social Security solvency. I believe that the President is right to raise this issue. Anyone who has studied this issue carefully has to concede that we have long-term health of the Social Security system we have a choice of either going forward with a laissez-faire approach that has long been advocated on the other side and ultimately have to see truly draconian cuts as a result, or if we act now we can put in place reforms that will allow us to preserve existing benefits, also provide a solid retirement for the next generation and so by improving the rate of return within the Social Security system. Nothing in this budget resolution is inconsistent with that initiative.

I am very, very pleased to addresse the concerns raised by the gentleman from New York about the supposed monolithic government in the Congress that has worked with a Republican administration on some things that the gentleman finds distasteful. The fact is our economic policies and our economic challenges today are at least partially the result of the gridlock that existed before the last election in which at least, it was not able to move forward on key issues like a stimulus bill, like an energy bill, like tort reform, that directly speak to our economic health because of the gridlock implicit in the rules that gave the minority a veto over many of these provisions. Monolithic government is not the issue. The issue here is whether we can move forward and get to a balanced budget ultimately. Our resolution clearly is the one strongest able to do that.

We continue to grow the economy without raising taxes, which clearly is the agenda on the other side, raising taxes that would slam the brakes on economic growth.

At the same time, it is obvious from the laundry list we have heard tonight which the Senate was at least not able to pass. Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt held by the public are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2005: $4,685,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: $5,065,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: $5,389,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008: $5,649,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009: $5,891,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010: $6,123,000,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The text of H. Con. Res. 95 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 95
Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE APPROPRIATIONS BALANCE THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 2006:

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010 are set forth.

TITTE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2010:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(a) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2005: $1,483,971,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: $1,589,905,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: $1,685,241,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008: $1,782,663,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009: $1,838,903,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010: $1,904,302,000,000.

(b) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2005: $53,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: $16,622,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: $24,414,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008: $42,927,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009: $8,570,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010: $7,142,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2005: $2,070,357,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: $2,135,250,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: $2,199,074,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008: $2,234,562,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009: $2,430,359,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010: $2,257,892,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTFAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2005: $5,652,551,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: $2,298,338,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: $2,402,719,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008: $2,507,365,000,000.

(4) DEFICIT (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2005: $568,580,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: $564,499,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: $513,034,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008: $474,066,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009: $474,066,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010: $463,462,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2005: $4,685,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: $5,065,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: $5,389,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008: $5,649,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009: $5,891,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010: $6,123,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2005: $4,058,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: $4,435,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: $4,801,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2008: $5,147,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2009: $5,483,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2010: $5,819,500,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2005 through 2010 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (500):

- Fiscal year 2005: New budget authority, $500,621,000,000.
- Outlays, $497,196,000,000.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Budget Authority</th>
<th>Outlays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>General Science, Space, and Technology</td>
<td>$383,590,000,000</td>
<td>$370,830,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>General Affairs</td>
<td>$292,587,000,000</td>
<td>$285,310,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>General Science, Space, and Technology</td>
<td>$395,364,000,000</td>
<td>$372,167,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>General Affairs</td>
<td>$374,529,000,000</td>
<td>$371,978,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>General Science, Space, and Technology</td>
<td>$365,343,000,000</td>
<td>$359,566,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>General Affairs</td>
<td>$374,529,000,000</td>
<td>$371,978,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Budget Authority</th>
<th>Outlays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>International Affairs</td>
<td>$317,188,000,000</td>
<td>$309,120,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>International Affairs</td>
<td>$323,618,000,000</td>
<td>$315,480,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>International Affairs</td>
<td>$327,702,000,000</td>
<td>$319,640,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>International Affairs</td>
<td>$312,549,000,000</td>
<td>$309,420,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>International Affairs</td>
<td>$312,549,000,000</td>
<td>$309,420,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>International Affairs</td>
<td>$312,549,000,000</td>
<td>$309,420,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Budget Authority</th>
<th>Outlays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$14,565,000,000</td>
<td>$13,900,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$317,050,000,000</td>
<td>$309,420,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$317,050,000,000</td>
<td>$309,420,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$317,050,000,000</td>
<td>$309,420,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$317,050,000,000</td>
<td>$309,420,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$317,050,000,000</td>
<td>$309,420,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Budget Authority</th>
<th>Outlays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$10,772,000,000</td>
<td>$10,100,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$10,772,000,000</td>
<td>$10,100,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$10,772,000,000</td>
<td>$10,100,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$10,772,000,000</td>
<td>$10,100,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$10,772,000,000</td>
<td>$10,100,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$10,772,000,000</td>
<td>$10,100,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Budget Authority</th>
<th>Outlays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>$295,010,000,000</td>
<td>$287,401,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>$295,010,000,000</td>
<td>$287,401,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>$295,010,000,000</td>
<td>$287,401,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>$295,010,000,000</td>
<td>$287,401,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>$295,010,000,000</td>
<td>$287,401,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>$295,010,000,000</td>
<td>$287,401,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Budget Authority</th>
<th>Outlays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$317,188,000,000</td>
<td>$309,420,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$317,188,000,000</td>
<td>$309,420,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$317,188,000,000</td>
<td>$309,420,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$317,188,000,000</td>
<td>$309,420,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$317,188,000,000</td>
<td>$309,420,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$317,188,000,000</td>
<td>$309,420,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(A) New budget authority, $24,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,029,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $69,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $69,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $68,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $67,928,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $69,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,672,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $70,059,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,787,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $39,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,501,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $40,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $41,390,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $42,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $42,202,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $42,860,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,268,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $16,748,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $18,017,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $17,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,999,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $17,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $17,387,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $17,408,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,216,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $297,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $310,479,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $310,479,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $359,797,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $359,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $397,194,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $397,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $426,162,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,162,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $453,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $453,172,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $3,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,135,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $3,284,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,284,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $47,903,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $25,359,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $10,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,388,000,000.
years 2005 through 2009 to the extent such excess is offset by a reduction in mandatory outlays from the Highway Trust Fund or an increase in receipts appropriated to such fund under the emergency fiscal year, caused by such legislation or any previously enacted legislation.

(b) Adjustment for Obligations.—For fiscal year 2006 in the House, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that changes obligation limitations or excess obligation limitations, but not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a), the appropriation of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays and appropriate aggregates for such fiscal year for the contingency accounts identified in the report, or joint resolution, by an amount of outlays that corresponds to such excess obligation limitations, but not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a).

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) Exemption of Overseas Contingency Operations.—In the House, if any bill or joint resolution, or an amendment or a conference report thereon is filed thereon, that makes supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2005 or fiscal year 2006 for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism, then the new budget authority, new entitlement authority, outlays, and receipts resulting therefrom shall not count for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for the provisions of such measure that are designated pursuant to subsection (c) of that section as mandating spending.

(b) Exemption of Early Enactment.—In the House, if a provision of legislation, which is designated as an emergency provision if the underlying situation poses a threat to life, property, or national security and is—

(1) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not being caused by the provision of legislation in advance of floor consideration;

(II) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(IV) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) Unforeseen.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate amount not to exceed the aggregate amount not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a), the appropriation of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays and appropriate aggregates for such fiscal year for the contingency accounts identified in the report, or joint resolution, by an amount of outlays that corresponds to such excess obligation limitations, but not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a).

Title IV—Budget Enforcement

Section 401—Emergency Legislation

(a) Exemption of Overseas Contingency Operations.—In the House, if any bill or joint resolution, or an amendment or a conference report thereon is filed thereon, that makes supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2005 or fiscal year 2006 for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism, then the new budget authority, new entitlement authority, outlays, and receipts resulting therefrom shall not count for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for the provisions of such measure that are designated pursuant to subsection (c) of that section as mandating spending.

(b) Exemption of Early Enactment.—In the House, if a provision of legislation, which is designated as an emergency provision if the underlying situation poses a threat to life, property, or national security and is—

(1) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not being caused by the provision of legislation in advance of floor consideration;

(II) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(IV) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) Unforeseen.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate amount not to exceed the aggregate amount not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a), the appropriation of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays and appropriate aggregates for such fiscal year for the contingency accounts identified in the report, or joint resolution, by an amount of outlays that corresponds to such excess obligation limitations, but not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule and the order of the House, no amendment to the concurrent resolution is in order except the amendments printed in House Report 108–19. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, except for amendment No. 2, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for one hour, and may not be in order in a Senate amendment unless the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider Amendment No. 2 printed in House report 109–19.

Amendment No. 2 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. Hensarling

Mr. HENSAWLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. Hensarling

(a) Declaration.—The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget
for fiscal year 2006 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010 are hereby set forth.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND REPORT SUBMISSIONS

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

Sec. 202. Submission of report on savings to be used for members of the Armed Forces in Iraq and Afghanistan.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE

Sec. 301. Rainy Day Fund for nonmilitary emergencies.

Sec. 302. Contingency procedure for surface transportation.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. Point of Order Protection.

Sec. 402. Restrictions on advance appropriation enforcement.$

Sec. 403. Automatic votes on expensive legislation.

Sec. 404. Turn off the Gephardt Rule.

Sec. 405. Restriction on the use of emergency spending.


Sec. 408. Change in budget allocations and aggregates resulting from realistic scoring of measures affecting revenues.

Sec. 409. Prohibition in using revenue increases to comply with budget allocation and aggregates.

Sec. 410. Application and effect of changes in function and aggregates.

Sec. 411. Entitlement safeguard.

Sec. 412. Budget Protection Mandatory Account.

Sec. 413. Budget Protection Discretionary Account.

TITLE V—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

Sec. 501. Sense of the House on spending accountability.

Sec. 502. Sense of the House on entitlement reform.

Sec. 503. Sense of the House regarding the abolition of obsolete agencies and Federal sunset proposals.

Sec. 504. Sense of the House regarding the goals of this concurrent resolution and the elimination of certain programs.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2010:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $1,463,971,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $1,589,905,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $1,693,266,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $1,824,251,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $1,928,663,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $2,043,903,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $53,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $16,622,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $24,414,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $4,927,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $8,570,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $9,063,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $2,070,357,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $2,125,110,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $2,186,198,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $2,291,682,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $2,404,965,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $2,497,036,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $2,052,551,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $2,143,613,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $2,182,270,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $2,275,421,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $2,377,265,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $2,476,988,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $568,580,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $553,708,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $499,004,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $651,170,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $448,662,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $433,085,000,000.

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2005: $4,685,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $5,374,742,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $5,620,265,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $5,865,547,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $6,074,877,000,000.

(2) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2005: $24,414,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $16,622,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $24,814,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $4,927,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $8,570,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $9,063,000,000.

(3) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2005: $31,404,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $24,814,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $24,814,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $24,414,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $24,414,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $24,414,000,000.

(4) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2005: $30,896,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $25,830,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $29,323,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $26,196,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $29,673,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $30,029,000,000.

(5) Homeland Security (290):

Fiscal year 2005: $30,081,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $31,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $31,702,000,000.

(6) Grants to States (500):

Fiscal year 2005: $6,074,877,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $6,074,877,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $6,074,877,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $6,074,877,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $6,074,877,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $6,074,877,000,000.

(7) Education and Human Resources (800):
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(6) Natural Resources and Environment (350):

Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(7) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(10) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(11) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(12) Health (550):

Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

2) Instructions.—

The Committee on Agriculture.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $80,251,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $59,104,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2010.

The Committee on Education and the Workforce.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $2,128,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $21,803,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2010.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $1,419,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006.
and $30,725,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(D) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $207,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(E) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The House Committee on Government Reform shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $45,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $3,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(F) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—The House Committee on House Administration shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $114,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $3,864,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(G) COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE.—The Committee on Intelligence shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $2,673,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $3,164,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(H) COMMITTEE ON RULES.—The Committee on Rules may not report a rule or order providing for consideration of any legislation (other than a concurrent resolution on the budget) until after the House has adjourned (a) for the period of one session of Congress, or (b) in any other case, for not less than 20 minutes following the adjournment of the House (other than on any day on which, because of the provisions of rule I, the House is not in session).

SEC. 203. REVENUE BILLS.—Revenues shall be considered as general and aggregate amounts, and may be provided for in a revenue bill or joint resolution in which a committee of the House reports a bill or joint resolution in which a committee of the House reports a bill or joint resolution or a conference report recommending a reconciliation bill or resolution in which a committee has completed enacting reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of subsection (b) of section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of that committee may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

SEC. 204. SUBMISSION OF REPORT ON DEFENSE SAVINGS.—In the House, not later than May 15, 2005, the Committee on Armed Services shall submit to the House its findings that identify $2,000,000,000 in savings from (1) activities that are determined to be of a low priority to the successful execution of current military operations; or (2) activities that are determined to be wasteful or unnecessary to national defense. Funds identified should be reallocated to programs and activities that directly contribute to enhancing the combat capabilities of the U.S. military forces with an emphasis on force protection, munitions, and surveillance capability. (For the purpose of this subsection, the report by the Committee on Armed Services shall be inserted in the Congressional Record by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget not later than May 1, 2005.)

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE

SEC. 301. RAINY DAY FUND FOR NON-MILITARY EMERGENCIES.—In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report recommending a reconciliation bill or resolution in which a committee has completed reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of subsection (b) of section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of that committee may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

SEC. 302. CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.—(a) In General.—If the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House reports legislation, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority for the budget accounts or portions thereof in the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and 250(c)(5)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in excess of the following amounts:

(1) for fiscal year 2005: $42,906,000,000, for fiscal year 2006: $47,328,000,000, for fiscal year 2007: $47,828,700,000, for fiscal year 2008: $49,715,400,000, or for fiscal year 2009: $51,743,500,000,

(b) Submission Providing for Changes in Revenue.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report a reconciliation bill or joint resolution that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues by not more than $17,700,000,000 for fiscal year 2006 and by not more than $19,200,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(c)(1) Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget of the House of a reconciliation bill or joint resolution that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues by not more than $17,700,000,000 for fiscal year 2006 and by not more than $19,200,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010,

(TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. POINT OF ORDER PROTECTION.—(a) In General.—(1) A rule by the Committee on Rules on a rule or order that would waive section 302(f) or 303(a) (other than paragraph (2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) may not be upheld for the purpose of enacting legislation (other than an amendment thereto) unless the rule or order that would waive section 302(f) or 303(a) (other than paragraph (2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) is submitted to the House not later than May 15, 2005, and concurred in by the Senate, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution that exceeds the amount of such legislation, the Committee on Appropriations may be provided for in a revenue bill or joint resolution in which a committee of the House reports a bill or joint resolution in which a committee of the House reports a bill or joint resolution or a conference report recommending a reconciliation bill or resolution in which a committee has completed reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of subsection (b) of section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of that committee may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(b) Waiver Prohibition.—The Committee on Rules may not report a rule or order providing for consideration of any legislation that would waive section 302(f) or 303(a).

SEC. 402. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.—(a) In General.—(1) If the House, except as provided in subsection (b), adopts an advance appropriation bill or joint resolution that sets forth in excess of $105,900,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010, the Committee on Appropriations shall report an advance appropriation that is determined to reduce the deficit and may make applicable ad-
projects, activities or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading "Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations" shall not exceed $23,568,000,000 in new budget authority.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "advance appropriation" means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2006 and thereafter which becomes available for any fiscal year after 2006.

SEC. 403. AUTOMATIC VOTES ON EXPENSIVE LEGISLATION.

(a) AUTOMATIC VOTES.—In the House, a vote shall not be sought except as provided in subsection (b).

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—If a matter is designated as an emergency requirement under subsection (a), the Speaker may order that the time for debate and amendments on the matter shall be limited to 10 minutes on the floor and that the matter shall be considered as ordered when the Speaker puts the question. If the Speaker so orders the matter shall be disposed of by a roll call vote of the House, and the yeas and nays shall be ordered if requested by any Member of the House, unless the Speaker determines that it is not in the interest of the House to require a roll call. If no roll call is taken, the Speaker shall announce the result of the vote.

SEC. 404. EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

(a) PROVISIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006.—In the House, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is filed thereon, that makes supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism, then the new budget authority, new entitlement authority, outlays, and receipts resulting therefrom shall not count for purposes of sections 302, 303, and 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for the provisions of this Act that are designated pursuant to this subsection as making appropriations for such contingency operations.

(b) EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.—In the Senate, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is filed thereon, that designates a provision as an emergency requirement pursuant to this section, then the new budget authority, new entitlement authority, outlays, and receipts resulting therefrom shall not count for purposes of sections 302, 303, and 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for the purposes of this Act that are designated pursuant to this subsection as making appropriations for such contingency operations.

(c) DEFINITION.—In general.—In this section, the term "emergency requirement under subsection (b)" shall include any expression or issue, act, or omission of the Congress, or any Committee or Member thereof, in the form of a report, statement, or resolution, or otherwise, that makes supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2006 and thereafter for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism.

SEC. 405. EMERGENCY SPENDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding the provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 1301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the concurrent resolution on the budget shall be treated as a legislature-wide emergency requirement under section 201(b) or 201(c), that makes supplemental appropriations for fiscal year after 2006. If such legislation is to be considered, the Committee on Appropriations shall cause the explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in paragraph (b) to be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) CRITERIA.—In general.—In this section, the term "emergency requirement under subsection (b)" shall include any expression or issue, act, or omission of the Congress, or any Committee or Member thereof, in the form of a report, statement, or resolution, or otherwise, that makes supplemental appropriations for fiscal year after 2006 and thereafter for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism.

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—In the House, if a bill or joint resolution contains an emergency designation that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(d) POINT OF ORDER.—In the House, if a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report providing for or related to an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies contains an emergency designation that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and


(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding the provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 1301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the concurrent resolution on the budget shall be treated as an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies and that makes supplemental appropriations for fiscal year after 2006.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—If such legislation is to be considered, the Committee on Appropriations shall cause the explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in paragraph (a) to be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

SEC. 407. ACTION PURSUANT TO SECTION 302(b)(1) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT.

(a) COMPLIANCE.—When complying with Section 302(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee on Appropriations of the House shall consult with the Committee on Appropriations of the other House, the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committees on Appropriations of the House, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate on the provisions of this Act that are designated pursuant to this Act as making appropriations for such contingency operations.

(b) REPORT.—The Committee on Appropriations of the House shall report to the House when it determines that the report made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section and the report made by the Committee on Appropriations of the other House pursuant to the same provision contain identical allocations of budget outlays and new budget authority among each Committee’s subcommittees.

(c) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report containing discretionary new budget authority that would increase an on-budget surplus or decrease an on-budget deficit or increase an on-budget surplus or decrease an on-budget deficit for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the appropriate Committee on the Budget; and

SEC. 408. CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES RESULTING FROM REALISTIC SCORING OF MEASURES AFFECTING REVENUES.

(a) Whenever the House considers a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report containing measures filed in compliance with section 201(b) or 201(c), that propose to change federal revenues, the impact of such measure on federal revenues shall not be considered by the Joint Committee on Taxation in a manner that takes into account—

(b) If the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall not take into account the provisions of any piece of legislation which proposes a new or increased fee for the receipt of a defined benefit or service (including insurance coverage) by the person or entity paying the fee.

SEC. 409. PROHIBITION ON USING REVENUE INCREASES TO COMPLY WITH BUDGET ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this Act shall—

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

SEC. 410. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

SEC. 411. ENTITLEMENT SAFEGUARD.

SEC. 412. PROHIBITION ON USING REVENUE INCREASES TO COMPLY WITH BUDGET ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.
joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) For purposes of this section, the term “direct-spending legislation” does not include—

(1) any legislation the title of which is as follows: “A bill to preserve Social Security,”; or

(2) any legislation that would cause a net increase in aggregate direct spending of less than $100,000,000 for any applicable time period.

(e) If direct spending legislation increases the on-budget deficit or decreases an on-budget surplus when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or decrease the on-budget surplus when taken together with all direct spending legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline assumed for the most recent concurrent resolution on the budget, except that direct spending effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted pursuant to reconciliation instructions that are part of that same calendar year shall not be available.

(f) This section may be waived by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members present and provided.

(g) For purposes of this section, the levels of budget authority and outlays for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

(h) The Committee on Rules may not report a rule or order proposing a waiver of paragraph (a).

SEC. 412. BUDGET PROTECTION MANDATORY ACCOUNT.

(a)(1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain an account to be known as the “Budget Protection Mandatory Account”. The Account shall be divided into entries corresponding to the allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget, except that it shall not include the Committee on Appropriations.

(2) Each entry shall consist only of amounts credited to it under subsection (b). No entry of a negative amount shall be made.

(b)(1) Upon the engrossment of a House bill or joint resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall—

(A) credit the applicable entries of the Budget Protection Mandatory Account by the amounts specified in subparagraph (2);

and

(B) reduce the applicable 302(a) allocations by the amount specified in subparagraph (2).

(2) Each amount specified in subparagraph (A) shall be the net reduction in mandatory budget authority (under current law or proposed by the bill or joint resolution under consideration) provided by each amendment that was adopted in the House to the bill or joint resolution.

(c)(1) If an amendment includes a provision described in subparagraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall, upon the engrossment of a House bill or joint resolution, reduce the level of total revenues set forth in the applicable concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year or for the total of that first fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years in an amount equal to the mandatory budget authority provided by each amendment that was adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution. Such adjustment shall be in addition to the adjustments described in subsection (b).

(2)(A) The provision specified in subparagraph (1) is as follows: “The amount of discretionary budget authority reduced by this amendment may be used to offset a decrease in revenues.”

(B) All points of order are waived against an amendment including the text specified in subparagraph (A) provided the amendment is otherwise in order.

TITLE V—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

SEC. 501. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON SPENDING ACCOUNTABILITY.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) authorizing committees should actively engage in oversight utilizing—

(A) the plans and goals submitted by executive agencies pursuant to the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993; and

(B) the performance evaluations submitted by such agencies (that are based upon the Program Assessment Rating Tool which is designed to improve agency performance); in order to enact legislation to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse to ensure the efficient use of taxpayer dollars;

(2) all Federal programs should be periodically reauthorized and funding for unauthorizing programs should be level-funded in fiscal year 2006 unless there is a compelling justification;

(3) committees should submit written justifications for earmarks and should consider not funding those most egregiously inconsistent with national policy;

(4) the fiscal year 2006 budget resolution should be vigorously enforced and legislation should be enacted establishing statutory limits on appropriations and amendments to the PAY-AS-YOU-GO rule for new and expanded entitlement programs; and

(5) Congress should make every effort to offset non-war-related supplemental appropriations.

SEC. 502. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ENTITLEMENT REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS—The House finds that welfare was successfully reformed through the application of work requirements, education and training opportunity, and time limits on eligibility.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that authorizing committees should—

(1) systematically review all means-tested entitlement programs and track beneficiary participation across programs and time;

(2) enact legislation to develop common eligibility standards and data sets for means-tested entitlement programs;

(3) enact legislation to accurately rename means-tested entitlement programs;

(4) enact legislation to coordinate program benefits in order to limit to a reasonable period of time the Government dependency of means-tested entitlement program participants;

(5) evaluate the costs of, and justifications for, nonmeans-tested, nonretirement-related entitlement programs; and

(6) identify and utilize resources that have conducted cost-benefit analyses of participants in multiple means- and nonmeans-tested entitlement programs to understand their cumulative costs and collective benefits.

SEC. 503. SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING THE ABOLISHMENT OF OBSOLETE AGENCIES AND FEDERAL SUNSET PROPOSALS.

(a) The House finds the following:

(1) The National Commission on the Public Service in recent reports recurrently reports: Business For America: Revitalizing The Federal Government For The 21st Century," states that government missions are so widely dispersed that none are able to achieve management effectiveness. The report also states that fragmentation leaves many gaps,
inconsistencies, and inefficiencies in government oversight and results in an unacceptable level of public health protection.

(2) According to the Commission, there are more than 350 food safety laws administered by 12 different federal agencies; 541 clean air, water, and waste programs in 29 federal agencies; 50 different programs to aid the homeless in 14 Federal agencies; and 27 teen pregnancy programs operated in 95 Federal agencies; and 90 early childhood programs scattered among 11 Federal agencies.

(3) According to the General Accounting Office (GAO), there are 163 programs with a job training or employment function, 64 welfare programs, a similar nature, and more than 500 urban aid programs.

(4) GAO also indicates 13 agencies coordinate 342 economic development programs, but there is very little or no coordination between them. This situation has created a bureaucracy so complex that many local communities stop applying for economic assistance. At the same time, the GAO reports that these programs often serve as nothing more than funnels for pork, have “no significant effect” on the economy, and cost $11 billion a year on programs and projects that are unsustainable and let us not continue funding these programs.

(5) In 1976, Colorado became the first state to implement a sunset mechanism. Today, about half of the Nation’s States have some sort of sunset mechanism in effect to monitor their legislative branch agencies. On the Federal level, the United States Senate in 1976 overwhelmingly passed legislation to sunset most of the Government agencies by a vote of 87-1.

(6) In Texas, “sunsetting” has eliminated 44 agencies and saved the taxpayers $1 billion.

(b) It is the Sense of the House of Representatives that the following programs should be eliminated:

(1) Title X Family Planning.
(2) Corporation for Public Broadcasting.
(3) National Endowment for the Arts.
(4) Legal Services Corporation.
(5) The Advanced Technology Program.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 2, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, spending is out of control in the Nation’s capital, and if we do not work to control this spending, we will leave our children and grandchildren a legacy of a lower standard of living, a legacy of more government, of less freedom, of less opportunity.

Many people in this Chamber have risen tonight to say that there is no spending problem. I think we should take a look at the facts.

Number one, Mr. Chairman, we are now spending over $20,000 for American families. For the first time since World War II, we are now spending this much money. For only the fourth time in the history of our Nation, and if we look back just 10 years, almost every government agency has grown by a huge multiple overinflation.

International inflation is up 93 percent; agriculture, 154 percent; transportation, 78 percent; education, 95 percent, and the list goes on and on. We have been growing government at twice the rate of inflation and 50 percent more than the inflation of the time.

We believe that these growth rates are unsustainable and let us just not look at the past. Let us look at the future.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, over the next decade Social Security is due to grow by 5.5 percent a year, Medicaid by almost 8 percent a year and Medicare by 9 percent a year. We have an explosion of government spending, and yet many in this Chamber want to spend even more, at the expense of American families.

Where is this leading us? Mr. Chairman, most recently, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Alan Greenspan said, as a Nation we may have already promised to coming generations of retirees that we will be unable to fulfill.

According to the General Accounting Office, Social Security faces a serious and growing solvency and sustainability challenge that is growing as time passes.

According to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, referring to Social Security, such chronic and growing obligations in the Social Security program are properly understood by the American public, including voters, as a sign that the program is out of balance and heading for bankruptcy.

According to the Comptroller General of the United States, 342 economic development programs, have no signifi-
cant effect on economic growth and job creation and are used to disguise the fact that the Bush administration is eliminating those provisions in the tax code that have increased domestic employment by eliminating those provisions in the tax code that have yielded the American public, including investors, as a sign that the program is out of balance and heading for bankruptcy.
they will realize is that government has been part of the problem. They have raided the Social Security trust fund 59 times. Government took the money away from Social Security; government should give the money back.

How does government give the money back? Governments can grow at a slower rate than it has in the past. The second theme of this budget, the second priority of this budget, is we believe we have to protect the family budget from the Federal budget. Is there really a comprehensive way that families have to get around their kitchen table and have to make tough decisions that we in Congress cannot do the same thing? We do not believe that the Federal budget should grow faster than the family budget, and this budget achieves that goal.

Finally, we believe a budget ought to be a limit on spending. We ought to decide, subject to emergency spending that we understand, that we ought to have some committees that have to do the work of achieving those reforms. I have worked with each one of those committees and the committee chairmen to arrange the agreements which bring the base resolution here today; and I respect that process, and I will support that process.

In addition, we have a President who for really the first time since I have been in Congress has been able to step up during a very challenging time in our Nation’s history when we are at war and say even though it would be easy to use the war as an excuse and not worry about what is happening on the domestic side, the President of the United States has said we are going to control spending, work on the entitlement programs, and try to reform the programs and to meet the needs out there.

The fact that the RSC comes forward with a budget that goes a little further, as I say, I respect that; but I do not think that we are going to get the support behind it that we need in order to get it done. At the end of the day, that is what we need. We need the budget to pass so we have something to enforce.

I want to speak to that briefly because as congressional watchers may have seen or misinterpreted, the intraruminal discussion that went on and off the floor related to being behind the smoke for years between friends and colleagues, I interpret what the RSC was doing, the Republican Study Committee was doing with regard to enforcement to be the exact right attitude to have. That is if you are going to do the work of having a budget, then let us enforce it.

The good news from my standpoint is last year when we were not able to get a budget through both bodies, the House took the version we passed, we deemed it, and we enforced it. We stuck to it. At the final analysis of the Congressional Budget Office when all of the smoke cleared and they finally were able to close all of the books, you know what we blew that budget by, a $2.4 trillion budget, and we missed it by $400 million.

Now Members could say we missed it, but I would say for not having a budget in both the House and Senate and not having the budget being the force of the Congressional budget, I would say that is a pretty good track record and one that I give a lot of credit to our Speaker, in particular, for having accomplished. I give them much credit not only on the work product of coming forward with a budget, but also their desire to enforce it. I stand ready to work shoulder to shoulder and side by side with them as we not only get that budget done, but enforce the budget, to work with them on their work product, and I reluctantly will vote against their budget.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I claim 10 minutes, or half of the time in opposition.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) be permitted to control 10 minutes, or half of the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) for 10 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will vote against this budget, and let me be clear why. It is because of my responsibility and duty to protect the base bill, the base resolution, the product that was worked and crafted in a very genuine way through the committee process, one that has the support of our majority, one that has the support of our leadership, one that has the support of our chairman, and one that I dare say has, and I believe has, the support of my friends who bring forth the budget resolution tonight.

As when the Congressional Black Caucus came forth, any one who has the guts to come out here with their own budget I have to applaud. I may oppose it, but I have to applaud it because I know what it takes to put together a budget. Whether the alternative budget has one person who supports it or 80 Members or 218 Members to support it, I commend the coalition for coming forth with their budget. I said the same to the Congressional Black Caucus because they are the ones that have to come up with a viable way every year I have been in Congress and for many years before. I really mean that. Anyone who is willing to put the sweat equity into it gets my admiration.

I reluctantly oppose this alternative because if given the opportunity to have a perfect world could we, should we work for more spending control? Yes, there is no question. For all of the haranguing that happens here about the cuts, we know there are a lot more weeds in the garden we could pull; we know there is more reform that we could drive. We know we could work harder and probably find more spending control.

We have some practicalities, however. One is we have some committees that have to do the work of achieving those reforms. I have worked with each one of those committees and the committee chairmen to arrange the agreements which bring the base resolution here today; and I respect that process, and I will support that process.

First, as we all know, a sound education is a stepping stone to economic opportunity, success, and prosperity. The CBC alternative budget has a comprehensive approach to education and training by increasing funding for education and training programs by $23.9 billion over the majority budget. It provides funds for school construction, full funding No Child Left Behind, and provides critical funding for Head Start, Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness Programs, and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA. For those in college, the CBC budget appropriates $450 million for Pell grants. In addition, the CBC budget funds the Perkins loan programs, job training, and vocational education programs that are critical in today’s global economy.

Young people, particularly African Americans, are lagging in education when compared to other groups. This budget aims to close the achievement gap here at home while making our students more competitive worldwide. The CBC understands that Federal support for community and regional development helps promote growth in economically distressed urban and rural areas. To remedy these economic disparities, the CBC budget ensures that the community development and housing programs continue to improve housing conditions in low- to moderate-income neighborhoods.
Our budget adds $1.5 billion to CDBG grants and improves housing conditions for moderate-income families. I cannot emphasize enough the importance of CDBG grants. They assist cities and counties with creating jobs, increasing economic development opportunities, and stimulating homeownership. CDBG provides for these services in a way that recognizes the unique needs of distressed areas in rural, urban, and suburban communities. It is the signature program for cities and counties to stimulate local economies.

I know that from experience because I once served as the mayor pro tempore on the city council for Carson, California.

In 2004, CDBG assisted 168,938 households across America with their housing needs, including financial assistance, construction, rehabilitation, and other improvements. At least 95 percent of the funds support activities benefiting low- and moderate-income families.

The alternative CBC budget also allocates funding to the Small Business Administration and the Manufacturing Extension Partnership and provides additional funding for adult training and dislocated workers programs. By supporting these programs, the CBC is working to close the existing economic disparities in the United States and to help entrepreneurs and ordinary Americans realize the American Dream.

The CBC alternative budget also allocates additional funding for enforcement initiatives such as juvenile justice and prison reentry programs. The CBC understands we need to protect the homeland, and our budget adds $2 billion to meet urgent homeland security needs that face our Nation. The alternative budget therefore devotes additional resources for guarding against terrorist attacks through our rail and ports, including cargo screening that prevents nuclear or radiological weapons from entering the United States.

It also supports essential funding for the Centers for Disease Control to help us prepare for a possible biological attack. The CBC alternative budget ensures that cities, towns, and hamlets will receive the resources that are urgently needed to protect our resources, citizens that are absolutely needed for our cities and towns.

We can accomplish this, all of these priorities, by reducing the tax cuts from 2001 and 2003 from an individual’s adjusted gross income that exceeds $200,000 and closing tax loopholes. I urge all of my colleagues to support this budget.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), a member of the Budget Committee and a budget leader within the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, before I begin, let me just say that in addition to rising in support of this amendment budget, I also rise to support the efforts of the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) that he has done to move us in the right direction with the budget that he has released.

It was just a short time ago that I had the opportunity to finish reading a book by Chuck Colson which is entitled “How Now Shall We Live”. And it is a title that is an intriguing title. It is a question that we really should all ask ourselves all the time. How shall we conduct ourselves in our lives with our families and our lives in our community, in our lives in our society, and it is really a question that every Member of Congress should be asking ourselves every day as we come down to the floor.

Now, with families, how shall we live. Well, we ask our families to do a simple thing, to live within our means. Families have many ways that we can be spending our money, on trips, on schools, on property, on houses and fancy cars. But at the end of the day, a responsible family knows it has to spend no more than it takes in at the end of the year and must live within its means because if it does not what will the family be doing but simply passing that financial burden on to their children and their grandchildren.

So Congress really has to set an example, and I guess you could say in a way we have been setting an example for years. But we have been getting a terrible example for families for years, and it is about time that we set a good one.

I serve on the Budget Committee, and if you ever come to those meetings you will see, from the other side of the aisle especially, their ways to live within our means is to increase the means by increasing the revenue by raising taxes, and they just did it last week again.

I have never had anyone explain to me how we improve the economy by taking more money out of the family budget and sending it down here to Washington so that we can spend it. So raising taxes obviously is not the answer to living within our means. It is spending less.

Just like families who have lots of things that we can spend money on. Congress has lots of things that we can spend money on and if you come to the budget hearings you see. Every agency, every department, every program that comes before us, they all say the same thing basically, that they want more money to spend.

As a matter of fact, if you sat on a budget hearing last year you saw the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GURNEE), who, where we put charts up on all the time of these various things, spending requests and what have you, the gentleman from Minnesota asked a question. He said, could you put up charts by agencies, all the programs, all the departments that have ever come before us to ask for their program, for their department to spend less money. And we all looked at the chart, and there was nothing on the chart, because no one ever asks for less money in Washington because we know we always spend more.

So I am rising in support of the bill sponsored by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) because it moves us in that right direction. It moves us in the direction of spending within our means. And how does it do it? Not really hard at all. One of the things it does is it reduces spending on nonsecurity discretionary by reducing the spending by 2 percent. 2 percent. Many families have to do that all the time. It is not a heavy lift to reduce our spending in that area. We should be able to do the same thing.

The second area is by reducing the growth in mandatory spending from 6.4 to 6.1 percent. We are still increasing spending there by almost twice the increase in the inflation rate, but we are just lowering the curve a little bit.

So how now shall Congress live? We shall live as families have to live, within their means. And this bill sponsored by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) does do that.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield a minute to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is very interesting listening to my colleagues make a presentation on their budget. And I would ask them really the real question, this is not about what Congress would do. This is about the needs of the American people.

It is interesting that if there was a serious intent about a budget that really was fair and did not burden the children of the future, we would not be adopting both the gentleman from Iowa’s budget and the gentleman from Texas’ budget, $1.5 trillion in new tax cuts that was not proposed by the President and taking every single penny from Social Security.

The budget that is on the floor right now does nothing to close the disparities between African Americans, Hispanics and others less fortunate than others in the United States of America. The Congressional Black Caucus budget, fair, balanced, closing the deficit, protecting our troops, but it understands protecting Medicaid and education funds and health care funds and homeland security.

The budget that is on the floor today now supports a trillion dollars plus in tax cuts and does nothing for catastrophic possibilities that may happen, such as a terrorist attack. This is the wrong direction to go. The Congressional Black Caucus closes the disparities and supports the investment in the American people.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), one of the most fiscally responsible Members of Congress.
Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for helping put together this package and for all the work that he has done on behalf of the Republican Study Committee and for all of my colleagues there that have worked so hard on this alternative budget.

I want to also commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSELE) for the budget that is presented here. It makes cuts of .7 percent in nondefense discretionary spending.

Finally, we are actually doing what families would do when a large deficit looms in the future, though we need to do far more than that. This budget would cut 2 percent. When you look at what lies ahead, when you look at the unfunded liabilities that lie ahead, this is kid stuff. We are going to have to do much, much more in the future. If we are inching toward bankruptcy in Social Security, we are flat running toward it with Medicare. And when you look at what lies ahead, there are unfunded liabilities that are $7 trillion in unfunded liabilities with the Medicare prescription drug bill, for example, that we are going to have to somehow deal with, that our kids and grandkids are going to have to somehow deal with.

We have got to get ahold of this deficit. The problem is not tax cuts. That is part of the solution. We need more revenue coming in. You do that by cutting taxes. We have seen that time and time again. The problem here is we have too much spending. There is a culture of spending in this institution that is just difficult to stop. This alternative budget makes some progress toward that end, but I again want to stress this is kid stuff compared to what we are going to have to do in the coming years to get a handle on this culture of spending.

I commend my colleagues for putting this forward. I urge this House to support it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to an observation the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) made that this was the most fiscally responsible budget since the Reagan years. I was surprised, first of all, that he chose the Reagan years as a frame of reference. Those are the years that the mushroom deficits first appeared. We had deficits of $300 billion, 5.6 percent of GDP in the early 1980s. It took us 15 years to get to those deficits. That would not be the kind of model that I would choose. If you want something to model a budget after, then there is a much more recent and much more valid model and that is what we did in 1990, 1993 and 1997.

In 1990, both sides sat down, President Bush took part in the negotiations through his staff and we came to the first agreement for the settlement of the budget deficit. The Bush balanced budget agreement of 1990 and 1991, laid the foundation for what we accomplished in the 1990s. In 1993, we did the Clinton budget. In 1997, we finished it up with the Balanced Budget Act. All of those acts contained three elements, the PAYGO rule which we are proposing to reinstate, caps on discretionary spending backed up by sequestration, and a multiyear 5-year budget, not just a 1-year budget but a 5-year budget in each year. That is what is lacking here, the budget process, the budget discipline, the budget plan.

If you want to see where this budget is likely to fail simply look once again that everybody should look in his mail and he or she will find an analysis of the President’s budgetary proposals for fiscal year 2006. This is essentially the President’s budget with a few changes to it, but it is basically his budget. As I have said, you only have to read two pages. You come to table 1.1 and you look in the far right-hand column and you will see the total debt accumulation according to CBO that will be incurred if we follow the President’s budget. That total is $5.135 trillion and that is before anything for fixing the alternative minimum tax which CBO tells us is going to cost at least $640 billion, and before anything is added to the cost side of the ledger for the war in Iraq. This is where we are going if we adopt this budget, right back where we were in 1980 with the budget that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) said he admired so much as fiscally responsible.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, growing government and putting us on a path to doubling taxes on the American people meets nobody’s definition of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CICOGOLLA), a real leader on budget enforcement in this Congress.

Mr. CICOGOLLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time and I thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership on this very important issue which I think is one of the most important issues that our Nation faces in the long term.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hensarling amendment. I do so because of a lot of reasons. I do so because the amendment in this budget is about simplification. It changes our budget functions from 19 that are really unrelated to the way we spend money around here to four simple budget functions, defense, homeland security, non-defense discretionary and mandatory spending, making the budget much simpler and easier to understand. It is about honesty. It creates a rainy day fund where we actually budget for emergencies. Every single year we spend Federal money on emergencies but we never budget for them. It seems to me if we know we are going to spend money, we ought to be honest and we ought to budget for it. It also is about accountability. It makes all of us more accountable because it has mechanisms on how we can enforce the budget which I think is the least we can do is pass a budget and stick by it and do what we say we are going to do to the American people. But most of all it is about fiscal responsibility. It starts the process of moving from a measure of success to how much we spend to how well we spend. It does so in a way, as has been pointed out, it reduces nondefense discretionary spending by 2 percent, it reduces the size of government, it makes mandatory spending by just a little bit, and there will be those that say this is very draconian. But it reminds me of a lot a long ago when I was in the private sector and I was in other budget process meetings. I would sit down with general managers of the business and I would say, your expense budget is reduced and maybe it is reduced by as much as 10 percent. You might expect the world was going to come to an end, we were going to lose all our customers. We were going to lose all our employees, but every single year the fact of the matter was that at the end of the year after we reduced our expense budget and we measured how we spend and we measured how much we spend, we grew our market share, we served our customers better, our employees were more secure in their employment because our company was stronger and more successful. In other words, we learned how to do more with less and we were better off for it.

I think that government should be no exception because no family and no business is an exception to the challenges that we face. This budget gets us on the path of being able to meet those challenges in a very responsible way. I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), an outstanding freshman Member.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I want to first start by thanking the gentleman from Texas for offering this budget alternative. I think it is a fiscally conservative, sane budget and I think it is much needed here in Washington, D.C. Furthermore, I would like to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSELE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for putting forward a very strong, fiscally conservative, reasonable budget for the American people that is aimed for our priorities here in Washington, D.C., like funding national defense, like funding homeland security, but it is also a good way to rein in government spending and eliminate government programs that have gotten out of control and maybe are not responsive to individual taxpayers.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hensarling amendment. I do so because of a lot of reasons. I do so because the amendment in this budget is about simplification. It changes our budget functions from 19 that are really unrelated to the way we spend money around here to four simple budget functions, defense, homeland security, non-defense discretionary and mandatory spending, making the budget much simpler and easier to understand. It is about honesty. It creates a rainy day fund where we actually budget for emergencies. Every single year we spend Federal money on emergencies but we never budget for them. It seems to me if we know we are going to spend money, we ought to be honest and we ought to budget for it. It also is about accountability. It makes all of us more accountable because it has mechanisms

So I compliment our chairman in that regard.

But, Mr. Chairman, the reason why I address the House tonight is because
we have a better alternative, a much more fiscally alternative budget put before us by the gentleman from Texas. This budget would further reduce spending, would further rein in government growth, and would take on the mandatory spending programs that are going to continue.

What the gentleman from Texas does with this alternative budget is rein in government spending and mandatory programs further, further reduce non-discretionary spending, while at the same time funding the President’s budget when it comes to defense and homeland security, two top priorities of this Congress. But, additionally, it continues the tax cuts. It continues re-turning the taxpayers’ money to them at home.

So I think it is important that we keep all those notions in mind as we vote for this budget. I encourage those on the other side of the aisle who ask for more fiscal discipline to come on over to the amendment (Mr. HENSARLING) has emerged as a national leader on fiscal restraint in Washington, D.C., and it is an honor for me to vote for the American people; and I encourage them to vote for the budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), one of the outstanding conservative leaders of this Congress, the chairman of the 100-member Republican Study Committee. (Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), who is a man of principle and a man of personal courage, in his quest to restore fiscal discipline to Washington, D.C. In just a few short years, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) has emerged as a national leader on fiscal restraint in Washington, D.C., and it is an honor for me to be associated with his handiwork in support of the Hensarling amendment.

I too join in the chorus of those conservatives who have spoken tonight in commendation of the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE), who has, in fact, produced the most conservative budget since the historic years of the Reagan Administration. And the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), who history may be calling him to other duties sometime soon, will leave a lasting and indelible mark on the budget at the Federal level, and we are grateful for his principled leadership and support.

I do support the Hensarling amendment, though, which today was endorsed by the 350,000-member National Taxpayers Union, Americans for Tax Reform, just to name a few, because it is long past time for Congress to put our fiscal house in order.

The OMB estimates the total fiscal outlays in 2005 will be a stunning 33 percent higher than outlays as recently as fiscal year 2001. We have seen extraordinary growth in various departments, including spending in the Department of Education, which has grown at almost twice the rate of even military spending. Spending at the Labor Department will have risen 26 percent during the same period.

The RSC budget, known as the Hensarling amendment, would provide for needed restraint by reducing non-defense-related discretionary spending by 2 percent and calling for $57 billion more in savings than the Committee on the Budget’s budget; but better yet, the RSC’s budget would dramatically enhance the possibility that Members will adhere to the spending levels set out in the budget resolution by providing bold initiatives in process reform, point of order protection, forcing Congress to define emergency spending and account for it in the budget, creating trigger accounts that would allow spending cuts to be directed toward deficit reduction or tax relief, just to name a few proposals.

The RSC budget is an opportunity for Members of Congress to vote for the President’s war on terror, our defense and homeland security and a little bit less than the Committee on the Budget’s number on everything else. Voting for the RSC budget is voting for finding more savings in the largest category of Federal spending, mandatory spending. And voting for the RSC budget is voting for a way to enforce the budget that the House passes and to embrace a series of budget process reforms, which, if they are successful in the Hensarling amendment, may yet be entertained by the 109th Congress in the months and days ahead.

I strongly support the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), his courage, his principle; and I urge support of all of my colleagues of the Hensarling amendment.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

For some members, we just cannot get enough government. But we are drowning in a sea of red ink already.

This is not a debate about how much we are going to spend on health care and education and housing. This is a debate about who is going to do the spending. We believe families should do the spending. We believe good things come from freedom, from opportunity, and freedom for families to choose the health care that is right for them, to choose the education opportunities for their children that are right for them, to find the best job in a competitive market economy. We cannot have unlimited government and unlimited opportunity. The Republican Study Committee believes in unlimited opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, we urge the adoption of this amendment; but should it fail, please, ask the House to vote for the Nussle budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. As I said before, I rise with reluctant opposition. What the RSC has done is bold; it is worth consideration. It will be part of the consideration as we go through the process. I am sure, throughout the rest of the year as well as we consider the budgets in years to come, if I would ask, as the author of the amendment just did, that while consideration be given that we adopt the underlying bill. And, therefore, I oppose the amendment, but with a great amount of respect and admiration for the work that has been done.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) will be postponed.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATHOURTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1334 PROTECTION OF INCAPACITATED PERSONS ACT OF 2005

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-20) on the resolution (H. Res. 162) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1334) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the removal to Federal court of certain State court cases involving the rights of incapacitated persons, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions 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.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken tomorrow.

PROTECTION OF INCAPACITATED PERSONS ACT OF 2005

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1332) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the removal to Federal court of certain State court cases involving the rights or medical treatment of incapacitated persons, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1332

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 “Protection of Incapacitated Persons Act of 2005”.

SEC. 2. REMOVAL OF CERTAIN CASES TO FEDERAL COURT TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF INCAPACITATED PERSONS.

(a) RIGHT OF REMOVAL.—Chapter 89 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

§ 1453. Protection of rights of incapacitated persons

“(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, within fewer than 30 days after available State remedies have been exhausted, an incapacitated person, or the next friend of an incapacitated person, may remove any claim or cause of action described in subsection (b) to the United States district court for the district in which the claim or cause of action arose, or was heard.

“(b) The claim or cause of action referred to in subsection (a) is one in which the State court authorizes or directs the withholding or withdrawal of food or fluids or medical treatment necessary to sustain the incapacitated person’s life, but does not include a claim or cause of action in which no party disputes, and the court finds, that the incapacitated person has sufficient capacity, and has executed a written advance directive, commonly known as a living will, that clearly authorizes, or prohibits, the withholding or withdrawal of food or fluids or medical treatment necessary to sustain the incapacitated person’s life. ’’

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1332, the Protection of Incapacitated Persons Act of 2005, which I introduced today with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend the remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1332, the bill currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1332, the Protection of Incapacitated Persons Act of 2005, which I introduced today with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDOO).

Madam Speaker, the Florida courts are poised to determine that Terri Schiavo will have her feeding tube removed on Friday. This legislation will protect Ms. Schiavo from starving to death by allowing her to have a Federal court consider her case anew, unrestricted by the findings of the State court.

H.R. 1332 authorizes the removal of cases in State court to U.S. Federal court to vindicate the Federal rights of incapacitated persons under the United States Constitution or any Federal law. Such proceedings would be authorized after an incapacitated person has exhausted available State remedies and the relevant papers must be filed in Federal court within 30 days after the exhaustion of available State remedies.

What is going on in Florida regarding Terri Schiavo is nothing short of inhumane. She is facing what amounts to a death sentence, ensuring that she will slowly starve to death over a matter of weeks. Terri Schiavo is a woman who smiles and cries and who is not on a respirator or any other 24-hour-a-day medical equipment, has committed no crime; and she has done nothing wrong. Yet the Florida courts seem bent on setting an extremely dangerous precedent by saying that we must stop feeding someone who cannot feed herself. Who is next? The disabled or those late in life? This legislation is humane and the right thing; not only to protect Terri Schiavo but also to reinforce the law’s commitment to justice and compassion for all, even the most vulnerable.

The bill applies to anyone who might find themselves in Terri Schiavo’s situation, namely, those who are in an incapacitated state and facing a court order authorizing “the withholding or withdrawing of food or fluids or medical treatment necessary to sustain the incapacitated person’s life.” The bill applies only to incapacitated persons, not to convicted criminals or those facing the death penalty, for example.

Furthermore, it applies only to those who have not executed in advance a written directive, commonly known as a living will, that clearly authorizes the withholding or withdrawing of food, water, and medical treatment in the event the person becomes incapacitated.

What Terri Schiavo and all disabled people deserve in contested cases is for justice to tilt toward life. When a person’s intentions regarding whether to receive lifesaving treatment are unclear, the clear choice is to provide an innocent person with the opportunity to have a Federal court provide a “double-check” for life under Federal law, unencumbered by the decisions of a State court. A measure of a Nation’s commitment to innocent life is measured in its laws by the extent to which the laws go to save it. This bill takes that extra step, not just for Terri Schiavo but for all of us. And I urge every Member of this House to take that step with me and overwhelmingly pass this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill because it is a dangerously reckless way to deal with some very serious issues.

The Committee on the Judiciary was supposed to have a hearing to examine this legislation, or any piece of legislation on this subject. This bill was introduced only a few hours ago. That hearing today was canceled and then we were told that this bill would be brought up.

We are dealing with some of the most difficult issues likely to come before this Congress, end of life issues, concerning the wishes of those unable to speak for themselves, ensuring due process and a fair and careful fact finding process.

Does this legislation do the job, or does it make matters worse? Has anyone looked closely at this bill? Have we
had a hearing? Have we had a markup? Has anyone had a chance to look at the competence of its drafting, at the effects of its language? No.

There is no way to make these judgments easy, even when the expressed desires are clear or unambiguous. Where there is disagreement on the medical facts or on the wishes of the patient, these cases can be heart rending, and sometimes bitter, beyond the comprehension of those who do not experience enough not to have to make those decisions.

Unfortunately, we have no choice. Even a decision to do nothing is a decision with consequences. Someone eventually will have to make that decision, either the patient or someone on behalf of the patient. In a dispute, a court must make the final call. I am grateful that burden has not fallen on my shoulders.

So what does this bill do? It would place the Federal judge and then Federal appellate judges in the middle of a case, after State courts, doctors, family members, counselors and clergy have struggled with that case perhaps for years. They have everything determined, everything adjudicated, and the participants finally sighing a sigh of relief that it is over, then a Federal judge jumps in.

It goes just with feeding tubes. It would allow intervention in any decision affecting any kind of medical care. Read the bill. It even says that the cause of action does not include a claim or cause of action in which the courts find that the incapacitated person while having capacity executed a written directive, et cetera.

What does that mean? It means that after someone writes a living will and says I do not want to be resuscitated, or do not use painful treatment beyond a certain point or whatever, and after the courts in that State have found that is what happened, that that is what the person meant and that those desires are clear or unambiguous, some busybody from outside can now come in and start the process all over again, notwithstanding the fact finding in the State courts, because we do not trust State courts any more. We do not trust the elected State courts, we want the unelected Federal judges that we normally excoriate in this Chamber.

Now suddenly they are trustworthy and we want to come and say they should start a whole new proceeding after every one is over and drag the case on, to the anguish of the family members, for another few years.

This bill allows a large number of people, not just the spouse or a relative in the State courts, to be allowed into the proceeding, or even after everyone thought the proceeding was finished. Even if the incapacitated person has executed a written advance directive, any party can drag the matter into Federal court simply by “disagreeing.” That is what the bill says.

Do we have no respect for families? Do we have no respect for the carefully established procedures our State legislatures and courts have set up to wrestle with these difficult situations? Do we have no interest in writing a law for the whole country that might actually do the job right?

Unfortunately, the leadership is determined to vote on this important life or death issue without giving the Members of this House the opportunity to actually look at the issue or even read the bill or to think about it. These things should not be done in haste tonight. That may be far for the course these days, but it is irresponsible and shows real contempt for the families who will have to live with this.

If you think this is the only way to prevent the disconnection of Terri Schiavo’s feeding tube, that we should not legislate this way, we should give Members the opportunity to read bills, we should not ride roughshod over State jurisdictions, but here we have an emergency because the case is coming down right away in Florida, consider this: The Florida legislature is considering its own legislation on this matter. There is no need to enact radical legislation unconsidered for the whole country just because Florida, for better or worse, is addressing it.

We should take back this bill and look at it carefully. People should at least read it. We should hold hearings. We should get expert witnesses.

We should ask ourselves that not any busybody can come and insert himself or herself into a family’s anguish. We owe American families that much.

I urge that this bill not be passed tonight, and that we stop, look, listen and think.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER). I note that this is the same majority that has instead offered, instead of moving to the Federal courts. The District Court’s consideration is restricted to determining whether the State court’s ruling violates any right, privilege or immunity secured by the Constitution.

I must say I am a bit befuddled by the gentleman from New York’s objections to this bill. It seems to me that many of our colleagues on the left are often content, and rightly so, to have the Federal courts defend the constitutional rights of Americans, and here in the case of one of our most vulnerable citizens, the arguments are lost on me as to why as to securing those constitutional rights the Federal District Court would not be the proper jurisdiction.

And with this I close: The Bible tells us we have three duties; to do justice, to love kindness, to walk humbly with our God. This is a deeply meaningful moment to this Member of Congress. I am grateful to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) for his leadership and his vision in bringing this bill to the floor. In so doing, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) brings justice and kindness to the law in this extraordinary case and comes alongside the family of Terri Schiavo to say the American people hear you and are anxious to bring you relief.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman’s courtesy in permitting me to speak on this measure this evening.

I must note in passing as I was listening to my colleague from Indiana I know speak from the heart, but I find irony that he talks about perceived inconsistencies by people on our side of the aisle.

I note that this is the same majority party that would seek to deny the Supreme Court the authority to be able to deal with matters that relate to marriage. They think that that is not appropriate for the Federal court. They do not trust the Supreme Court to deal with these personal issues. But if they are thinking that they can continue with efforts to have government interfere with some of the most painful, personal areas, then they are willing to compromise consistency and move forward.

I have watched as a Member of this Chamber a consistent effort to try and
interpose some people’s version of what they sincerely believe from the heart, and I respect that.

But I have watched, for instance, in my State, where citizens have struggled with these sensitive issues of end of life questions, from Oregon. I have watched Oregonians struggle with the question of profound significance of how we are going to deal with end-of-life questions; who is going to have control, where is government going to intervene and how far are we going to extend government.

I have watched for 4 years as the Bush administration has engaged in an assault against the decision of the voters of Oregon, not unelected bureaucrats, not unelected judges. Oregonians, not once, but twice, decided to be the first State in the Union that was going to try and deal with these sensitive personal issues openly and honestly. Because I will tell you that in every State of the Union, every day, decisions are made by physicians and families that end up shortening life, maybe even terminating life.

The difference is in Oregon, that is the first State where we decided we are actually going to have a legal framework work with this that provides guidance. The assisted suicide that we have requires not one but two doctors to work with citizens, to be able to provide a framework, finding among other things that they are at the end of their lives in the last 6 months, and that they are not doing this out of an act of desperation or depression.

In fact, there is pretty pervasive evidence that by having this framework and giving people control, there are probably fewer suicides, because people have a sense that they control their own destiny, and that armed with this and a prescription that would end their life, many of them choose not to move forward.

But I have watched the assault against the decision of Oregonians, approved by the voters, by the Bush administration through the courts, that to this point has been thwarted. We found people in this Chamber who have been fit to criminalize the practice of medicine by injecting the decision of prosecutors to determine the intent of physicians in these most personal matters. Thus far, at least, it has been resisted.

We, Madam Speaker, the assault by ideologues and the intolerants who would impose government on these most personal decisions continues. We have seen it in Florida. This is a case in Florida where we have all been following, where the politicians repeatedly have been seeking to intercede on the objection of the husband in this case.

The courts in Florida have seen fit to render judgment, but it is not good enough for folks. They want to go ahead over the objection of the parties involved, and they want to remove this to the Federal courts. As I pointed out, the same people that wanted to deny the authority of the Federal courts to deal with issues; for example, of marriage, to interfere with decisions with which they disagree.

You may not be from Oregon or Florida, but make no mistake, this is a dragnet to take away the authority of citizens to deal with these most personal issues. Not will be safe if we allow this path to continue. Families, local courts, voters, are going to be overruled by people in their zeal to tell others how to lead their lives.

I strongly urge that this misguided proposal, a face that tries to smile. She has an active EEG. She has eyes that respond, a face that tries to smile. She tries to vocalize.

In my opinion, this legislation that the chairman has brought forward is essentially the same thing as the bill I introduced last week. My legal remedy was a habeas corpus method of dealing with it. The chairman has, I believe, actually come up with a better solution; the removal act I think is a better way to deal with this.

I would just simply point out to all of my colleagues, we do not actually in this bill make a determination that her feeding tube will stay in. It simply allows a Federal review to make sure her rights under the Constitution are properly protected, the right to due process, the right to equal protection, and as well her right to life.

The annals of medical history are filled with numerous cases of people in these semi-comatose states who come out of it. And as we all know, the mother and father and the brothers and sisters desperately do not want her to be starved to death and that the original guardian in this case found the testimony of the husband that she, Terri, had prior voice no life sustaining measures should she ever be in this condition. His testimony was not credible.

Let me tell Members, I have been there; and when people have voiced a sentiment that they do not want heroic measures should they ever be in this type of condition, it is brought up immediately. It is not brought up 7 years later. The person comes in, they have had a stroke, a car wreck and you hear immediately from the family members, Uncle Joe or grandma said if they were ever like this, she would not want life-sustaining measures. You do not have a 7-year pause in this case.

Just to close, we do not actually say this woman will continue to get her feedings. All we simply say is there will be a review; and I think there desperately needs to be a review. This is typically intended for a order on the withdrawal of food and water from somebody. It has never been done before to my knowledge. And then to order that the family members cannot put a glass of water up to her mouth, this constitutes, in my opinion, cruel and unusual punishment.

I commend the chairman for what he has done.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Madam Speaker, I think the gentleman for yielding me time.

I practiced medicine for 15 years prior to my election to this body; and, unfortunately, I personally had to get involved on many instances in cases like this. And I would just share with Members there were instances where I did support families’ wishes to withdraw or to allow food and water to be removed. I said if the dividing line always was, are you prolonging the death? Are you prolonging suffering or are you prolonging life?

The case that has precipitated this piece of legislation does not involve a dying person. It does not involve a person with a terminal disease. It is not a person in a vegetative state. She has an active EEG. She has eyes that respond, a face that tries to smile. She tries to vocalize.

In my opinion, this legislation that the chairman has brought forward is essentially the same thing as the bill I introduced last week. My legal remedy was a habeas corpus method of dealing with it. The chairman has, I believe, actually come up with a better solution; the removal act I think is a better way to deal with this.

I would just simply point out to all of my colleagues, we do not actually in this bill make a determination that her feeding tube will stay in. It simply allows a Federal review to make sure her rights under the Constitution are properly protected, the right to due process, the right to equal protection, and as well her right to life.

The annals of medical history are filled with numerous cases of people in these semi-comatose states who come out of it. And as we all know, the mother and father and the brothers and sisters desperately do not want her to be starved to death and that the original guardian in this case found the testimony of the husband that she, Terri, had prior voice no life sustaining measures should she ever be in this condition. His testimony was not credible.

Let me tell Members, I have been there; and when people have voiced a sentiment that they do not want heroic measures should they ever be in this type of condition, it is brought up immediately. It is not brought up 7 years later. The person comes in, they have had a stroke, a car wreck and you hear immediately from the family members, Uncle Joe or grandma said if they were ever like this, she would not want life-sustaining measures. You do not have a 7-year pause in this case.

Just to close, we do not actually say this woman will continue to get her feedings. All we simply say is there will be a review; and I think there desperately needs to be a review. This is typically intended for a order on the withdrawal of food and water from somebody. It has never been done before to my knowledge. And then to order that the family members cannot put a glass of water up to her mouth, this constitutes, in my opinion, cruel and unusual punishment.

I commend the chairman for what he has done.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member on the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Committee on the Judiciary, both for his very thoughtful presentation and as well for the difficult position that we are in in highlighting the difficult position we are in to say to my friends on the other side of the aisle and proponents of this legislation that I too do not want to see Miss Schiavo lose her life or begin to lose her life Friday with the termination of any sort of assistance. But we find ourselves in a very complex and difficult posture.

One might argue that the more appropriate vehicle for this particular case is a private relief bill that we believe may be offered by the other body, because this is certainly not a poster case for any sort of right way to handle this very tragic circumstance.

I agree with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) that if you had had evidence that someone articulated their desire to not be in this condition, it seems that you would have brought this at an earlier time.

I think what draws me to this particular legislation and wishing that we highlight for the woman from New York (Mr. NADLER) has suggested, and that is to have a full hearing on this matter, is to be able to answer these very difficult questions.

I think what draws me to this initiative is the fact that it does point to the fact that there are written document, and there is an oral representation by someone that Miss Schiavo does not want to remain in this condition. The written document qualification is, I think, an important aspect of the initiative and it gives the bill certain more credibility.

Where I have difficulty, of course, is the definition of “next friend.” I think
Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has said that the Private Relief Bill is the way to go rather than the legislation that is before us. If the Private Relief Bill were introduced or came over from the Senate, Terri Schiavo would be dead before we even had a hearing. I would draw the Members’ attention to rule XIII clause 1(a)(3) of the rules of the House of Representatives that says that the Private Calendar is provided in clause 5 of rule XV to which shall be referred all private bills and all private resolutions.

There is no exception to that. And rule XV clause 5 says that the private calendar shall be called only on the first Tuesday of every month, and at the Speaker’s discretion, in addition, the third Tuesday of the month. Furthermore, clause 5 of rule XV says that the Speaker may not obtain a reservation of the right to object to the consideration of the bill or resolution.

That means that private bills go through without debate. And furthermore, under the clause that I have just cited, two Members may object to the private bill in which case it is recommitted to the committee.

So if only two Members are opposed to a private bill and come to the floor and object, that kills it once and for all.

Now, those are the procedural hurdles against the private bill coming up. And that is why the only way to deal with this issue in a timely manner is through public legislation such as the bill that is currently under consideration.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. JOHNSON).

The genius of our federalist democracy is that it maximizes the power of people to govern themselves by explicitly requiring that those decisions that can be made at the local level are within in the purview of local government. Those decisions that can be managed at a State level are within the purview of the State government, and that only in exceptional cases can Federal power override the power of State and local government.

This is a very tragic situation. It is a difficult and serious issue. It is one that every State legislature has struggled with. And the laws in our different States are different because the people across our large and diverse democracy govern themselves by explicitly requiring that those decisions that can be made at the local level are within the purview of local government.

I personally believe that the reason America is still vital and strong is because we are a federalist democracy, and we do have this wonderful vitality and differences in how we govern ourselves at the State level. It is a route that is taken. I believe a bill as it expands itself to incapacitation temporariously or for a long period of time? If it is a temporary incapacitation, meaning they have come in with a terrible tragic accident and may have the ability to recover, what does that mean in terms of this particular initiative? Does it then come in at that point or is it a long-term incapacitation?

The idea that someone could argue or could utilize the courts, in this instance the courts in the State of Florida, to a person who has desires to eliminate the feeding of an individual to me is abhorrent. But I hope that this legislation would not then be the precedent for interference in a woman’s right to choose, and I think this is a difficulty when you jump the legislative process and put forth a written legislative initiative and then come to the floor of the House with no opportunity to ask the hard questions and to answer the hard questions as well.

I would hope that the Private Relief Bill that is proposed in the other body is a route that is taken. I believe a bill that is as broad as this one needs a full hearing, and I believe that this also cries out for bipartisanship.

All of us feel the pain that the parents of this young woman are experiencing. All of us feel the pain of the dilemma of the decision-making as to what should happen. And all of us sense that there is a greater opportunity for her, meaning that she should have the opportunity, or many of us feel that she should have the opportunity, to live. But I am certainly concerned that we would put it in this format with no opportunity for a full hearing, no opportunity for amendment, and no opportunity to fully understand the breadth of this legislative initiative.

I think the Federal court and the constitutional provisions have a great deal of merit. I think that this particular party has the right to have their constitutional rights assessed. I would hope that all of us would have that right.

There are those who choose to die and those who choose to live. It would be far better to have done so in a broader context.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
would imagine that my colleague from the State of Florida has not examined Ms. Schaivo, doctors who have examined her have consistently said that she is in a persistent vegetative state. In fact, it is only physicians who the Schiaivo family have employed who have said she is not, and they have reviewed her via videotape. The doctors that have actually examined Ms. Schaivo have determined that she is in a persistent vegetative state.

The fact is that the doctors have examined Ms. Schaivo found that she has no cerebral cortex; that the reactions and responses that we have seen on TV dozens of times, that she seems to respond to her parents when they talk to her, that those are all reflexive, that they are not direct responses to interaction with people.

The doctors have examined her, again have examined her, that have reviewed her MRIs that she is not in a persistent vegetative state.

This is a horrible case. No matter what the facts are, it is a horrible case, but Terri Schaivo made her wishes clear, and we should not interject what this body, the Federal Government, the United States Congress, into a personal family matter.

We are taking one set of facts for one family, which is the tragedy of one family and apply it to tens of thousands of families who have or will have loved ones in nursing homes, in hospice facilities or even those being kept alive by their families in their own homes. We are reaching all the way into very personal family matters in communities all across the country, and we are trying to apply a one-size-fits-all solution to all of them. That is totally inappropriate, and I think if we ask just about any family in America whether they think it would be okay if the United States Congress made an end-of-life decision for their loved ones, they would resoundingly say no.

I find it particularly hypocritical that we would say okay if the United States Congress made an end-of-life decision for their loved ones, they would resoundingly say no, that those that talk about the defense of marriage now want to interject the Federal Government between a husband and his wife on what was a personal family matter. I ask that we think about how we would feel if, God forbid, one of our family members were in a persistent vegetative state and were in the circumstances and faced the circumstances that Terri Schaivo does. Would we want the United States Congress making the decision or would we want to be involved in that decision ourselves solely on our own?

I think that most families would resoundingly say that they want to make that decision. There but for the grace of God go I.

Mr. SENSENBERGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for yielding me time, and for bringing this bill, H.R. 1334, the Protection of Incapacitated Persons Act, to the floor, and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), my physician colleague, as coauthor of this bill.

I think part of the question here is whether or not Terri Schaivo is truly in a persistent vegetative state. I practiced medicine for 26 years, and in my opinion, no, I have not examined Ms. Schaivo, but I trust my colleague the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

I agree that she is not in a persistent vegetative state. The pictures of her, we have seen them on television, the balloon that she followed with her eyes, the smiles, the recognition of her family.

I think this lady deserves the right to live, and as a physician Member of this body, I feel very compelled to stand up here and passionately support this bill. My colleagues on the other side will join us because I think it is the right thing to do.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, this House has seen plenty of outrage, but this is the most outrageous thing I have ever seen.

You come with a bill that is not on the calendar. You pop it out in the middle of the night, when all the Members are down at the White House on the Republican dinner with the President. You try and change what is going on in a court because you do not like what is going on in a court.

How do you know what is going to come out of those courts in Florida? Oh, no, let us put it up in a Federal court or let us change everything.

The Members on the other side of this aisle do not believe in process. You do not believe in government by law. You believe in raw power. If you haveraw power, you do anything here at any time and run it through here without any debate and no hearings and no anything. You ought to be ashamed of yourself that you have no shame, that you would come on this floor like this with a bill that is as complicated as this and do it without a single moment of hearing. It is a disgrace.

Mr. SENSENBERGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consider appropriate, and I think if we ask just about any family in America whether they think it would be okay if the United States Congress made an end-of-life decision for their loved ones, they would resoundingly say no.

I find it particularly hypocritical that we would say okay if the United States Congress made an end-of-life decision for their loved ones, they would resoundingly say no, that those that talk about the defense of marriage now want to interject the Federal Government between a husband and his wife on what was a personal family matter. I ask that we think about how we would feel if, God forbid, one of our family members were in a persistent vegetative state and were in the circumstances and faced the circumstances that Terri Schaivo does. Would we want the United States Congress making the decision or would we want to be involved in that decision ourselves solely on our own?

I think that most families would resoundingly say that they want to make claim or cause of action removed under this section, the court shall only consider whether authorizing or directing the withholding or withdrawal of food or fluids or medical treatment necessary to sustain the incapacitated person’s life constitutes a deprivation of any right, privilege or immunity secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States.”

Now, in every civil rights lawsuit that was removed to Federal court, the Federal court applied privileges and immunities and provided by the Constitution of the United States or Federal law, and all this bill does is to allow the same type of review on whether someone’s Federal rights are deprived by action of the State court in the Federal court.

If we did not do this in the civil rights revolution of the 1960s, this country would be a lot different place and a lot worse place than it is today. It was Federal judges that applied Federal law in those cases, and if it was good enough to apply them in the civil rights cases of the 1960s, why is it not good enough to deprive a person who is incapacitated the same type of Federal judicial review on their Federal rights in a Federal court?

We should not deprive an incapacitated person of a judicial review in a Federal court of their Federal civil rights, and that is why this bill ought to pass.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Madam Speaker, the phrase that the distinguished chairman just read is a catch-all phrase. If a person thinks a court in a State is depriving someone of civil rights they can go into Federal court under a section 1983 action and say that there is an alleged deprivation of Federal rights under current law. This is far broader. What we have heard from the distinguished gentleman from Florida about the facts of the case are compelling, but I would remind everybody this bill is way beyond the facts of this case.

It establishes for any interested person, someone who has a significant relationship with the incapacitated person, whatever that means, no definition, a right to come in, overturn what the courts have decided, overturn what the family has decided, what she has decided and subject that family to the agony of perhaps years of further litigation.

Maybe that has to be done in some cases, I do not know, but this kind of slapdash legislative procedure with no hearing, no consideration, no real understanding of what this bill does in cases far beyond Terri Schaivo should not be on this House floor tonight, and I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. SENSENBERGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the Chair for allowing me to
The Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. Drako). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.
Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

SPECIAL ORDERS
The Speaker pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Brown) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Brown of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER
TIME
Mr. McDermott. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to use the time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Brown).

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF PAUL WOLFOWITZ AS PRESIDENT OF THE WORLD BANK
The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDermott) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDermott. Madam Speaker, having watched that last bill, I continually am surprised in this House that I think I have seen everything, and then I see another one like this one tonight. But on the television today we saw an even more amazing thing. We saw the architect of the Iraq war and all the problems that still remain, the killings, the massacring of civilians, the instability of the government, the inability for them to pick their leadership, their inability to give security to the people of Iraq, we see that every day on the television. It is all the creation of a man named Paul Wolfowitz and his friend, Mr. Rumsfeld, the Secretary of War. The two of them together have put together this disaster that we now face.

Now, one would think that, given the failure of the planning and all of what went on in the Iraq war, you would be able to see the end of Mr. Wolfowitz one way or another. But history has some really interesting things in it.

Some of you may remember the Vietnam War. There was an architect for the Vietnam War. His name was Robert McNamara. Robert McNamara led us into the swamp; 58,000 people died. Tons and tons of folks died on the Vietnamese side. We wasted money. We put ourselves deeply in debt. And when it was over, Lyndon Johnson made him the head of the World Bank. Who would think that today the President of the United States would reward a man who has created the mess in Iraq with the job of being the head of the World Bank?

Now, what does the World Bank do? Well, if a country wants to build a dam or they want to do some road improvement projects or they want to do some prevention of AIDS, treatment, they come to the World Bank and ask for loans. Imagine the world coming to the feet of Paul Wolfowitz and trying to get him to understand about rebuilding. This is a man who has flattened Afghanistan and flattened Iraq, has come in here and asked for $80 billion again and again and again, even today, 80 more billion dollars, and they still do not have the water running and the sewage moving, and they do not have the basic requirements of a civil society in Iraq. And he comes in here, now to be the head of the World Bank. We are going to give him billions of dollars to hand out to the world to rebuild the very mess that he created. What in the world is the President thinking?

I suppose he thinks, well, maybe, you know, Paul created all those problems over there, bombed everything and led our neocon ideas, that if we could just get enough power, we just bomb enough, you could have a city like Fallujah in Iraq. It is a city of about 400,000 people. It is flat. Just like we did in the Second World War to Dresden and we did with the atomic bomb in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. He flattened that city.

Well, that was to save it, you know, because they were so resistant in that city, American troops thought the only solution Paul Wolfowitz and his conferences in the department of war could think of was to bomb it flat. And now he is the World Bank president, and he will be letting the loans to put Fallujah back on its feet. Man, I have seen everything.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. Drako). Under a previous order of the
House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Jones) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. Osborne. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

ALCOHOL AND NCAA ADVERTISING IS A BAD MIX

The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. Osborne) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Osborne. Madam Speaker, I do know Paul Wolfowitz and I guess I don't know Paul Wolfowitz. I know in comparison with the recent remarks, I hope people will evaluate him on what he has accomplished, which I think is rather substantial.

Madam Speaker, this weekend the NCAA basketball tournament begins. The tournament advertising provides millions of dollars to fund the NCAA. It is the primary source of funds for the NCAA. In 2003, alcohol producers spent $52 million on 4,747 beer commercials. Nearly one-half of the $52 million spent on alcohol advertising in 2003 was spent on the basketball tournament. Alcohol is the primary product marketed on NCAA sports broadcasts today.

I think this is a bad idea. Why? Number one, this advertising violates the NCAA's own bylaws. The NCAA bylaws, according to their handbook, are as follows: "Advertising policy of the association are designed to exclude those advertisements that do not appear to be in the best interest of higher education."

The leading cause of death on college campuses is alcohol-related; 1,400 college students die each year from alcohol-related injuries. We have lost 1,500 in Iraq in 2 years, and we agonize over those deaths. We have 1,400 annually that die on college campuses. More than 70,000 students are victims of alcohol-related sexual assault. 500,000 students are injured under the influence of alcohol each year, and two of five college students currently are binge drinkers and sometimes are problem drinkers.

It does not seem to me that it is very logical that we would have the major social problem on college campuses be alcohol, and on the other hand turn around and use our athletic teams to promote alcohol advertising. It seems inconsistent, and it does seem to be in my mind at least to violate the bylaws of the NCAA.

Furthermore, the average young person today starts consuming alcohol at age 13, not 23, not 21. Age 13. So this has some tremendous implications I would like to discuss a little bit further because even though we are concerned about alcohol consumption on college campuses, and this is very damaging, I am even more concerned about alcohol consumption of teenagers because kids identify with athletes. Kids like sports. They see athletes on the television screen and in the stadium, and they want to be like the athletes, and there is a subtle connection between what they see on the court and what they see on the commercials, which usually are young people, attractive people having a good time involved in alcohol-related activities. Therefore, there is a definite lure and a movement to move those kids toward consumption of alcohol.

The younger children are when they start to drink, the more alcoholism results. In other words, a young person who starts using alcohol at age 15 or earlier is 400 percent more likely to become alcohol-dependent than someone who starts consuming alcohol when they are the legal drinking age of 21. This causes tremendous devastation of these young people.

Also the longer you put off when you are you when you start consuming alcohol, the more cognitive dysfunction occurs. Hence the second graph I would like to point out here. These are images of a teen, of teen brain activity performing memory tests. This is a non-drinker. The brain is firing pretty well. This is a 15-year-old male heavy drinker. This is a young person not under the influence of alcohol, but someone who uses alcohol regularly and is a heavy drinker. You can see the differences in cognitive function. You can see the differences, the problem-solving ability that would be changed in these cases.

So our young people are having a difficult time with alcohol. At the present time it is estimated that there are 3 million teenagers who are full-blown alcoholics. And those addicted to other kinds of drugs would number probably in the hundreds of thousands. It is a huge problem, much more weighted toward alcohol consumption.

Also alcohol kills six times more young people than all illicit drugs combined. So methamphetamine, cocaine, heroin, we can lump them all together, and alcohol kills six times more young people than all of those drugs combined. Also, under-age drinking costs the United States $53 billion annually, a huge cost.

So I think that we should really rethink this policy of the NCAA. There is no question that under-age drinking is still going to occur even if that advertising policy were to change.

Madam Speaker, I would say in conclusion that alcohol advertising on NCAA sports, number one, appears to violate the bylaws. And, secondly, such advertising promotes alcohol consumption on the college campuses and also on the junior high school and on the high school campus. This is certainly very negative as far as our country is concerned.

I hope my colleagues will join me in simply urging through a resolution that the NCAA cease and desist this practice of alcohol advertising on amateur sports, particularly NCAA sports, because it does appear to be in violation of their own bylaws.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MELVIN E. BANKS

The Speaker pro tempore (Ms. Kaptur addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

Tribute to Dr. Melvin E. Banks

The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Rush) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Rush. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to recognize Dr. Melvin E. Banks of Chicago, Illinois, on his company's 35th anniversary. Dr. Banks is the owner of Urban Ministries, Incorporated, which is the largest African American owned and operated Christian publishing and media company.

At the age of 12, Dr. Banks discovered the Lord and his subsequent call into ministry. He is sharing his story from the back roads of Birmingham, Alabama. At that time an elderly gentleman heard his testimony and provided the young Banks with a Bible verse that would have significant impact on his future pursuits, Hosea 4:6 states, 'My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge.' Upon hearing those words, Dr. Banks knew immediately that God's purpose for his life was to help spread knowledge of the gospel from an African American perspective.

After founding Urban Ministries in 1970, Dr. Banks and his small staff operated out of the basement of his home for 12 years. As Dr. Banks' faith grew, so did his media ministry. In 1982, Urban Ministries occupied the second floor of a building located at 1439 West 103rd street in Chicago, Illinois. Guided by a vision that others did not see, Dr. Banks moved Urban Ministries in 1996 to its current 46,000 square foot headquarters in the Chicago area.

Today, Urban Ministries serves over 40,000 Sunday school teachers throughout the United States, Haiti, the Bahamas, Nigeria and South Africa. Under Dr. Banks' leadership, souls have been touched and prayers have been answered as Urban Ministries moves closer to its goal of reaching every black Christian church with Christian education products and services.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Banks holds a Bachelor's Degree from Moody Bible Institute as well as undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate degrees from Wheaton College in Illinois.
So on this day, I congratulate Dr. Banks on this momentous milestone in his company's history. My fellow colleagues, please join me in extending best wishes to Dr. Banks on 35 years of success and for another 35 years of success that surely will be approaching.

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

Ms. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. Mr. BURTON's remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.

CHILD PREDATOR ACT OF 2005

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, media stories about sex crimes against children are presently being reported at an alarming rate in the United States. These crimes are also some of the most underreported of criminal acts. Last month, in Colorado, an ex-convict for sexual assault of a child, a child predator, continued his dastardly deeds against kids and assaulted several children. This child molester was able to slither and sneak into a quiet Colorado community and prey on the innocent children. This child molester was able to slither and sneak into a quiet Colorado community and prey on the innocent children because of registration loopholes in current law.

One of the victim's grandmothers said, "People have the right to know where sex offenders are living. The police should know. The public should know." We know the number one thing child predators desire is to remain anonymous. Those days are over. No longer can ex-convicts for child sexual assault move in and out of our neighborhoods without knowing who they are. While some States have registration laws for convicted child predators, when those criminals move across State lines, they slip through the system.

We know that the recidivism rate of a convicted child molester is extremely high. When many leave the penitentiary, they continue their evil ways against our greatest natural resource, our children.

So today, Madam Speaker, I am introducing my first bill, the Child Predator Act of 2005, to hold these outlaws accountable and impose tougher sentences for child predators who reoffend. This act closes loopholes in the present law and places tools in the hands of parents who want to safeguard their children from these people. This legislation amends the Wetterling Act of 1994 in six ways.

First, the Child Predator Act defines the term "child predator" as a person who has been convicted of a sexual offense against a victim who is a minor if the offense is sexual in nature and the minor is 13 years of age or younger. Second, child predators must report change of residence within 10 days of a move.

Third, the Child Predator Act requires community notification. Child predators would have to notify, at a minimum, schools, public housing and at least two media outlets such as newspapers, television stations or radio stations covering that community.

Fourth, child predators who knowingly fail to register would be charged with a Federal felony.

Fifth, the Child Predator Act would also mandate a national registration database. This would be available on a free access Internet Web site.

Finally, the Child Predator Act would require prominent designation of a convicted offender as a child predator.

The National Center For Missing and Exploited Children confirms that the sexual victimization of children is overwhelming in magnitude, yet largely unrecognized and underreported in the United States. Statistics reveal that one in five girls and one in 10 boys are sexually exploited before they reach adulthood. Less than 35 percent of those child sexual assaults are reported to authorities.

While through previous legislation we have significantly reduced the prevalence of the child predator and real nightmare to children, we must stay the course. We must remain ever vigilant and keep in this fight. Child predators, like their criminal counterparts in other areas, are innovative. They stalk neighborhoods, playgrounds, Cub Scout dens, houses of worship, and as of late they exploit the Internet to target youngsters.

Madam Speaker, we must put child predators on notice and let them know once and for all that we will not tolerate this continuing victimization of children. I wish to extend an invitation for Members of this body to consider enlisting in the Victims Rights Caucus that I recently founded and cochair with the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS).

During my 22 years as a felony court judge in Houston, Texas, I have seen scores of victims come through my courtroom. Ironically, as large a contingent that victims are, they are one of the most underrepresented groups in the United States. This session of Congress, in cooperation with my fellow representatives, I hope to change this.

We must always remember that victims do not choose to be victims. As L.H. Harrington of the President's task force on victims of crime once said, "Somewhere along the way, the criminal justice system began to serve lawyers, judges and defendants. Victims are treated with institutionalized disinterest. The neglect and mistreatment of crime victims is a national disgrace."

Madam Speaker, to be a victim is an unforgettable nightmare but to become a victim at the hands of the criminal justice system is an unforgivable travesty. The duty of government is to protect its citizens. We as a people are not judged by the way we treat the rich, famous and influential but by the way we treat the weak, the innocent, the children.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.

NO DEMOCRACY IN THE PEOPLE'S HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, we have just concluded our legislative day. A number of incidences and legislative initiatives have been addressed that I would like to comment on in this opportunity that I have during this special order.

We just completed our discussion dealing with incapacitated persons. I do want to remind my colleagues that the issue is not to ignore the tragedy of those individuals. It is to foster, through our legislation, to recognize the broadness of the responsibility of the Members of the United States Congress. The point that I made earlier, that I wish to clarify, is that I too would not like to see this loss of life if there is some alternative. But I did suggest that because this legislation that has just passed the floor of the House would have had a better approach, which is to have a full hearing before the Committee on the Judiciary and other committees of jurisdiction, that the same relief could have been given to this distressed situation by offering a private relief bill.

The opposition noted that a private relief bill would take a long time through the legislative process. Let me remind my Republican colleagues who are in the majority that rules could have been waived to move a private relief bill forward expeditiously as quickly as any bill that we have just put on the floor. So it is certainly a misstatement for anyone to rise to the floor of the House and suggest that an action of a private relief bill could not have brought relief and that the party in question in Florida might be dead before that occurred when they know full well that this House is controlled by Republicans and if they desired to move a private relief bill forward quickly, it could have been done.

And then, Madam Speaker, I want to quickly comment on a bill that appeared before us in the Committee on the Judiciary where not one single Democratic amendment was accepted.

In fact, the Republican majority made it very clear that they had a perfect bill from the Senate and that they really did not want to do anything in the Congress. When amendments were offered by Democrats to protect veterans, it was denied. When amendments were offered
by Democrats to increase the allowance for private and parochial schools that might be exempted when someone filed for bankruptcy, it was disallowed. When we asked to protect those who are paying the tuition of their children, it was disallowed. When we asked for help dealing with identity theft debts, when someone would steal your credit cards, debt would pile up and all of a sudden you might have to pay that for some ridiculous reason, we asked for relief in that instance, it was denied.

When we asked for relief for those who were sexually assaulted and therefore we did not want the liability to be extinguished when someone went into the bankruptcy court, it was denied. It was denied that if you received dollars through a natural disaster such as the terrible flooding and hurricanes in Florida and you wanted to protect those dollars that you got from a natural disaster against a bankruptcy filing, it was denied.

Frankly, the democracy in this body has simply been denied. Democracy has shut down. This is a one-party government, one party in the administration, one party in the House, one party in the Senate, and there is no room for democracy. What a shame on us that we would push democracy in Afghanistan and Iraq and around the world, places that I have been, and we simply cannot have democracy in this body on behalf of the American people.

Let me also suggest that I am looking forward to responding to the request by Supreme Court Justice Rehnquist by offering a court security act for 2005 which responds to Justice Rehnquist and other Supreme Court Justices asking for more protection of judges and courthouses in America. It is a travesty that we would have the terrible, tragic act in Atlanta and the killing of the relatives of a judge in Illinois. It is time now to provide resources, training and, of course, security with designs to ensure that justice does occur, justice by way of protecting our courts and our court systems and all the parties who go into our court system for fairness and justice. I hope my colleagues will join me when I file the Securing American Courts Act of 2005. We owe our justice system that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLER-McDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLER-McDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THIRTY-SOMETHING CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for half the time until midnight as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I just want to say that it is an honor again to address the House and the American people, also. I am sharing this hour today with the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), also. It is a pleasure to be here on the floor with her one more time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Once again it is a pleasure to be here with you.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, if I may take just a moment to talk about a friend of ours and a pillar in Florida. Mr. Bill Lehman, Congressman William Lehman went on to glory today. He served our country well. He was blessed to be here for some 91 years. He passed away with his family by his side. He served in the 17th Congressional District. Madam Speaker, from the time of 1973 to 1992 with great distinction.

He was one of the longest serving, if not the longest serving, chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and a good go-to-guy was he here. A quiet man but a man that enjoyed to have a good time, and we will appropriately honor him with an hour here on the floor, designated by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), Democratic leader, at a later date, with reflections of friends that served with him in the Congress and also those Members who knew him well. And we send our prayers and appreciation to his family for allowing him to serve this great government of ours and play a role in democracy as the annals will reflect.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. My colleague from Florida is always so eloquent, and one of the things that has struck me from the time I have been privileged to serve in the Congress, for about 10 weeks now, is that we really stand on the shoulders of giants in this Chamber and there are precious few that fall into that category and that deserve that accolade. And Congressman Lehman was most definitely one of them.

I am privileged to represent a good portion of his district. I can only hope, as I am sure the gentleman can because he also represents a portion of his former district, that he will be given the accolades and support that his colleagues from South Florida can even begin to fill his shoes. Certainly it is our responsibility to carry on his legacy, and I know that is what we will strive to do every day on this floor, and look forward to the hour that will be devoted to his life.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity. Not only I, but former Congresswoman Carrie Meeck, the three of us had an opportunity to take a picture together. Congressman Lehman, in 1972, in the newly created 17th Congressional District, he ran for it. As the gentlewoman knows, he served in local government also and ran for that seat and won. So we are the only three that have served in the 17th Congressional District and that was a good time. We have an opportunity to celebrate not only his life, but we will have an opportunity to celebrate his spirit for years to come. And I know that he is there with his good friend, Dante Fascell, and they are talking about old times when they used to run this House.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. That is right, Madam Speaker. And if the gentleman will continue to yield, the one thing I want to add is that those who did not know Congressman Lehman, his name was far more widely known because there are far too numerous to mention car dealerships across Florida and, quite honestly, Congressman Lehman was a leader in transportation for good reason, because there are thousands and thousands of drivers who began their driving careers thanks to Mr. Lehman and his family. And he has not just been a pillar of the community but a giant when it comes to transportation, and I think that should not be lost on this body.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments; and like I said, we will honor him appropriately on this great House floor.

Madam Speaker, I just want to once again thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for allowing us to represent the minority side here tonight and also thank leadership on the Democratic side. And being a Member of the House, it is always a great honor and privilege to come to the floor. So many Members before us have had this opportunity.

The 30-something Working Group that was created, and we have to talk about this every time because we have to make sure that Members understand that we are here to come to this floor to share good information and to make sure the American people know exactly what we are doing. And also in some instances what we are doing to them, and I think it is very important that we remember that.
We have been talking a lot about Social Security lately, but tonight we are going to talk about the deficit. And I want to once again commend those groups that are out there on the Social Security front, before we get into the budget that has been out there working very hard.

The President today made some comments from the White House. One thing that he did say, and I am glad that he has decided to come with the American people and say that privatization of Social Security will not resolve the Social Security issue. Some may say crisis; I say issue because Social Security is going to be solvent for the next 47 years, providing 100 percent of the benefits to the American people as they pass on and have left some children.

Social Security will not end tomorrow. So I said we are going to be here on the budget. But it is interesting, when we start talking about the budget, the philosophy of principles, because there is no plan, it is not reflected in the budget. So we will talk about that a little bit more. But I want to just say that Democrats believe that for every issue that is facing our Nation, it is our responsibility to establish the policies that we pursue are consistent with the values that we cherish.

These guiding principles are particularly crucial when it comes to our children and the future generations.

The Bush administration budget and the Republican leadership budget fail short of protecting or investing in our children, in our young people. It is fiscally reckless, adding trillions to the deficit over the next 10 years, but we teach our children to save and be fiscally responsible.

It is morally irresponsible to slash health care programs that are for young people and seniors, I must add, in my education and youth development programs that provide our children opportunities to achieve the American Dream are crucial.

In Proverbs it tells us to “train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old, he will not depart from it.” I think that it is important that we hold that as a value and cherish that here in this House. If the lessons to our children and young people are reflected in the budget, then we have failed them and ourselves and the future of the democracy.

We have only about 20 more minutes to talk, but we are going to share some of the values of the Democratic budget versus the Republican budget. And I must say there are some individuals that are well intended on the majority side, I must add; but they are being overwhelmed by individuals who are willing to fight for others and not fight for all. So I think it is important that we share the facts here tonight.

And I would love to here some of the gentlewoman’s opening comments, and hopefully we can get into some of these charts we have so that we can share with the American people what is happening here in this House.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Absolutely, Madam Speaker. And I think it has to be said that the gentleman has been incredibly thoughtful in co-chairing with our colleague from Ohio this 30-something Working Group. We are really here to talk to our generation, to talk to the American people in our generation about the policy decisions that are made here in Washington and how it affects them.

I think the gentleman is right. I think we have a number of well-intentioned colleagues on the other side. But, unfortunately, this train is being driven by the right. It is being driven by the right wing of the Republican Congress. They are driving the train here, and the moderate voice is just completely snuffed out. Absolutely snuffed out.

And I think we should spend a little bit of time talking about how the Bush administration’s budget affects education because a lot has been said and the President has touted this Pell grant increase as being so fantastic and how he has really made a commitment to expanding access to higher education. When we sift through the facts and the reality as to how he gets to that $100 increase in Pell grants, it is really astonishing that they would claim it is an increase.

Essentially, when he was campaigning in 2000, the President pledged to make college more affordable and accessible by increasing the maximum Pell grant for college freshmen to $5,100.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, reclaiming my time, I am so glad that the gentleman pointed out why I think it is important that the Members pay very close attention to what is happening. I think not only do we have the constitutional responsibility, but we have the responsibility to the people that elected us to be sure to make sure we are not followers, but leaders in this process.

I can tell you I take no pleasure, Madam Speaker, to be a part of a Congress that oversees the highest deficit in this history of the Republic. I must say at no other time in this country’s history we have had the deficit that we have right now in, and it is very unfortunate that this is going to be passed on to not only my children and grandchildren, but definitely those that are yet unborn.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and I are both parents. In many instances our children are going to be okay because of the choices that have been made here. But I can tell you that my constituents, and I know your constituents, did not say, well, I want to send you all to Congress so you can have better health care than I have, so that your children will have better opportunities than my children have. They sent us here to make sure we do not hand their children a bad deal. Because the goal of any parent or grandparent is to make sure that their children and grandchildren have a better opportunity than what they have.

I have a chart here that I want to share with the Members. As you can see, this is what has happened as relates to the backsliding here into the deficit ditch. This deficit went from a surplus, I must add, during the Clinton years when he started, and this House I must add, balanced the budget without one Republican vote, I must add, balanced the budget, and we were into surplus, some $523 billion in the surplus.

Now we have found ourselves in a downward spiral since this administration and this emboldened Republican
majority here in this House has taken us to some $4 trillion projected deficit. I think it is important that we understand that this is real money, these are just not numbers, and it is taking our children even further down.

I have never chart here, and I am going to talk rather quickly because I now we have to move on here. This is what is going on as relates to the interest payments on the deficit, on the debt, and I think that it is only getting worse.

As you can see here, in the 2004 budget, money that is being spent, we are spending more money on paying down the debt, and this number here is actually in the billions, I must add, some $150 billion in the 2004 budget. But better yet, here in education we are spending less than we are spending on taking down the debt.

Also as you start looking at the environment here in purple, we are spending far less than we are spending in paying off the debt because of irresponsible spending. And if you go further over, our veterans, our patriots, so many of us talk about them. I am on the Committee on Armed Services, we have a lot of chest beating going on in that committee about who loves the troops and who does not love the troops, and who loves veterans and who does not love veterans, and folks start talking about the tattoos on their chest that they love the troops and all of this.

But I can tell you one thing as it relates to our spending in the 2004 budget, it does not reflect our values. I was talking about Proverbs a little bit more, but I will come back to that a little later.

I think it is important for us to also look at the amounts spent by 2010 if we are going to talk about Social Security, we are talking about what we have got right here, right now, not even talking about Social Security. By 2015, each family of four would have $10,500 that they essentially would responsibility for in terms of a debt tax and how much the debt was going to cost them.

That is where we have gone in this country. We are just going to keep adding and adding and weighing people down. What happens with our generation, on the front page of the South Florida Sun Sentinel the other day, I was flying the front page talked about “Generation Debt.”

Our generation is Generation Debt, because we are not the generation of savers. Our parents and our grandparents were the generation of savers, but we are already shoudering tremendous amount, way more than we should, in personal debt. On top of that, the President heaps this on top of us also, and it is just wrong.

If you are going to talk about what we are going to have to talk about jobs and technology and how that is going to affect our generation.

The number one issue for young people right now, for our generation, is finding a job. We supposedly have this fantastic reemergence of the economy, but job creation is still totally flat.

The current unemployment rate for individuals 16 to 19 is 17 percent. And, more and more, those young people need a job. We are not just talking about jobs, we are talking about kids who are 16 to 19 years old who need to earn a salary to help pay the family’s bills. If they do not have a job, then their family is falling down flat. And the President’s budget contains absolutely no job growth stimulation proposals, it squanders $1.6 trillion on tax breaks to people who do not need them.

Job training: We have no proposals for job training. In fact, the President cuts job training in his budget. He consolidated it into a single block grant, and then cuts the funding for these programs, for job training programs, by $146 million.

He eliminates the Advanced Technology Program, and I am trying to speed along also, which funds research and emerging technologies.

His budget slashes by nearly 60 percent the funds from the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program, which is a program that helps small manufacturers with new technologies.

And lastly, our generation cares about the Internet. There are so many opportunities in expanding access to high speed Internet. This President has proposed to slash broadband assistance guaranteed loans by $190 million, and he has called for the total elimination of broadband telecommunications grants.

Are they thinking about our folks? They are clearly not. They have no interest in what is going to happen to the generation coming behind the one that already has theirs.

That is what we have got to do. We have got to make sure we can refocus the attention that is paid to our generation because no one is thinking about us.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I can tell the gentlewoman that tomorrow on this floor Members will not only vote on the Republican budget but will also vote on the Democratic budget that we have put forth, and I must say that our budget will balance out in the next 10 years.

There has been so much cake and ice cream given out in the last 4 years and from the majority side. I want us to confuse Members and start talking about the President and the President proposed the budget of course, but we come up with our own budget. And I can tell you if you think the President’s budget is bad, you need to look at the majority-side budget.

Can tell you some of my friends are Republicans and I can tell you this, here in the House, some of them are fiscal conservatives but they do not want to make a career decision as it relates to their position in this House to vote against their very own budget.

I will also tell you this, if one is a fiscal conservative there is no way in the world they can vote for that budget. I am very proud of the work that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATF) and others have done on the budget. In our Democratic budget we have given $1.6 billion more than the Republican budget for veterans health care and also for other programs for 2006, and $17 billion more over the next 5 years. The Democratic budget also reversed the $798 million cut to veteran affairs which helped veterans and their families.

I must also share, not only with the Members, 77 percent of the troops that are in Iraq and Afghanistan are under budge by 30 years old. These young people should be paid the attention that the Congress should reflect their future and their families’ future, and I think that is important.

I do not want to get too far away because I want to make sure people truly understand this because I know there are about 100 charts in this Chamber. I can tell you for every chart we have, we not only have the source, this is from the Treasury International Capital System from the House Committee on the Budget, the source.

This is what foreign countries like China and others, what they pay for our debt. We go to them. We ask them
for money. They buy our bonds and they pay our debt. Now we are 44 percent indebted to foreign countries. And you can see how it has risen since the majority party has been emboldened by having the President in the White House for 2 years. In 2003 it was 30 percent. In 2002 it was 34 percent. In 2003, 37 percent; and 2004, 44 percent and climbing. There is no decline. There is no effort to bring a decline now.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. There is a reason for that.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. What is the name?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Borrow and spend.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That is very interesting because I heard some folks in here talking about borrowing and spending and blaming us. There is more spending that is going on, but it has not just been about the war. It has been about irresponsible policy-making here.

I want to say we want to thank those that contact us via e-mail. We receive quite a bit of e-mail from not only the American people, but also even within this Capitol complex. If you have e-mail us at 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov, we would appreciate it.

If you want to learn more not only about Social Security but about the Democratic budget, you can go on to Democraticbudget.com, 30something. But you can go on the Democratic leader’s Web site and get what we are doing here and what we are proposing.

I think it is also important for us to talk about. One may say, why are you all talking about what the Republican budget, what they are doing to the American people?

The reason why we are talking about it is because we are not in the majority. We fought all day on this floor, 5 hours of amendments, 5 hours of debate to fight on behalf of the everyday worker and retired American in this country. And if we were in the majority, it would be totally different. Those numbers I gave on veterans, the veterans would have what they need. The true budget balancing will happen in 10 years. We have made Social Security, the issue of privatization, we can tell the President to stop spending the tax-payer dollars burning Federal jet fuel, because it is not going to happen.

So until we are able to get the majority, then we will not be able to do some of the things we are doing; but we will fight to the bitter end to make sure that we protect American people and their families.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. In the last several weeks I have tried to talk about the impact on women that the Bush administration’s policies have made. For example, there are 20 million women in this country without health insurance and millions more who can barely afford to pay their premiums; but this budget does nothing to hold down health care costs. It slashes Medicaid by a total of $45 billion over the next 10 years. That is a devastating cut on women and children because women account for over 70 percent of adult Medicaid beneficiaries.

In terms of violence against women, the President’s budget cuts the Violence Against Women Act programs by $19 million; child care, the budget freezes funding for the Maternal and Child Health block grant and eliminates the Universal Newborn Screening Program.

Now, I have a 19-month-old. You have young children. I have passed legislation in Florida that ensured that we expanded screening for genetic anomalies and problems in newborns, and this Bush budget reverses all of that progress.

If we do not make sure we screen newborns for hearing problems, then we will have learning disabilities that are directly related to hearing abnormalities without any excuse. But we have got to make sure that we think about children and families when prioritizing and that is what we could do. And the proof is in the pudding that we do not.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Does the gentlewoman have something else to talk about?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I also wanted to talk a little bit about health care because one of the most important issues that we have is the skyrocketing cost of health care.

We have 45 million Americans who do not have health insurance. That means when they are sick, they cannot go to the doctor and they have to let their health care problems spiral out of control until they have to go to the emergency room to get the problem solved. And young Americans, our generation, are the most likely group to be uninsured. We think we are invincible. We think we are not going to have to worry about having health insurance and going to the doctor, so we go without. But more often we also cannot afford it.

Thirty percent of young adults age 18 to 24 have no health insurance at all. Compare that with 18 percent of adults who are 35 to 44 and only 1 percent of seniors. So the health care crisis disproportionately affects our generation, and there is nothing in the Bush budget to stop this spiral. Where is this President’s leadership on expanding access to health care?

When I go down the street, when I go to the supermarket at home, when I go to street festivals, people stop me in the street. I have heard the gentlewoman talk about people stopping him in the street and talking about issues that are important to them. The thing that they stop me on the most often is education and health care.

They say, if my baby girl or my baby boy is sick, I have no health insurance and I cannot get them shots. If they have a cold, I cannot bring them to the doctor. I have to wait until the problem is bad enough to bring them to the emergency room, and no mother or father should have to suffer through something like that.

This President needs to exercise some leadership in this budget on how to solve this problem and he has not. It is his responsibility of leadership.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I want to close and touch a little on CDBG, which is the Community Development Block Grants.

The Republican budget cuts funding for Community Development Block Grants by $38 billion over the next five years. These cuts will likely fall on Community Development Block Grants which the Republicans have proposed to eliminate. I must add eliminate. These cuts will have a significant negative impact on the ability of State and local governments to be able to provide housing and community development needs.

Last year, 1.6 billion of CDBG dollars were used for housing, and the result of that was 120,000 home owners received assistance for rehabbing or working on their homes; and 11,000 families became first-time home buyers, and 19,000 rental units were being rehabbed.

The proposed CDBG cuts will have a particularly severe impact on the resources provided by housing and job training, domestic violence prevention, child care assistance, homeless assistance, small business development, and other services.

The Democratic budget provides $2 billion more than the Republican budget for 2006 and $9 billion for over the next five years. Community and regional development will be eliminated and the downward spiral of these block grants will be detrimental to so many communities.

I want to say to the city and county mayors, you need to call your Congressman and your Congresswoman and the Members of the other body and the administration and say the cutting of what we need will hurt our communities.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Under the previous Speaker’s announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP) is recognized for the remaining time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Madam Speaker, I adjourned consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to highlight an important
issue that has been the topic of much discussion across the country. Social Security. The Republicans in Congress have joined together to form teams to highlight important issues facing our Nation today, and I am proud to serve as the Chairman of the Retirement Security Task Force. I have been joined by a number of my colleagues to discuss this important topic tonight.

First, I would like to invite the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), my colleague, to share with us some of her perspectives on Social Security and how we address those challenges.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Kentucky for yielding and allowing me to participate in this debate.

Madam Speaker, as we begin tonight, I tell my colleagues I just have to comment, listening to my colleagues from across the aisle, one would think if they were listening to this great debate that there is here that they believe everything depends on the government; the panacea has to be the government; the solution to the problems, it has all got to be the government.

As we talk about Social Security, we want to welcome them and invite them to come participate in the debate, but I find it so interesting. They do not bring new ideas to this debate, and they keep saying let us let the government deal with that, it does not deal with talk about the importance of developing an ownership society. They do not want to talk about giving power to the people.

I always wonder when I hear someone say government is the solution, government has got the solution, leave it to government, let them work it out, let us grow a bigger government. I always wonder about Ronald Reagan and how he said government, let them work it out, let us let the government grow, let them work it out, let them work it out. I always said it is all about the people. It is all about the people. That is where the solutions lie.

Whatever the debate is, whatever our colleagues across the aisle, whatever their view is on Social Security reform, I would hope that no one will oppose a discussion on this issue.

We are brought here to Washington, those of us that are elected, and we come to Congress to participate in big issues that are going to impact individuals’ lives and the American people’s lives. The people of our country have a range of problems that we are facing right now, but I think it is fair to say and I think that my colleagues would agree with me that strengthening and stabilizing Social Security is at the top of that list.

I would invite our colleagues from across the aisle to join us in this debate, bring some ideas and to participate in how we should look at Social Security for future generations. I think it is very unfortunate that so many across the aisle are following the lead of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader, and nearly every Democrat in the House has chosen to stifle debate, rather than to engage in it, and I think that is not leadership. It is really obstructionism.

Madam Speaker, about a week ago, President Bush visited Memphis, Tennessee, which is just outside of my district, and I would have liked to have been there and been a part of that, but things did not quite work out that way for me on last Friday. That did not stop the Democratic National Committee from both the President and me in a statewide radio ad.

Their ad was misleading at best, and it essentially said that we should not even debate reform. They are essentially saying that we should bury our head in the sand and problems. They will not consider this. They will not consider Social Security reform but let us not squash the discussion.

In fact, I call from a man in Collierville, which is in Shelby County near Memphis, and he says: I was listening to WREC radio today and heard a rather obnoxious DNC commercial telling you to vote against the President’s effort to modify Social Security. I am contacting you but rather to encourage you to work with the President to pass a reform.

On the day of the President’s visit, a front page article in the local newspaper where I talked about four solutions to the Social Security problem until it just goes on and runs over us. I can tell my colleagues, the DNC attacked generated two calls. Only two calls to my Shelby County, Memphis, area office in opposition to any proposal. We want to talk about a very real problem, a very real problem and what we are going to do about it.

Now, is it not amazing, here in America, here in the United States House of Representatives, when you want to lead on a discussion and bring to the attention of the American people something that is a problem, then it makes you a political target. That is absolutely incredible. Facing a problem, addressing and defining a problem and then working to find a solution, that is what is called leadership.

Since last fall, I have been holding town hall meetings and discussions across the State and we have had people talking about Social Security reform in these. We are letting constituents know the process that we are going through and how we are searching for the right thing, the right steps to take, and we have their own ideas here.

Some people are absolutely opposed to the discussion. They will not consider the idea of reform, any kind of reform, but that is not the norm. I found that most people are not only willing to discuss Social Security reform, but they have their own ideas of what we should do, and that tells me something. People are thinking about this issue.

The Democrats in the House are unwilling, really unwilling to discuss the topic. They refuse to come to the table and say, okay, let us see what we can do to fix this problem. They are out of touch with mainstream America. They were out of touch in the last election cycle, and they remain out of touch today.

I have brought with me today, Madam Speaker, a handful of the thousands of e-mails that I have received to share with you.

On the other side, I have got one from a woman in Nashville, Tennessee: I am opposed to the privatization of Social Security. I am in favor of reform, but there are many people who could pay more into Social Security or maybe take less out.

Another man from Collierville, Tennessee: Can you help pass Social Security reform? I would appreciate the opportunity to invest a percentage of my Social Security payments.

Does that not sound like a pretty good debate? These people are not afraid to discuss it. America is discussing the issue. We would like to think that the Democrats would also.

We have several bills in the House and the Senate that are proposing different reforms, and I want Tennesseans to know that I am going to continue to review these ideas, to talk with them about the bills that are being brought forward, and we will continue to support committee action on a range of proposals.

Some of the e-mails that I have received ask why we are doing this now, why we cannot just put it off for another decade. It is similar to refinancing your house. You refinance your home mortgage today and get a much lower interest rate than you could probably 10 years from now. Why would you wait when conditions will never be better than they are now? Well, that is where with what we have to do with Social Security. Conditions for reform will not get any better than they are now. It makes no sense to wait.
workers for every retiree, and by the time my two children who are in their mid-twenties retire, there will only be two workers for every retiree. We have 13 years when the Social Security will begin taking in less money than it pays out to retirees.

It is time for us to move forward. We know that the American people are engaged in this debate. We know that they are participating in this debate. I have had a survey on my Web site running for a week now, and I have had a tremendous turn-out to this. I talk to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they had better start taking part in this very real, very lively discussion because there is a widespread view that we should do something and do it now. The only people willing to work on this are the Republicans and the Republican leadership in Congress.

It is a disservice to our Nation that our colleagues across the aisle do not want to participate. It is not why we were elected in the first place.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) who has been such a leader in our conference and is so eager to participate in this conversation.

There is a lot of misinformation about Social Security that is being promulgated across this country, but I think the most important facts that we can share with our constituents is that of every program and every idea that has been put forward, nobody wants to change anything for today's seniors, and there is a good reason for that.

For today's seniors, there are enough workers in the system that their Social Security check is protected. They are going to be fine. For those people that are about to retire, there are enough workers and enough money in the system to protect them. But for younger workers who are going to bear the responsibility for those that retire before them, there will not be enough workers to provide for their Social Security check. So what we want is to allow younger workers to begin to build their own nest egg so they can prepare for their own retirement as they shoulder the responsibility for those that retire before them.

Madam Speaker, I welcome the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA) and thank the gentleman for being part of this discussion tonight. I know the gentleman is involved in talking about Social Security in his community. Please discuss some of what you hear and some of the misconceptions.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this issue. She is a leader and a clear voice in the House on this issue.

The President has recently been in my district, and I thank the President for his leadership on this issue as well, and for him talking on one of the most important issues we face as a Nation today and critical to future generations of Americans.

The President understands that we solve problems through leadership and leaders do not pass along problems to future Presidents or future generations. It was an extraordinary event when the President was in South Bend, Indiana, at Notre Dame, which I know you have been to. I have been in many situations to the gentlewoman's heart, and the numbers who engaged in the dialogue on this issue were astounding.

There were over 8,000 people at the Joyce Center at Notre Dame. They came to listen to the President talk about this issue. And there were 200 people outside of the Joyce Center that were protesting the President. I would say that is a pretty good ratio. That reflects the common sense of the American people. They understand we have a problem.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Madam Speaker, that is very reflective of the numbers in my district. There were about 2,000 inside listening to the President. There were 160 organizations that tried to stir up a lot of activity outside to protest. There were about 100 people outside protesting.

That morning AARP had held their own roundtable, their own town hall meeting. So I think people know that the President was wrong on this issue. They of course have massive organization, a huge mailing list, and they actually got 40 people to their town hall meeting. So I think people know that there is no problem and we should not be doing anything about it, whether it is to seniors as in seniors that are retired or seniors as in seniors in college that might be found on the Notre Dame campus, both of those groups are eager to talk about it and be part of the discussion.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Madam Speaker, that is absolutely true. I think one of the reasons that the President got reelected in the reason is the gentlewoman has been reelected in a very competitive district is people appreciate leadership. It is easy to be against things, but we are elected as public servants to be for solutions, and the harder the issue, the more responsibility we have to step up to the plate and solve the problems that we face as a Nation.

What I heard the President say when he was in South Bend is we have a problem. We can call it a crisis, whatever we want; but it is clearly and undeniable challenge, and I think the American people understand that.

I heard the President say it is not the seniors' problem. If you are retired or near retirement, your benefits are safe and secure and you are going to get everything you have earned, and all options are on the table. This is a debate that should be engaged in by all. The President said it does not matter if it is a Republican idea, a Democrat idea, or any other idea, we should be embraced and be part of the solution.

I think it is important that we focus on the facts. Recently, I sat in a hearing of the Committee on Ways and Means where David Walker who is the Comptroller General of the United States, a former trustee of Social Security, and he made a pretty profound statement that we need to focus on nonpartisan facts, a bipartisan solution. I think it is important that we all engage in this debate to find a solution that benefits every single generation.

He talked about the Social Security trust fund. In his words, the trust fund is not broken, but clearly intervention is needed. And one of the earliest lessons I learned in business was that balance sheets and income statements are fiction, and cash flow is reality. That is a challenge that we face in the short term we have a cash flow problem. In the medium and long term, we have a solvency problem, and that is what we are talking about and that is what we have to solve.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Madam Speaker, seconding the amendment of the American family. Adults in that family come home from work, and from every single paycheck if they put $100 in a cookie jar for their children's college education, and then they borrow to buy a car, buy clothes, go on vacation, whatever they used it for, when the child is 18, they would have a cookie jar full of IOUs. And there is still the bill for the college tuition and no money in the cookie jar. That is essentially what has happened in Social Security was a pay-as-you-go system. Whatever came in, whether it was taken out as part of your payroll tax or part of your income tax or part of your FICA, it went into the general treasury. Those dollars paid old age benefits and paid for services that the government provided.

So none of the dollar have been saved. Maybe some of us wish, especially those of us about to retire, wish this was not a tough or impending crisis, wish it was just a bigger back wall that was hit in 1945 and substantially that they had truly put the money aside in a trust fund and it had been earning interest. But that was not done back then and it has not been done, and so we need to wrestle with the facts.

We have some good ideas. We have some ideas that will make this a good system that will be there for our children. We know it will be there for our moms and dads. My mom is 82. Obviously, I want to make sure that everything is fine for her. And I want to make sure that for those about to retire, the trust they have had in the system that they be reassured that their benefits are secure.

But when we talk about it as a crisis, I will use another analogy and say it is like jumping off an 80-story building. As you pass the 40th floor, you can say, has no harm happened yet, but clearly intervention is needed. And intervention is needed today in Social Security.
Mr. CHOCOLA. I do think facts are very important in this debate. We need to focus on the facts because the facts are what is going to lead us to a solution. Unfortunately, our friends on the other side of the aisle really do not offer any solutions. They just list the principles that the President has offered and others have offered. They call some of these principles a risky scheme. They say that we are putting Social Security at risk. But the reality is that if we do not do something, the riskiest thing we can do is nothing. The riskiest thing we can do is go on ignoring this problem and pass it on to future generations and really suffer, I think, very negative consequences.

These are certain things we know. We know that the system cannot pay the benefits that are promised. If we do nothing, we know that there will be a benefit cut to future retirees of about 27 percent. We know that we have a $10.4 trillion unfunded liability. That is in present dollars. That is, if we had $10.4 trillion, and that is with a T, in the bank today earning interest that we could fund the unfunded liabilities. If we had to pay every year, it is something like $27 trillion that we have in unfunded liability. Just to put that in perspective, the national debt is just over $7 trillion. So the unfunded liability that we know that we have to face in the future is four times the size of the national debt today. People say, well, if we would find a solution that would make the Social Security system solvent, it would be $1 trillion or $2 trillion. The reality is that is not additional debt. If the Federal Government accounted like every business in America, and I will not get in the weeds here and talk about accrual accounting, but if the Federal Government recognized its unfunded liabilities like every business does, we would already have that on the books. It would already be part of our national debt. So finding a way to move some of these costs up is not additional debt, it simply, as the gentlewoman from Tennessee said, is pre-paying our mortgage. It is finding a way to spend money now to reduce our real costs in the future and preserve the system, make it stronger and make sure it is here for every generation.

It has been one of the greatest programs in our Nation’s history. It has served our seniors well. We need to make sure our system is going to continue to serve future generations just as well as it is serving our seniors today.

Mrs. NORTHUP. It is amazing that people talk about this being a risky solution when, in fact, the riskiest thing we could do is to do nothing. The fact is that as we wait, each year it grows worse. In fact, right now because Social Security is bringing in a surplus, we still have a few years left where we could use those dollars to help fund a transition. Then by the year 2017, we are going to lose one of these years that we are in surplus and we pick up at the other end of the 75-year spectrum that we are looking at, a year where we have $600 billion of additional unfunded liability. So not only give a year of transition up, we gain a year where we have huge, impossible-to-meet deficits and unfunded liabilities.

I cannot remember the House 8 years ago. There has not even been a leader in the White House and certainly resolving this problem is going to take all the leadership potential that we have in this country and we need the White House to do it. And it has never been a leader in the White House that was willing to roll up their sleeves and to say, let’s work our way through this, let’s bring everybody to the table, let’s put all the ideas on the table and certainly a solution is going to take multiple ideas and maybe more than just one idea, personalized accounts or whatever. But if we had done this right when I first came to Congress back in 1996, before I understood how serious and how quickly the situation was deteriorating for future generations, I think if we had addressed the problem then, we would have gotten 8 more years of surplus and certainly those surpluses before we had the war on terror, before we had some of the other challenges, and we would have been in a better place if we had addressed those. And so to wait even one more year is going to make the situation more costly, more difficult, we are going to lose a year of surplus that could help finance this transition. That looks like a crisis to me.

Mr. CHOCOLA. I think it is certainly a crisis depending on your time frame and certainly our seniors today are fine, those about to retire are fine, but those retiring in the future will face this crisis if we do not act now. Those that say that there is no problem, that there is no need to act until the year 2042 when the trust fund is exhausted really need to answer the question, how can we pay for those benefits? If they would come to the floor or they would offer their solution by saying, well, if we raise payroll taxes by 50 percent, maybe we could address this crisis and they may be right. But the reality is that more Americans pay payroll taxes than they do income taxes. When you want less of something, increase taxes on it. When you increase taxes on jobs, it would be devastating to our economy, it would be devastating to many low- and middle-income families.

I think it is critical that we find a package of good ideas, and personal accounts may be one of those good ideas, but the people that want to raise taxes have to, I think, face up to the devastating effects that they would have on our economy and our families and they also have to face up to the fact that we have already raised taxes since Social Security was put into place 22 times. Each one of those times it did not solve the problem. If in 2042 when we raised the cap on earnings, which is currently $90,000, the total goes up to 30 times. And so it is critical that we find this package of good ideas that not only solves the problem today but permanently solves the problem so future Members of this body do not have to come down and engage in this debate and say why we failed to act and thought our responsibility as elected officials.

Mrs. NORTHUP. We know that we could not possibly tax our way out of these problems, we could not raise taxes enough and have a viable economy left if we tried to solve the Social Security problem with tax increases. We can look across the ocean to economies, for example, France where they did not address the Social Security problem, the Social Security challenge that they have there and because now the cost of those senior survivor benefits are so high in France, their economy is crumbling under the weight of those costs. In fact, no matter what solution we have, we depend on growth in this economy to fund the transition. And so to have to raise taxes, we have to have a plan to save and strengthen Social Security for our children. It is safe for today’s seniors but for our children, to make it safe and secure and solvent for them, and we need that economy to be growing so we can have those good jobs, so that they can build the personal accounts while they meet the Social Security needs for those that were in the workforce before them. And so growth and a new plan to grow the Social Security for future generations are both needed. We cannot trade a growing economy in order to strengthen Social Security, because raising taxes would have a chilling effect on our economy and at the same time it would only be a very short-term fix.

I think these conversations, conversations with the American people, conversations with our constituents when we go back home and conversations between each other are helping us grow to better understand, better analyze the problem and to put forth good ideas. I am excited about the ideas that are being put forth. They are not scary to me. They are exciting.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana to share with us his closing thoughts.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Again I would like to thank the gentlewoman for her courageous leadership on this, willing to take the risk of least important problems for our Nation. I, too, hear when I am at home doing town hall meetings, why do we not put the money aside, why do we not spend it on general fund items like Congress has been doing for 60 years now. There is a mechanism to make sure that the money can only be used for Social Security benefits. That mechanism is called personal accounts. When you allow people to set aside part of their payroll taxes into a personal account, you are helping them really to understand how that money is invested in a very safe and secure investment. That money is theirs. It cannot be used for any other
purpose and it is going back to a term that has been used in the past, a personal lockbox for every individual.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership. This is a debate that will be ongoing and one that is critical to the future of our Nation.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE HONORABLE PETE SESSIONS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Drake) laid before the House the following communication from Charles Bauer, Chief of Staff of the Honorable Pete Sessions, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 8, 2005.

Hon. J. Dennis Hastert,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Speaker: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the 3rd Judicial District Court of Henderson County, Texas, for testimony.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

Charles Bauer,
Chief of Staff.

COMMUNICATION FROM OUTREACH COORDINATOR OF THE HONORABLE PETE SESSIONS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Flo Helton, Outreach Coordinator of the Honorable Pete Sessions, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 15, 2005.

Hon. J. Dennis Hastert,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Speaker: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the 3rd Judicial District Court of Henderson County, Texas, for testimony.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

Flo Helton,
Outreach Coordinator.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE PETE SESSIONS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable Pete Sessions, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 8, 2005.

Hon. J. Dennis Hastert,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Gutknecht, for 5 minutes, today and March 17 and 18.

The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:

Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the fourth quarter of 2004 and the first quarter of 2005, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Foreign currency</th>
<th>U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Griddine</td>
<td>1/16</td>
<td>11/18</td>
<td>11/18</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>236.07</td>
<td>305.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>728.00</td>
<td>3,033.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/17</td>
<td>11/19</td>
<td>11/19</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,544.00</td>
<td>2,090.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,033.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/18</td>
<td>11/20</td>
<td>11/20</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,544.00</td>
<td>2,090.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,033.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/19</td>
<td>11/21</td>
<td>11/21</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,850</td>
<td>728.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,578.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Poe) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. Poe, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Gutknecht, for 5 minutes, today and March 17 and 18.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1160. An act to reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program through June 30, 2005, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced the signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 384. An act to extend the existence of the Nazi War Crimes and Japanese Imperial Government Records Interagency Working Group for two years.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. Northup. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, accordingly (at midnight), the House adjourned until today, Thursday, March 17, 2005, at 10 a.m.
REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. MARGARET PETERLIN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 23 AND NOV. 28, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Peterlin</td>
<td>11/28</td>
<td>11/30</td>
<td>Austria, Kosovo, Greece</td>
<td>2,210.00</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>2,210.00</td>
<td>2,210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,210.00</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>2,210.00</td>
<td>2,210.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
3 Military air transportation.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. VANESSA GRIDDINE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 23 AND DEC. 17, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Griddine</td>
<td>12/03</td>
<td>12/08</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>1,236.00</td>
<td>1,236.00</td>
<td>1,236.00</td>
<td>1,236.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,236.00</td>
<td>1,236.00</td>
<td>1,236.00</td>
<td>1,236.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
4 Business center.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. ALCEE HASTINGS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 9 AND NOV. 16, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Alcee Hastings</td>
<td>11/09</td>
<td>11/16</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>3,030.00</td>
<td>3,030.00</td>
<td>3,030.00</td>
<td>3,030.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,030.00</td>
<td>3,030.00</td>
<td>3,030.00</td>
<td>3,030.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. ALCEE HASTINGS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 4 AND DEC. 17, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Alcee Hastings</td>
<td>12/07</td>
<td>12/09</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>4,750.00</td>
<td>4,750.00</td>
<td>4,750.00</td>
<td>4,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,750.00</td>
<td>4,750.00</td>
<td>4,750.00</td>
<td>4,750.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. ALCEE HASTINGS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 23 AND DEC. 28, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Alcee Hastings</td>
<td>12/23</td>
<td>12/28</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>1,236.00</td>
<td>1,236.00</td>
<td>1,236.00</td>
<td>1,236.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. JANICE MCKINNEY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 23 AND FEB. 27, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janice McKinney</td>
<td>2/23</td>
<td>2/27</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1,118.18</td>
<td>6,087.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,205.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO VIETNAM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 8 AND JAN. 14, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Darrell Issa</td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>1/14</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>781.00</td>
<td>2,077.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,858.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT, 1 AND DEC. 31, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. John Boehner</td>
<td>11/23</td>
<td>11/28</td>
<td>Austria, Kosovo &amp; Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per diem</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
3 Expenses not yet available.
### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency (in U.S. dollar or U.S. currency)</td>
<td>Foreign currency (in U.S. dollar or U.S. currency)</td>
<td>Foreign currency (in U.S. dollar or U.S. currency)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/00</td>
<td>11/10</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>238.00</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>238.00</td>
<td>238.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.</td>
<td>11/10</td>
<td>11/10</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>238.00</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>238.00</td>
<td>238.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Kiko</td>
<td>12/08</td>
<td>12/11</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>246.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>246.00</td>
<td>246.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>492.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,922.11</td>
<td>8,414.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent, if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency (in U.S. dollar or U.S. currency)</td>
<td>Foreign currency (in U.S. dollar or U.S. currency)</td>
<td>Foreign currency (in U.S. dollar or U.S. currency)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Schmidt</td>
<td>11/06</td>
<td>11/07</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td>225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial aircraft transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,304.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kline</td>
<td>11/06</td>
<td>11/07</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td>225.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent, if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
3 Military air transportation.

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign currency (in U.S. dollar or U.S. currency)</td>
<td>Foreign currency (in U.S. dollar or U.S. currency)</td>
<td>Foreign currency (in U.S. dollar or U.S. currency)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kline</td>
<td>11/06</td>
<td>11/07</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td>225.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent, if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

F. JAMES SENSENBERNBRER, JR., Chairman, Feb. 4, 2005.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, Feb. 16, 2005.
EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred to as follows:

1227. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Fenbuconazole; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerance (OPP-2004-9410; FRL-7699-2) received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1228. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Clofentazine; Pesticide Tolerance (OPP-2005-0022; FRL-7699-8) received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1229. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Captain Dan W. Davenport, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1230. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received February 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1231. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received February 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1232. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations — received February 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1233. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Revised Format for Materials Being Incorporated by Reference 


1237. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Arizona [AZ204-0083; FRL-7875-2] received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1238. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Revised Format for Materials Being Incorporated by Reference 

1239. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Redesignation of the City Weirton as a Nonattainment Area; the Clay and Butler Master Districts 802 Nonattainment Area and Approval of the Maintenance Plan; Correction [R03-OAR-2004-WV-0002; FRL-7782-4] received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.


1241. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Arizona [AZ204-0083; FRL-7875-2] received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1242. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Washington; Yakima County Nonattainment...
H1620

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
1274. A letter from the Program Analyst,
FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney
JT8D-209, -217, -217A, -217C, and -219 Series
Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-80-AD;
Amendment 39-13948; AD 2005-02-03] (RIN:
2120-AA64) received March 8, 2005, pursuant
to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on
Transportation and Infrastructure.
1275. A letter from the Program Analyst,
FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasiliera de
Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB135BJ Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA2004-19526; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-140AD; Amendment 39-13952; AD 2005-02-07] (RIN:
2120-AA64) received March 8, 2005, pursuant
to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on
Transportation and Infrastructure.
1276. A letter from the Program Analyst,
FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas
Model MD-11 and MD-11F Airplanes Equipped
with Pratt & Whitney PW4000 Series Engines
[Docket No. FAA-2004-19449; Directorate
Identifier 2004-NM-07-AD; Amendment 3913951; AD 2005-02-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received
March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.
801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
1277. A letter from the Program Analyst,
FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757 Series Airplanes Equipped With Rolls Royce
Model RB211 Engines [Docket No. 2003-NM252-AD; Amendment 39-13955; AD 2005-02-10]
(RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
1278. A letter from the Program Analyst,
FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas
Model MD-11 and MD-11F Airplanes [Docket
No. FAA-2004-19262; Directorate Identifier
2004-NM-54-AD; Amendment 39-13953; AD
2005-02-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 8,
2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
1279. A letter from the Program Analyst,
FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319,
A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No.
2000-NM-70-AD; Amendment 39-13954; AD
2005-02-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 8,
2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
1280. A letter from the Program Analyst,
FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767-200,
-300, and -300F Series Airplanes [Docket No.
FAA-2004-19201; Directorate Identifier 2003NM-100-AD; Amendment 39-13959; AD 2005-0303] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 8, 2005,
pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
1281. A letter from the Program Analyst,
FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-279-AD;
Amendment 39-13957; AD 2005-03-01] (RIN:
2120-AA64) received March 8, 2005, pursuant
to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on
Transportation and Infrastructure.
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1282. A letter from the Program Analyst,
FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-300,
-400, and -500 Series Airplanes; and Model 757200 and -200CB Series Airplanes [Docket No.
2003-NM-221-AD; Amendment 39-13958; AD
2005-03-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 8,
2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
1283. A letter from the Program Analyst,
FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace
Corporation, Ltd. Model 750XL Airplanes
[Docket No. FAA-2004-19444; Directorate
Identifier 2004-CE-33-AD; Amendment 3913960; AD 2005-03-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received
March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.
801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
1284. A letter from the Principal Deputy
Associate Administrator, Environmental
Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Effluent Limitations Guidelines, Pretreatment Standards, and New
Source Performance Standards for the
Transportation Equipment Cleaning Point
Source Category [OW-2004-11; FRL-7866-7]
(RIN: 2040-AE65) received January 27, 2005,
pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
1285. A letter from the Vice President for
Government Affairs, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting notice that
Amtrak fully intends to comply with its
legal requirement and will submit its FY06
Legislative and Grant Request shortly, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 24315(a)(1); to the Committee
on
Transportation
and
Infrastructure.
f

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS
Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of
committees were delivered to the Clerk
for printing and reference to the proper
calendar, as follows:
Mr. GINGREY: Committee on Rules. House
Resolution 162. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1334) to amend
title 28, United States Code, to provide for
the removal to Federal court of certain
State court cases involving the rights of incapacitated persons, and for other purposes
(Rept. 109–20). Referred to the House Calendar.
Mr. GINGREY: Committee on Rules. House
Resolution 163. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect
to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept.
109–21). Referred to the House Calendar.
f

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS
Under clause 2 of rule XII, public
bills and resolutions were introduced
and severally referred, as follows:
By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of
Texas (for herself and Mr. SIMMONS):
H.R. 1329. A bill to amend the Lacey Act
Amendments of 1981 to treat nonhuman primates as prohibited wildlife species under
that Act; to the Committee on Resources.
By Mr. SALAZAR:
H.R. 1330. A bill to provide that Social Security contributions are used to protect Social Security solvency by mandating that
Trust Fund monies cannot be diverted to
create private accounts; to the Committee
on Ways and Means.
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By Mr. WELLER (for himself and Mr.
RANGEL):
H.R. 1331. A bill to provide for a fair and
equitable resolution of claims relating to the
work opportunity credit; to the Committee
on Ways and Means.
By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr.
DELAY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FEENEY, Mr.
JENKINS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KING of
Iowa, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. KELLER,
Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California,
and Mr. PENCE):
H.R. 1332. A bill to amend title 28, United
States Code, to provide for the removal to
Federal court of certain State court cases involving the rights of incapacitated persons,
and for other purposes; to the Committee on
the Judiciary. considered and passed.
By Ms. HART (for herself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr.
PLATTS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MCCOTTER,
Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr.
NORWOOD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GARY G.
MILLER of California, Mr. BOEHNER,
Mr. GERLACH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska,
Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. WU, Mr. ROSS,
Mr. DICKS, Mr. FORD, Mrs. JO ANN
DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr.
FARR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr.
COOPER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JEFFERSON,
Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr.
WEINER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WILSON of
South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. WOOLSEY,
Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida,
Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr.
SOUDER, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of
Florida, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr.
LANGEVIN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. GENE
GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr.
BECERRA, and Mr. PITTS):
H.R. 1333. A bill to amend title XVIII of the
Social Security Act to authorize physical
therapists to evaluate and treat Medicare
beneficiaries without a requirement for a
physician referral, and for other purposes; to
the Committee on Energy and Commerce,
and in addition to the Committee on Ways
and Means, for a period to be subsequently
determined by the Speaker, in each case for
consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.
By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr.
DELAY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FEENEY, Mr.
JENKINS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KING of
Iowa, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. KELLER,
Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California,
and Mr. PENCE):
H.R. 1334. A bill to amend title 28, United
States Code, to provide for the removal to
Federal court of certain State court cases involving the rights of incapacitated persons,
and for other purposes; to the Committee on
the Judiciary.
By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself
and Mr. RAMSTAD):
H.R. 1335. A bill to amend title 5, United
States Code, to increase the mandatory retirement age for members of the Capitol Police from 57 to 60 years of age; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within
the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.
By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:
H.R. 1336. A bill to amend the Harmonized
Tariff Schedule of the United States to clarify the classification of laser light sources
for semiconductor manufacturing; to the
Committee on Ways and Means.
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By Ms. HERSETH (for herself, Mr. Ross, Mr. Ford, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Payne, Mr. McDermott, and Mr. Hastings of Florida):

H.R. 1348. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide reimbursement for non-TRICARE health insurance premiums paid by certain members of reserve components during the period the members were not eligible for TRICARE coverage; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia (for herself, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Souder, Mr. Hayns, Mr. Fitzpatrick of Pennsylvania, Mr. Hoyer, Mr. Akin, Mr. Bonilla, Mr. Case of New Jersey, Mr. Whitfield, Mr. Kuhl of New York, Mr. McHenry, Mr. Pearce, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. Fossella of New York, Ms. Jones of North Carolina, Mr. Westmoreland, Mr. Garrett of New Jersey, Mr. Kline, Mr. McCaul of Texas, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. Shaw, Mr. Bartlett of Maryland, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Istook, Mr. Kennedy of Minnesota, Mr. Gutknecht, Mr. Erlenbach of Nebraska, Mr. Chocola, Mr. Forbes, and Mr. Boyd):

H.R. 1337. A bill to support certain national youth organizations, including the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DelAUBRO (for herself, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Bradley of New Hampshire, Mr. Pallone of New Jersey, Ms. Liske, Ms. Slaughter, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Gene Green of Texas, Mr. Wexler, Mr. Michaud, Mr. Moran of Virginia, Mr. Israel, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Farr, Mr. Waxman, Mr. Strickland, Mrs. Jones of Ohio, Mr. Lantos, Mr. Jackson of Illinois, Ms. Wasserman Schultz, and Mr. Gonzalez):

H.R. 1338. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to permit refinancing of student loans, increase Pell Grant maximum awards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. EMERSON:

H.R. 1339. A bill to amend the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 to provide a period of time to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 1340. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the reporting fee payable by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to educational institutions for reports or certifications which such educational institutions are required by law or regulation to submit to the Secretary; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. PAYTAR:

H.R. 1341. A bill to require each State to provide a minimum level of access to health care to veterans of such State as a condition for participation in Federal health care funding programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. LoBiondo):

H.R. 1342. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1560 Union Valley Road in West Milford, New Jersey, as the "James Parrello Postal Service Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. HERSETH (for herself, Mr. Ross, Mr. Ford, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Payne, Mr. McDermott, and Mr. Hastings of Florida):

H.R. 1343. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage owners and operators of privately-held farm, ranch, and forest land to voluntarily make their land available for public access under programs administered by States and tribal governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania (for herself and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan):

H.R. 1344. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers to claim a work opportunity credit for hiring military service personnel returning from service in Afghanistan, Iraq, or other countries, by hiring their dependents and dependents of deceased personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSIBLENKRNER (for himself, Mr. Sessions, and Mr. Hostettler):

H.R. 1353. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the provision of scientifically sound information and support services to patients receiving a positive test diagnosis for Down syndrome or other catastrophically diagnosed condition; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SIMMONS (for himself, Mrs. Johnson of Connecticut, Mr. Shays, Ms. Delauro, and Mr. Larson of Connecticut):

H.R. 1345. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the tip tax credit to employers of cosmetologists and to promote tax compliance in the cosmetology sector; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. Ahearn, Mr. Case, Mr. Pascrell, Mr. DelAUBRO, Mr. Green of Wisconsin, Mr. Hultgren, Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, Mr. McCotter, Ms. Norton, and Mr. Pallone):

H.R. 1346. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a more equitable geographic allocation of funds appropriated to the Department of Veterans Affairs for medical care; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Ms. Norton, and Mr. Tom Davis of Virginia):

H.R. 1347. A bill to provide funding for projects to reduce traffic congestion and improve travel options in the metropolitan Washington region; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. Norton:

H.R. 1348. A bill to provide for nuclear disarmament and economic conversion in accordance with District of Columbia Initiative for Comprehensive Change of Control of the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself and Ms. Norton):

H.R. 1349. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide a comprehensive regional and state level strategy and infrastructural development in the most severely distressed regions in the Nation; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 1350. A bill to eliminate the safe-harbor exemption for packaging of dehydrated or instant coffee products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself, Mr. Osborne, Mr. Green of Wisconsin, Mr. Andrews, Mr. Boehlert, Mr. Oberstar, Mr. Boswell, Ms. Herseth, Mr. Moore of Kansas, and Mr. Udall of Colorado):

H.R. 1351. A bill to designate the public facility at 2820 Second Street in the Food Security Act of 1985 to encourage owners and operators of privately-held farm, ranch, and forest land to voluntarily make their land available for public access under programs administered by States and tribal governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota (for herself and Mr. Blumenauer):

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution calling on the President to order an immediate moratorium on the rendition of persons to Syria and all countries that routinely use torture as reported by the Department of State, the Joint Council of Governments, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.
By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CARSON):

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution urging the appropriate representatives of the United States to the 61st session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to introduce a resolution calling upon the Government of the Republic of Belarus to cease its human rights violations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. NEY (for himself and Mr. PITTS):

H. Res. 159. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on House Administration in the One Hundred Ninth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. PETZEL):

H. Res. 161. A resolution condemning the conduct of Chief Minister Narendra Modi for his actions to incite religious persecution and urging the United States to condemn all violations of religious freedom in India; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

H. Res. 163. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a National School-Based Health Centers Month to raise awareness of health services provided by school health centers; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H. Res. 165. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the One Hundred Ninth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H. Res. 166. A resolution urging Turkey to respect the rights and religious freedoms of the Ecumenical Patriarch; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H. R. 12: Mr. REHBOURG, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. KLINE.

H. R. 20: Mr. WATT.

H. R. 21: Mr. EVANS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WATSON, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. KIND, and Mr. Davis of Florida.

H. R. 22: Mr. SCHIFF.

H. R. 32: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. GOHMER.

H. R. 37: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H. R. 68: Mr. PORTER.

H. R. 97: Mr. CARTER.

H. R. 110: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H. R. 115: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H. R. 127: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. SANDERS.

H. R. 136: Mr. ALEXANDER.

H. R. 139: Mrs. MCCARTHY.

H. R. 180: Mr. NORWOOD.

H. R. 213: Ms. WATERS and Ms. BALDWIN.

H. R. 262: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H. R. 265: Mr. MCCAUL.

H. R. 269: Mr. GORDON.

H. R. 280: Mr. McHugh.

H. R. 32: Mr. POMBO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MELANCON, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WATTE of Florida, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H. R. 303: Mr. CRAKER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. R. 314: Mr. CLAY.

H. R. 326: Mr. KILDAYE, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.

H. R. 333: Mr. SANDERS and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H. R. 341: Mr. SHAWS.

H. R. 358: Mr. OBEY.

H. R. 369: Mr. UEDON, Mr. FORTUNO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ENGLAND of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H. R. 373: Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. PASCRELL.

H. R. 376: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. R. 421: Mr. McDermott and Mr. RUSH.

H. R. 480: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H. R. 496: Mr. HINCHY and Mr. KUCINICH.

H. R. 500: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. HERSKIND, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H. R. 515: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H. R. 525: Mr. SULIVAN, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. HOBSON.

H. R. 553: Mr. SNYDER and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.

H. R. 551: Mr. MEKES of New York, Mr. FAHL, Mr. HINCHY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RUSH of Indiana, Mr. OSE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H. R. 554: Mr. GINGREY.

H. R. 562: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. R. 583: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.

H. R. 594: Mr. DAVIES of Pennsylvania.

H. R. 62: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GOEDE, and Mr. HONDA.

H. R. 668: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H. R. 669: Mr. SAXTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. HOLT.

H. R. 691: Mr. GILCHREST.

H. R. 700: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WATTE of Florida.

H. R. 731: Mr. DeFAZIO.

H. R. 739: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H. R. 740: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H. R. 741: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H. R. 742: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H. R. 759: Mr. NADLER.

H. R. 766: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. WILKSON of Florida, Mr. HALL, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H. R. 769: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. R. 772: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. BOUCHER.

H. R. 788: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mrs. SAINSTRE.

H. R. 792: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. R. 793: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. WALSH.

H. R. 800: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mrs. EMERSON, Miss MCMORRIS, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. STABH, Mr. CARDONE, Mr. CUVELAR, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PIEONEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.

H. R. 810: Mr. MATSUI, Ms. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H. R. 839: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FARR, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H. R. 859: Mr. GLAYVES and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. R. 867: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H. R. 877: Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. COSTELLO.

H. R. 908: Mr. FORTUNO, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. GORDON.

H. R. 930: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. CONEYER.

H. R. 952: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H. R. 953: Mr. GRAY of Connecticut, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WALSH, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. WATERBURY, and Mr. TANNER.

H. R. 1216: Mr. STRICKLAND.

H. R. 1217: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FATTAL, Mr. CARSON, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H. R. 1218: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H. R. 1225: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.

H. R. 1227: Mr. WALSH, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. OLIVER, and Mr. LEACH.

H. R. 1226: Mr. CARSON.

H. R. 1245: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. RANDELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SHAW, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. WATSON, and Ms. NOETZEN.

H. R. 1226: Mr. CONVEY and Mr. MEeks of New York.

H. R. 1290: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. McDermott.

H. R. 1298: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. McDermott.

H. R. 1305: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. CLAY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. McDermott.

H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. PENCE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Ms. EIDENBROECKER, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FORD, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. GILLHOLM, and Mr. BURMAN.

H. Con. Res. 90: Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. CALVERT.

H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. WYNNS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. McDermott, Ms. MALONEY.
H. Res. 67: Mrs. Christensen, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Berman, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Michaud, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Gene Green of Texas, and Mr. Higgins.
H. Res. 84: Mr. Lewis of Kentucky.
H. Res. 90: Mr. Capuano and Mr. Sanders.
H. Res. 142: Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Schwartz of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Ruppersberger.
H. Res. 145: Mr. Boozman and Mr. Miller of Florida.
H. Res. 148: Mr. Capuano, Ms. Harris, and Mr. Lewis of Kentucky.
H. Res. 155: Mr. Baird.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:
H.R. 525: Mr. Meeks of New York.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk’s desk and referred as follows:
10. The Speaker presented a petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 15 of 2005 petitioning the United States Congress to issue a Congressional Gold Medal to Welles Remy Crowther for his bravery and sacrifice in saving dozens of people from certain death on September 11, 2001, resulting in his own death that day; which was referred to the Committee on Financial Services.
The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable SAM BROWNBACK, a Senator from the State of Kansas.

PRAYER
The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.
O God of love, all the good things we have are from You. Give us the wisdom to slow down long enough to discover Your plan.
All this we ask in Your powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The Honorable SAM BROWNBACK led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:
I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication from the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

To the Senate:
Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable SAM BROWNBACK, a Senator from the State of Kansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

TED STEVENS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BROWNBACK thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE
Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this morning we will begin consideration of the budget resolution. We have an order in place from last night which sets aside specific debate times in relation to several amendments this morning. We will debate an NIH amendment, to be followed by additional debate on the ANWR amendment, to be followed by further debate on two veterans amendments. At the conclusion of these debates, we will vote on the pending Amtrak amendment and the pending ANWR amendment. We also anticipate that we will reach agreement to vote on some of the other previously discussed amendments. Senators could therefore expect a series of votes to begin sometime between 12:30 and 1 o'clock today.

I thank the chairman and ranking member of the Budget Committee for working out a reasonable approach for the consideration of these issues. Once again, we will continue through the afternoon and evening on additional amendments with votes throughout the session.

I yield the floor.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2006
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 18, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010.

Pending:
Byrd Amendment No. 158, to provide adequate funding of $1.4 billion in fiscal year 2006 to preserve a national intercity passenger rail system.

Cantwell Amendment No. 168, to strike section 201(a)(4) relative to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Akaka Amendment No. 149, to increase veterans medical care by $2.8 billion in 2006.

Ensign Amendment No. 171, to increase veterans medical care by $10,000,000 in fiscal year 2006.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, is recognized for up to 20 minutes.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, as we all know, this budget cuts a score of critical domestic programs: food for women and infants; community development block grants for cities, which cities use for vital purposes; and health and education programs for children. That is just a few. It cuts Medicaid by $15 billion over 5 years. It zeros out reimbursements to States and counties of the cost of incarcerating criminal aliens. It is an unfunded mandate in that regard. Yet this budget contains $41.3 million for nuclear weapons initiatives including $8.5 million for a nuclear program that scientists say is impossible to achieve.
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The seriousness of the issue and the clear intent of this administration to renew funding this year for this nuclear initiative that was zeroed out by the Congress last year compel me to come to the floor today.

President Bush’s fiscal year 2006 budget calls for $8.5 million, including $4 million for the Department of Energy and $4.5 million for the Department of Defense, for the research and development of a nuclear bunker buster, a weapon called the ro bust earth nuclear penetrator. The purpose of the research is to determine whether a missile casing on a 100-kil oton warhead can survive a thrust into the earth and take out a hardened and deeply buried military target without spewing millions of cubic feet of radioactive debris into the atmosphere. Scientists know that the laws of physics will not allow that to happen.

It includes $25 million to lower the Nevada test site time-to-test readiness from 36 months to 18 months. This sends a clear signal of an urgent move to begin underground nuclear testing as soon as possible. This is despite the fact that our country has had a moratorium on nuclear testing since 1992. We have had it for more than 13 years.

It also contains $7.8 million for a so-called modern pit facility. This is a fa cility to build 450 new pits. These are the nuclear triggers for nuclear weapons, in which the fissile material is contained and detonated. This is 450 new pits a year, some of which would be designed for new nuclear weapons.

Currently the United States has approximately 15,000 warheads. Under the Moscow Treaty, the United States is to decrease its strategic nuclear force to 1,700 to 2,200 by 2012. To maintain a 2,200-warhead force at replacement level—and this is important—we would only need 50 pits a year, but 450 which is called for in this budget.

So why build a new facility unless there are plans underway to develop a new generation of nuclear weapons?

Perhaps because the explosion and use of nuclear weapons took place at the end of World War II, we forget what it is like. I hope people will look at this and see what it is like. This is Hiroshima. This is at the end of World War II. This is a 15-kiloton nuclear weapon, not a nuclear bunker buster. This is incomprehensible to me. This is what the Enola Gay dropped on Hiroshima. It cleared bare 4 square miles. It killed immediately 90,000 people. It caused hundreds of thousands of people to die of radiation sickness. Again, why fund this project?

Congress made a strong statement last year. We took out the appropriations for these new nuclear weapons. This defunding was made possible by the leadership of Representative David Hoiberg, the chairman of the House Appropriations Energy Committee, who was successful, with our support, in eliminating $27.5 million in funding for this 100-kiloton nuclear bunker buster and $9 million for the advanced weapons concepts initiative. This is a falla cious concept of creating low yield tact ical nuclear weapons, under 5 kilo tons, to use on a battlefield, no less. Who would ever want to send their sons and daughters to any war where the battlefield had nuclear weapons? It also eliminated funding to lower the time-to-test readiness at the Nevada test site 18 months and limited funding for the Modern Pit Facility to $7 million.

Congress spoke last year. We said: We will not approve appropriations for this program. And yet once again those appropriations have crept into this budget.

I will take a few minutes to make that evident to Members of the Senate. Last year was a consequential victory for those of us who believe very deeply—and I might say passionately—that the United States sends the wrong signal to the rest of the world by reopening the nuclear door and beginning the testing and development of a new generation of nuclear weapons.

This year, our message is clear: Don’t reopen this nuclear door. Those of us who are appropriators will once again try to remove this funding from the budget.

I am so disappointed to learn that the administration has requested funding again this year for a 100-kiloton nuclear bunker buster, to lower the time-to-test readiness at the Nevada test site to 18 months, and to fund a modern plutonium pit facility that could produce 450 new plutonium pits a year when only 50 are needed.

There should be no doubt that this is the Secretory of Defense’s program. He is determined to get it funded. It is that Secretary who requested the Secretary of Energy to place $4 million in the energy budget and $4.5 million in the defense budget. This is very clever. In this way Secretary Rumsfeld hopes to get it done in the defense budget, if he can’t through energy appropriations.

I ask that the Senate know that the development of a 100-kiloton robust nuclear earth penetrator is simply not possible without spewing millions of tons of radioactive material and killing large numbers of people.

Secondly, the development of new nuclear weapons will undermine our antiproliferation efforts and will make our Nation less safe, not more safe.

And thirdly, as a nation, we are sending the wrong message, a message that will encourage nuclear proliferation by others. In fact, it already has. The bottom line: There is simply no such thing as a clean or usable 100-kilot on nuclear bunker buster that could destroy a hardened and deeply buried military target without spewing radioactive radiation.

Consider this: A 1-kiloton nuclear weapon, detonated 25 to 50 feet under ground, would dig a crater the size of Ground Zero in New York and eject 1 million cubic feet of radioactive debris into the air. Given the insurmountable physics problems associated with burrowing a warhead deep into the earth, you would need a weapon with more than 100 kilotons of yield to destroy an underground target at a depth of 1,000 feet. Yet the maximum feasible depth a bunker buster can penetrate is about 35 feet. At that depth, a 100-kiloton bunker buster would scatter 100 million cubic feet of radioactive debris into the atmosphere.

There is no known missile casing that can survive a 1,000-foot thrust into the earth to avoid overwhelming and catastrophic consequences. That is not me saying this, that is science saying this.

Let me give you the words of the head of the National Nuclear Security Administration, if you don’t trust me. On March 2, 2005, Armed Services Strategic Forces Subcommittee, Congresswoman Ellen Tauscher asked Ambassador Linton Brooks the following question: want to know to get it done in the defense budget. This is very clever. In this way Secretary Rumsfeld hopes to get it done in the defense budget, if he can’t through energy appropriations.

The answer, according to the Ambassador: No, there is not.

When Congresswoman Tauscher asked him how deep he thought a bunker buster could go, using modern scientific concepts—in other words, here we get to the missile casing—he said:

. . . a couple of tens of meters maybe. I mean certainly—I really must apologize for my lack of precision, if we in the administration have suggested that it was possible to have a bomb that penetrated far enough to trap all fallout. I don’t believe that—I don’t believe the laws of physics will ever let that be true.

So here we have the administration saying what we who have opposed this program from the start have said. The laws of physics will never allow the development of a “clean” 100-kiloton robust nuclear earth penetrator.

Again, simply stated, there is no cas sing that will withstand a 1,000-foot thrust into the earth—the depth at which a spewing of radioactivity might be contained. Such an admission begs the question: Why are we even spending a dime on this research? Or as Secretary Rumsfeld said to me in a December meeting: The physics problems associated with burrowing a warhead deep into the earth are insurmountable. The laws of physics will never allow the development of a “clean” 100-kiloton robust nuclear earth penetrator.

Again, simply stated, there is no cas sing that will withstand a 1,000-foot thrust into the earth—the depth at which a spewing of radioactivity might be contained. Such an admission begs the question: Why are we even spending a dime on this research? Or as Secretary Rumsfeld said to me in a December meeting: The physics problems associated with burrowing a warhead deep into the earth are insurmountable. The laws of physics will never allow the development of a “clean” 100-kiloton robust nuclear earth penetrator.

Do I believe that answer? Absolutely not. This has never been about a study. It has been about the intent of the administration to develop new nuclear weapons, and I have followed this for a long time now.

This year, this budget funds $8.5 million. In fiscal year 2007, it increases to $17.5 million, including $14 million for the Department of Energy and $3.5 million for the Pentagon.

While the administration is silent this year on how much it plans to
spend on the program in future years, last year they let it all out. Last year’s budget request called for spending $485 million on a 100-kiloton nuclear bunker buster over 5 years, which scientists say is impossible to devise. The laws of physics will not allow it, unless you are going to prevent one that is going to spew tons of radioactivity.

Let me, for a moment, mention the policies underlying this initiative. These policies began in 2002 with the document called the Nuclear Posture Review. That document places nuclear weapons as part of the strategic triad for the first time in our history, therefore, blurring the distinction between conventional and nuclear weapons—a very bad policy decision. Then take National Security Directive 17, which came out later that year, which indicated for the first time in America’s history that we would engage in a first use of nuclear weapons—a historic statement. We have never had a first use policy, but we have never said that we would countenance a first use of nuclear weapons. And in National Security Directive 17 we do just that. We say we would engage in a first use of nuclear weapons—again, that is a historic statement—to respond to a chemical or biological attack against certain nations. The Nuclear Posture Review named seven nations against whom we would countenance a nuclear attack. One of those nations is a nuclear nation. This is ridiculous and foolish policy, and it jeopardizes the future of all Americans. But what does this also is it encourages other nations to develop their own nuclear weapons, thereby putting American lives and our national security at risk. That is why the North Koreans are moving ahead. They see what we are going to do. They see that we have said we would enter into a first use of nuclear weapons. North Korea is one of the seven nations named that is happening in Iran now. Iran is one of the seven nations named. Other countries are now looking at advanced weapons concepts, based on the fact that we have moved in this direction.

The next nuclear nonproliferation review conference is in May, and it will allow parties to the treaty to measure progress in implementing their obligations and to discuss additional steps to meet the treaty’s objectives.

In public statements—this is the hypocrisy—the administration recognizes the importance of the NPT. Last week, President Bush stated that the NPT “represents a key legal barrier to nuclear weapons proliferation and makes a critical contribution to international security,” and that “the United States is firmly committed to its obligations under the treaty.”

If we are indeed serious about strengthening our nonproliferation efforts to reduce the spread of international nuclear security, we should lead in reducing nuclear arsenals; we should lead in preventing nuclear proliferation; and we should know that a production of a 100-kiloton nuclear bunker buster is sheer hypocrisy on our part.

Make no mistake, the rest of the world is watching us and paying close attention to what we do. I believe the United States can take several actions to make better use of our resources and demonstrate our commitment to keeping the world’s most dangerous weapons out of the hands of the most dangerous people. We have to strengthen the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty at this May 2005 review conference.

This includes supporting tougher inspections to monitor compliance, more effective controls on sensitive technologies, to safeguard and eliminate nuclear weapons usable materials, and agreement that no state may withdraw from the treaty and escape responsibility for prior violations of the treaty.

Finally, we should abandon and accelerate Nunn-Lugar threat reduction programs. I hear Senator after Senator saying they support the Nunn-Lugar program. We should provide the necessary resources to improve security and take the necessary nuclear chemical and biological weapons arsenal and infrastructure out of circulation.

Third, we should strengthen the ability of the DOE’s global threat reduction initiative to secure and remove nuclear weapons usable material from vulnerable sites around the world.

Last year, Senator DOMENICI and I sponsored an amendment to the 2005 National Defense Authorization Act, which authorized the Secretary of Energy to lead an accelerated, comprehensive worldwide effort to secure, remove, and eliminate the threat by these materials.

Finally, we should improve—this has to do with the bunker buster—our intelligence capabilities in relation to underground targets and expand conventional options to put them at risk. Every underground target has entry and exit, has an access way, to take them out with conventional weapons. That is what we should be doing instead of exploring, doing research and development of a 100-kiloton nuclear bunker buster, which science says cannot be done without the spewing of millions of tons radiation. History repeats itself.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

The Acting President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The Acting President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for—may I have up to 10 minutes? I don’t think I will go that long.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, this is out of the amendment time, and there is 45 minutes on our side. We have many speakers. Can the Senator go for 7 minutes?

Mr. WYDEN. That would be gracious. I will try to do that.

Mr. CONRAD. If Senator SPECTER has not appeared by then, we can provide more time.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague.

The Acting President pro tem. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, those who advocate drilling in the Arctic claim that the drilling is needed to reduce our Nation’s dependence on foreign oil. But what is included in the Senate budget resolution doesn’t increase U.S. energy security. To the contrary, it is a license to export Alaskan oil outside the United States. With the inflated revenue projections of $2.5 billion from drilling in the Arctic included in the budget, the Federal Government will be forced to sell the oil to the highest bidder to even come close to reaching that amount.

Under the Senate budget, if the highest price is in South America, oil from the Arctic refuge would have to go to South America. If the highest price is in the Far East, Arctic oil would have to go to the Far East. If the highest price is in the Middle East, Arctic oil would have to go to the Middle East. With the weak dollar, that would be a virtual certainty that the highest price for Arctic oil would be outside our country. It would not reduce our dependence on foreign oil one drop to export Arctic oil overseas, but that is exactly what could happen under the Senate budget resolution.

Now, last Congress, in passing its Energy bill, recognized that drilling in the Arctic wildlife refuge won’t help our Nation’s energy security. If the oil from that drilling is exported overseas. The House-passed Energy bill explicitly prohibited the export of oil from the Arctic wildlife refuge. But the Senate budget resolution fails to include an export prohibition. In fact, it invites exports by assuming revenues that can only be met by requiring the oil to be sold to the highest bidder, at a time when the dollar is weak.

If the goal is energy security, then including the Arctic drilling in the budget resolution in this fashion is the wrong way to go about it. We can get more energy security, and we can get it sooner, than from Arctic oil drilling under the Senate budget resolution.

Last week, the President renewed his push for drilling in the Arctic by arguing it would produce nearly 10 million barrels per day. But the President acknowledged that that amount of oil would not be produced until 2025. We can get that much energy security and more and we can get it instead of waiting until 2025. We can get that added energy security by changing the current policies on exports of oil and
petroleum and providing the right incentives for producers to develop the billions of barrels of recoverable oil that are in U.S. reserves but are not being developed today.

Right now our country is exporting about 1 million barrels a day of petroleum products. That happens every single day. We could in effect get 1 million barrels a day more oil for our country, 10 percent more energy security, and we could get it right now by ending those loopholes.

By comparison, the administration’s Energy Information Administration says the amount of oil that the President says would be produced in the Arctic would only reduce our Nation’s dependence by 3 percent, from 68 percent to 65 percent dependence on foreign oil. I seriously doubt the OPEC cartel will stop its anticompetitive practices because of a tiny increase in Arctic production 20 years from now that even the Energy Administration says would reduce our dependence on foreign oil by 3 percent. Our country can get more than three times that amount of increased energy security and we can get it now rather than 20 years by stopping exports of U.S.-produced petroleum products, and under the unrestricted export language of the Senate budget resolution we could end up with no additional energy security—no additional energy security, absolutely not. I can do much better than a 3 percent increase in energy security. We can do better than the 10 percent increase in security our country would get from eliminating exports. In fact, our country could produce an additional 40 billion barrels of oil, enough to replace all of our country’s imports of oil for the next 10 years, and we could get that additional oil from existing reserves that could be produced in our country if the right incentives were provided.

If we want to get serious about energy security, we can start today. We should eliminate the budget resolution’s license to export Arctic oil out of our country. We should replace the budget resolution’s export license with policies that provide real energy security for our Nation.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The Acting President pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll. The journal clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I note the absence of a quorum with the condition that the time be charged equally against both sides.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The journal clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SPECTER, is recognized to offer an amendment relative to NIH on which there will be 45 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 173

I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The journal clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER), for himself and Mr. Harkin, proposes an amendment numbered 173.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: Increase discretionary health and education funding by $2,000,000,000)

On page 17, line 16, increase the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 17, line 17, increase the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 18, line 16, increase the amount by $1,500,000,000.

On page 18, line 17, increase the amount by $1,500,000,000.

On page 26, line 14, decrease the amount by $2,000,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, decrease the amount by $2,000,000,000.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, at the outset, I submit a statement for the record and ask that it be included in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPECTER. In order to summarize, since we have a relatively limited period of time, this amendment provides for increasing funding for the Department of Education by $500 million, which would bring it up to level funding, and an addition of $1.5 billion for the National Institutes of Health, and the offset would be across the board from Function 290. This reduction would affect many programs but simply reduce administrative expenses, travel, and consulting services by .237 percent, which is minuscule in the overall scheme of things, I admit, very minor compared to the importance of having additional funding in education and additional funding in the National Institutes of Health.

NIH has made remarkable advances on an enormous list of very major diseases and they are worth itemizing because each one of those strikes thousands of Americans. They include: Autism, stroke, obesity, Alzheimer’s, Parkinson’s, spinal muscular atrophy, scleroderma, ALS, muscular dystrophy, diabetes, osteoporosis, cancers, including breast, cervical and ovarian, lymphoma, multiple myeloma, prostate, pancreatic, colon, head and neck, brain, lung, pediatric renal disorders, multiple sclerosis, deafness and other audiological disorders, glioma, macular degeneration, sickle cell anemia, heart disease, spinal cord injury, sudden infant death syndrome, arthritis, schizophrenia and other mental disorders, polycystic kidney disease, hepatitis—Cooley’s anemia, primary immune deficiency disorders, and the list goes on and on.

As I read them off to itemize them, they are abstractions to people who suffer from these ailments. To families of people who suffer these ailments, they are catastrophic. Take someone who has autism, take someone who has Alzheimer’s, this disrupts the family, these ailments are overwhelming. The National Institutes of Health has had increases in this budget on a committee by this body this year, and we have increased the funding very substantially. But last year and the year before and this year, the funding well has not proceeded as it should. When you talk about a budget of $28 billion for the National Institutes of Health, when you have an overall budget of approximately $2.67 trillion, $28 billion is totally insufficient.

If there is not an increase in funding for the National Institutes of Health, there will be 402 less grants awarded next year than last year. The increase of less than $200 million does not begin to approximate the replacement rate for chemical, biomedical research which is 3.5 percent. We have 1.7 billion which is being applied by NIH to bioterrorism. With all due respect, that ought to come out of homeland security, bioterrorism. It is coming out of the NIH budget because it is a medical issue. If there is not additional funding, these are some of the points of impact on the National Institutes of Health:

They will be unable to test safety of new behavioral treatments for autism; unable to initiate phase 3 to determine the relationship between infection and cardiovascular disease; unable to expand research on early identification of hepatitis—bioterrorism attacks—here again these are abstractions, but to the people they hit, they are catastrophic—unable to expand the development of methamphetamine addiction; unable to initiate multicellular studies of autoimmune hepatitis, and the list goes on and on.

The subject of adequacy of NIH research is one which I thought was of enormous importance before I was
elected to the Senate in 1980, and my initial assignment on Appropriations took me to the Subcommittee on Health and Human Services. I have always been an advocate for increasing NIH funding. Then when I took over the chairmanship of the subcommittee in 1995, in a position to establish priorities, the Senate voted to double NIH funding, but then in the first year following defeated an effort to add $1 billion. Senator HARKIN and I have formed a partnership on a bipartisan basis, and he has had the gavel when the Democrats took over for 17 months in 2001 and when we have had a transfer of the gavel, it has been seamless, he and I and this partnership of established priorities within our subcommittee even when this body did not grant increases to NIH. We have found the money by establishing priorities. But the fact is that opportunity is gone. It is gone because there have been decreases in the other facets of the budget.

The Department of Labor budget has been cut by 3½ percent this year. I don’t know how we are going to fund the necessary programs for worker safety. The education budget, believe it or not, has been cut by almost 1 percent, by some $500 million. I will come to that in a moment on the aspect of this amendment which seeks to raise education funding by $500 million. But it is not possible anymore to juggle the books. We cannot juggle the books and find money and priorities to add an additional $1.5 billion to the National Institutes of Health.

My interest in medical research occurred before I developed a cancer problem, which has been publicized, with Hodgkin’s, and I am glad to say that there is a cure for the particular problem I had. But in many forms of cancer there is no cure. President Nixon declared war on cancer in 1972. Here we are 33 years later, the wealthiest country in the world, the greatest talent in the world on research, and we spend $2.6 trillion. We spend it in many directions which are challenged by many people in our society, but we allocate $28 billion to NIH. And it is totally, totally, totally insufficient, and for families where they suffer from Alzheimer’s or heart disease or the long list of maladies I recited, it is simply unacceptable. I know the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee has enormous problems. I compliment him on taking on what is probably the toughest job in the Senate, to try to find a way to make allocations on the budget.

But among the priorities, I will say that the expression is frequently used, “none is higher.” Well, that means it could be tied with a lot of others. But I would say health is highest. If you don’t have your health, you can’t do anything else. I could give an extended dissertation on that particular proposition because it has struck home to me. Not to overly personalize the matter, but when you go through the regimen for Hodgkin’s, they fill your body full of poisons to fight the poisons which are in your body. It is quite a war of the worlds as it battles through you. It underscores the importance of health. For the people who were suffering from the long list I recited, it is the beginning and end of every day.

We ought to win the war on cancer. In the particular institute of a very distinguished doctor, John Glick, who is my oncologist, they had plans for a 57 percent increase in their funding. That was reduced to 42 percent. And that was eliminated. That is symbolic of what is going on across America. That reduction in funding means a lot of pain, a lot of suffering, and a lot of deaths. We have the capacity to do something about it. This $1.5 billion is a modest step.

Now on to education. The President’s budget came over with a .9 percent decrease in education funding. It is a little hard for me to understand, given the importance of education. The Governors meet, the industrialists meet, and they decry the inadequacy of education in America. While the Federal Government provides a relatively small percentage of funding, we do have the leadership position.

Just last week, the Senate passed, 99 to 0, the reauthorization of the Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Program, which is a $2 billion program. But on the Education Department budget, this program is zeroed out. It was $2 billion, and we voted for it 99 to nothing. We looked good when we had the authorization vote, but when it comes to putting our money where our mouth is, we are AWOL, we are gone, we are not there.

There is an enormous number of educational programs which have been cut out totally. The GEAR UP program, which has been funded by my subcommittee over the last 6 years, which takes seventh graders and gives them mentoring and puts them on the right course through high school, an enormously important program not only for education but for crime control, where there is really the stark alternative of becoming a juvenile delinquent or becoming an educated America—it is gone.

The list is too long to read. I ask unanimous consent the full text of these programs which are being cut be printed in the Record.

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

**EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FY 2006 DISCRETIONARY BUDGET, TERMINATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2004 appropriation</th>
<th>2005 appropriation</th>
<th>2006 request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCLB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations for Learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Up Fellowships</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in English Education</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Educational Equity</td>
<td>2,967</td>
<td>2,956</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Dropout Prevention</td>
<td>4,971</td>
<td>4,930</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Integration in Schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,960</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Technology Centers</td>
<td>9,941</td>
<td>4,960</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanges with Historic Banking and Trading Partners</td>
<td>11,111</td>
<td>11,033</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javits Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>14,247</td>
<td>14,291</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready to Teach</td>
<td>36,546</td>
<td>17,656</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Leadership</td>
<td>38,154</td>
<td>17,656</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language Assistance</td>
<td>18,960</td>
<td>20,336</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Writing Project</td>
<td>20,180</td>
<td>19,637</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Schools</td>
<td>29,169</td>
<td>29,169</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Education</td>
<td>29,065</td>
<td>29,065</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDS Alcohol Abuse Reduction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,725</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Counseling</td>
<td>33,725</td>
<td>33,725</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts in Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,071</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Information and Resource Centers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41,866</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller Learning Communities</td>
<td>173,867</td>
<td>94,476</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Reading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>391,650</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even Start</td>
<td>246,930</td>
<td>225,095</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and Drug-Free Schools State Grants</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>213,381</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Technology Grants</td>
<td>691,841</td>
<td>496,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, NCLB</td>
<td>2,078,426</td>
<td>1,762,278</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other K-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech-Prep Demonstration</td>
<td>4,948</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Employment Information</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,382</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education National Programs</td>
<td>31,852</td>
<td>31,725</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech-Prep State Grants</td>
<td>106,665</td>
<td>105,812</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education State Grants</td>
<td>1,195,008</td>
<td>1,194,331</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Other K-12</td>
<td>1,203,946</td>
<td>1,202,017</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.J. Stupak Olympic Scholarships</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. President, I have sought recognition today to offer a $1.5 billion amendment to increase the health function and $500 million to increase the education function in this resolution. The amendment would add to the funding already included in the resolution for the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Education. The amendment is offset by an across-the-board reduction in Function 920. This reduction would not cut programs, but simply reduce administrative expenses, travel, and consulting services by 0.237 percent.

This amendment would provide NIH with a $1.5 billion increase over the President’s budget. While this sounds like a tremendous increase, in reality it provides only 5.6 percent more than the previous year and provides a slight increase over biomedical research inflation.

As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, I have said many times that the National Institutes of Health is the crown jewel of the Federal Government—perhaps the only jewel worthy of the name. When I came to the Senate in 1981, NIH spending totaled $3.6 billion. The FY 2003 omnibus appropriations bill contained the funding for the NIH which completed the doubling in FY 1998. The successes realized by this investment in NIH have spawned revolutionary advances in our knowledge and treatment for diseases such as cancer, Alzheimer’s disease, Parkinson’s disease, mental illnesses, diabetes, osteoporosis, heart disease, ALS and many others. It is clear that Congress’ commitment to the NIH is paying off. Now it is crucial that increased funding be continued in order to translate these advances into additional treatments and cures. As the investment has resulted in new generations of AIDS drugs which are reducing the presence of the AIDS virus in HIV infected persons to nearly undetectable levels, death rates from cancer have begun a steady decline. With the sequencing of the human genome, we will begin, over the next few years, to reap the benefits in research fields of research. And if scientists are correct, stem cell research could result in a veritable fountain of youth by replacing diseased or damaged cells. I anxiously await the results of all of these avenues of remarkable research. This is the time to seize the scientific opportunities that lie before us.

On May 21, 1997, the Senate passed a Sense of the Senate resolution stating that funding for the NIH should be doubled over 5 years. Regrettably, even though the resolution was passed by an overwhelming vote of 98 to nothing, the Budget Resolution contained a $100 million reduction for health programs. That prompted Senator HARKIN and myself to offer an amendment to the budget resolution to add $11.1 billion to carry out the expressed sense of the Senate to increase NIH funding. Unfortunately, our amendment was tabled by a vote of 84-37. We were extremely disappointed that, while the Senate had expressed its druthers on a resolution, it was simply unwilling to put up the actual dollars to accomplish this vital goal.

The following year, Senator HARKIN and I again introduced an amendment to the Budget Resolution to add $1 billion for the NIH. While we gained more support on this vote than in the previous year, our amendment was again tabled by a vote of 57-41. Not to be deterred, Senator HARKIN and I again went to work with our subcommittee and were able to add an additional $3 billion to NIH account for fiscal year 1999.

In fiscal year 2000, Senator HARKIN and I again offered an amendment to the Budget Resolution to add $1 billion for the NIH. The Senate Labor and HHS Subcommittee and we were able to increase the NIH $3.7 billion, which achieved the doubling effort. In FY 2001, I and Senator HARKIN offered an amendment to add an additional $2.8 billion to the budget resolution to ensure that the momentum achieved by the doubling could be maintained and translated into actual cures. The vote was 96-1. Unfortunately, the amendment was dropped in conference. We worked hard to find enough funding for a $1 billion increase in FY 2001. We fought long and hard to make the NIH a reality, but until treatments and cures are found for the many maladies that continue to plague our society, we must continue our flight.

In FY 2005, once again, Senator HARKIN, Senator COLLINS and I offered an amendment to add $2 billion to discretionary health spending, including NIH. The amendment passed 72-24. However, the subcommittee’s allocation did not reflect this increase. The final conference agreement contained an increase of $800 million over the FY 2004 funding level.

I, like millions of Americans, have benefited tremendously from the investments we have made in the National Institutes of Health and the health that we offer today will continue to further the important research work of the world’s premier medical research facility.

My amendment also intends to ensure that discretionary funding for the Department of Education is not cut below the amount provided by Congress last year. The resolution currently assumes a cut of $500 million below the FY 2005 appropriation. My amendment would add $500 million to Function 500 in order to prevent such a reduction.

My amendment also intends to ensure that discretionary funding for the Department of Education is not cut below the amount provided by Congress last year. The resolution currently assumes a cut of $500 million below the FY 2005 appropriation. My amendment would add $500 million to Function 500 in order to prevent such a reduction.

Many members have pointed out that the budget for the Department of Education has increased significantly over the past several years. In fact, funding has been raised from $24.7 billion in FY 1995 to $56.6 billion last year, an increase of 129 percent. My subcommittee has taken the lead in providing increases for Title I grants for Disadvantaged Students, Vocational Education and Pell grants. President Bush has made increases in these important programs a priority, which is why funding for Title I grants is up 45 percent since No Child Left Behind was passed in 2001, funding for Special Education is up 67 percent since FY 2001 and Pell grants are up 41 percent from the level when President Clinton was in office.

However, I am concerned that the budget resolution will force my subcommittee to make very difficult choices and cut one education program for another. For example, the budget proposes to eliminate $1.3 billion in funding for the Perkins Vocational and

### EXHIBIT 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2004 appropr.</th>
<th>2005 appropr.</th>
<th>2006 request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest Subsidy Grants</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground Railroad Program</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic Education and Training Program</td>
<td>40,672</td>
<td>40,672</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration Projects for Students Disabilities</td>
<td>4,617</td>
<td>4,617</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd-Hershel Scholarships</td>
<td>6,913</td>
<td>6,914</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy and School Assistance Partnership</td>
<td>6,665</td>
<td>6,665</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Perkins Loans Cancellations</td>
<td>6,665</td>
<td>6,665</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Quality Improvement</td>
<td>6,665</td>
<td>6,665</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO Talent Search</td>
<td>144,987</td>
<td>144,987</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEAR P</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO Upward Bound</td>
<td>312,451</td>
<td>312,556</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Postsecondary</td>
<td>1,029,505</td>
<td>1,019,307</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Other ED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR Migrant and Seasonal Workforce Programs</td>
<td>2,331</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR Recreational Programs</td>
<td>2,564</td>
<td>2,543</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Project and Programs</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>2,571</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR Projects With Industry</td>
<td>21,799</td>
<td>21,625</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders</td>
<td>19,585</td>
<td>19,585</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR Supported Employment State Grants</td>
<td>37,680</td>
<td>37,379</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Educational Laboratories</td>
<td>66,665</td>
<td>66,131</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Other ED</td>
<td>155,882</td>
<td>156,764</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (48 Terminations)</td>
<td>4,591,659</td>
<td>4,264,456</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we have finished the debate on this particular amendment so we can share this time in a way that does not force up the rest of our schedule here.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I think we can do that. I have 8 minutes remaining. There is 22 minutes in opposition. My speculation is that neither of us will be able to make a commitment to the other side on that, then, in advance, but probably no later than 10:20, 10:25, we can return to the Senator from North Dakota for his presentation, taking time off the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I follow that procedure.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I also thank the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Pennsylvania for making this arrangement so the flow of debate on this particular amendment can stay intact.

I do rise in opposition to the amendment of Senator SPECTER to increase discretionary spending by $2 billion. One of my favorite things is to make sure everybody else’s in this Chamber—is to give away money. You really don’t get much opposition when you give away money. Unfortunately, we are in a situation where we do not have real money to give away—although, if we pass certain things, it turns into real money, and the deficit increases. We are making a very concentrated effort this year to hold down the deficit—not eliminate the deficit, but to hold it down. You have to do that a little bit at a time.

This concept is very similar to family budgeting. There are a lot of things a family would like to spend their money on, that they really feel they ought to spend their money on, but there is just not enough money to go around.

That is the case for virtually every amendment in this budget, there is a huge desire to be able to do some very specific things we know will make a difference. We have been doing that for a lot of years. That is part of the reason we are in the problem we are in right now.
This amendment increases discretionary funding for Function 500, which would include additional funding for education and job training—my favorite area—and Function 550, which would include additional funding for health—my second favorite area. That comes from the appropriations committee, the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. It is a huge bite of the apple.

I am asked every once in awhile: How did this committee wind up with that much jurisdiction? I said it started out as just the Labor Committee, and then it picked up all the things that had to do with labor negotiations, the benefits that were negotiated, which include health benefits, job training, and pensions—Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

We have since then made it a four-part equal stool so we can have a comprehensive review of these things. We have been doing that, and we have been making tremendous headway.

My colleague from Pennsylvania has indicated that the additional $1.5 billion in funding for Function 550, included in his amendment, would be allocated to the National Institutes of Health. Specifically, he supports the basic biomedical research and other important activities at this agency. I agree with Chairman Gregg that now is not the time to specifically determine the amount of funding for NIH. That is a difficult decision. That can only be done as part of the appropriations process, and Senator Specter is certainly in charge of the major determinations after Chairman Cochran makes the allocation. This is not the time for specifically determining that, although we get the impression that very specific determinations are made as part of the budget process.

That is partly the fault of the President. The President sends us a billion-page budget that shows how he would spend the money if he were spending the money. He doesn’t have the authority to spend the money. He doesn’t spend $1 of the money. This body and the one at the other end of the building have to do all of the appropriations, and we have set up a process for doing it. This part of the process is not to go through the President’s items in detail but to establish some caps on spending. How much are we willing to increase the deficit? What are we accepting and deciding. Can we show restraint and fiscal responsibility so that over a period of time we reduce the amount that we are increasing the deficit? Can we reduce the rate of spending? We are not talking about huge cuts. We are talking about reducing the amount of increase, in most cases.

As you get into the specific details of the President’s guidelines, you will find things that are very distressing because some of the places he chose to make increases might not be places we would. Some of the places he chose to make decreases might not be places we would. While the President might have a real desire to decrease a certain program, Congress might disagree—maybe because it is a pet program of ours. We have that authority, and we can override any of the baseline indicators the President has sent to us, and we do in a lot of instances.

I again want to remind people that this is setting the overall cap and, of course, giving some suggestions on how to do it.

As chairman of the HELP committee, I look forward to modernizing NIH through the reauthorization process later this year. I am excited to build on the great work of Dr. Zerhouni, the Director of NIH. We will be considering management reforms, including the NIH Roadmap, which will improve overall efficiency. This is particularly important given that the President has recently fulfilled his commitment to doubling the funding for the NIH. That is a monumental thing. We have doubled funding of NIH over the last several years. I applaud the President for improving scientific research, and I look forward to working with him and others to ensure that NIH has appropriate funding to fulfill its mission.

I commend the NIH for their process of peer review to see what research has the most potential to result in solutions to illnesses. I also commend the process NIH uses to give priorities to some very isolated diseases so that those get research, too. They do a marvelous job of allocating what they get. We confer with them regularly to see how they are doing, how quickly they can expand, and how easy it would be for them to include extra money. Like any Government agency or business, the more money they have, the more results they can get. The difficulty, again, is taking a look at the overall picture to see what we can do.

As chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, and I am committed to ensuring that there is appropriate funding for all agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services while still keeping in mind the current budget deficit.

As we all know, the President’s budget is a target, and the actual appropriations amount for NIH and other agencies at the Department of Health and Human Services will be more fully discussed after we have reauthorized the program.

Any time we reauthorize a program, there is a need to examine that program carefully and decide what legislative constraints exist that keep people from doing their job in the most efficient and cost-effective way possible. We need to look at the things NIH has discovered since the last reauthorization and decide what programs have been completed and can now be eliminated—this type of reauthorization leads to more efficiency and more savings.

We want more cures. We have an agency that has the kind of direction and the capability to do more. As chairman of the authorizing committee that has jurisdiction over this agency, I look forward to working closely with Senator Specter and other appropriators to determine the agency’s appropriate allocation of funding later this year. I strongly support the mission of NIH to pursue our knowledge about nature and living systems and the application of that knowledge to extend healthy life and reduce the burdens of illness and disability.

That is one of the reasons that a couple of weeks ago we passed comprehensive nondiscrimination legislation—to make sure people have more access to blood tests without any negative effects as a result of things learned from blood tests and the Genome Project. I was pleased that passed the Senate unanimously, which also shows the concern for doing the right thing with health.

We are making amazing progress, and I look forward to modernizing the process we use to achieve that progress through the reauthorization process later this year.

This amendment also assumes a $500 million increase in the Education Department to fund that Department at the 2005 level. I understand that some of my colleagues are concerned about the administration’s proposed cuts to higher education programs such as TRIO, GEAR UP, and vocational education. Again, I want to point out the President’s basic structure for arriving at a cap number. We are going to be working on this cap number. We are not going to be approving or disapproving the way the President got to those numbers. And, quite frankly, for the 8 years I have been in the Senate, there have been suggested changes by both Presidents that would affect TRIO, GEAR UP, and vocational education. Every time, the Senate has made sure those things did not happen. We are interested in vocational education. For example, last week we passed the Perkins reauthorization for career and technical education. That was a commitment 99 to 0 by this body that we want to have career and vocational education at the high school level, and it is absolutely essential that we have that.

One of the things we are concerned about is the number of dropouts in high school. We want to reduce that. The amount that the Federal Government contributes to solving that problem is very small. In fact, mostly what we do is increase paperwork and tests that require additional time out of the classroom. That is not the best way to strengthen education for our kids.

We are looking for ways to decrease the dropout rate. I am pretty sure, if we eliminate career and technical education, we are going to increase the dropout rate.

But we have a plan within the committee authorization to be able to do the things we need to do in education, working them into a logical, staged
and HARKIN that would increase funding has been offered by Senators SPECTER today to discuss the amendment that is currently an unfunded administration to the 2006 budget resolution to agree to, it will be the first amendment that if the Specter amendment is agreed to, it will be the first amendment to the 2006 budget resolution to be offset by using Function 920, which is currently an unfunded administrative account.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Specter amendment.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the amendment that has been offered by Senators SPECTER and HARKIN that would increase funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act by $500 million.

While I support bolstering special education spending, I do not support reducing defense and veterans spending at a time of war.

In my time in the Senate, I have worked with my colleagues to almost double funding for IDEA. That increase has been echoed in my home state of Nevada, where the Federal investment in IDEA has almost doubled since 2001.

I recognize that we have a long way to go toward reaching the Federal Government’s promise of funding 40 percent of the excess costs to educate, but we have made great strides toward that goal. The Federal Government now funds about 20 percent of the excess costs States and school districts face when educating children in special education programs.

We have an obligation to create the best education system for our children and their children—to do that we must eliminate waste and focus spending on programs that directly benefit our children. This budget accomplishes that goal. This budget, as did the President’s budget, contains a $500 million increase for IDEA funding. While this is not the $1 billion increase many of us would like to see, it is a significant increase over last year’s funding. During this time of large deficits and war in Iraq, it is necessary to temper funding increases. This includes funding for education.

The budget provides generous funding for the Appropriations Committee to work with. It is then the appropriators’ job to determine which programs receive cuts or increases in funding. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee with regard to IDEA. The Committee will receive the increase in funding it needs to stay on track and meet the Federal Government’s 40-percent promise.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I don’t need any time to discuss the matter. I need a unanimous consent request. I wonder if the Senator will yield to me to do that.

Mr. SPECTER. I yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. This has to do with a time allotment on our side for the debate on the Senate side. I am on the Committee and take the lead on the budget on Senators’ behalf. On the Specter amendment, the Senate has no time left on the debate. We have 45 minutes of our time for them.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I yield.

Mr. SPECTER. I yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. That would be 45 minutes. Some might use less and give it to other Senators.

I wanted the Republican Senators to know they are all in line at some point during the debate, with 45 minutes of our time for them.

I thank the chairman. I appreciate it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time situation?

I ask unanimous consent that 45 minutes be distributed as follows to Senators on our side to speak on the Clinton budget. Each Senator has 5 minutes of their time.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, what is the time situation?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the Specter amendment, the Senate from Pennsylvania has 7 minutes 23 seconds. The Senator from New Hampshire has 7 minutes 30 seconds.

Mr. GREGG, Mr. President, let me speak, and then the Senator from Pennsylvania can wrap up.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I should be able to conclude and save some of that 7 minutes.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Pennsylvania bringing this amendment forward. I know of his deep commitment to NIH and education, and as chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee which has jurisdiction over both of these accounts on the discretionary side, it is challenging, to say the least. He has the second largest appropriating account in the Senate after defense, but he probably has the job with the most scrutiny. That is defense, and he has attempted to balance those demands very effectively. However, in this instance, I believe we should stay with the basic numbers we have put forward in this budget.

It is critical if we are going to have fiscal discipline around here to have a top-line discretionary number which we have agreed to—$43—and that we do not use any blank check to redirect funds within that number in a way that either negatively impacts other accounts or positively impacts accounts. That would be a unilateral activity of the Senator from Pennsylvania when he starts marking up the bill.

The 920 account, if it is used here, will have the practical effect of an across-the-board cut on all other accounts in the Government that are discretionary so that it creates a pressure that will be difficult to handle if it is put forward in this way.

On the specific issue of funding, we all recognize NIH is a premier institution and has done an extraordinary job, but we have to progress in a way that has been extraordinarily generous over the last few years with NIH. Beginning at the beginning of the Bush administration, there was a decision to double the funding of NIH, and that is exactly what happened. It has grown at rates of 14 percent a year compounded. It has gone from $13 billion to a $27 billion account and $28 billion account in the last 5 years, a huge expansion in the commitment to research in the area of health care.

There are some concerns with whether we should not take a brief breathing period and make sure dollars are being used efficiently. The President has proposed an increase for NIH but not as much as maybe NIH believed it would like, but certainly in the context of the dramatic increase in funding over the last few years it is appropriate.

In the education accounts, this President has committed huge increases in education. The numbers are staggering, quite honestly. It is the commitment the administration has made relative to the prior administration. In the area, for example, of the overall discretionary budget, the Department of Education has gone up 33 percent since the Clinton years. In the area of No Child Left Behind, it has gone up 46 percent, title I has gone up 52 percent, IDEA has gone up 75 percent. The way the President structured the budget was to say let’s take a look at the mis—

There has education funding that are targeted that have a small impact and see whether those priorities, in comparison with the big programs in which the Federal Government has a major role, such as No Child Left Behind, special education, Pell grants, and so forth, the President decides to put more money into those programs rather than to the specific targeted programs.

Obviously, it will be up to the Senator from Pennsylvania, working with his committee and working with Senator ENZI, chairman of the Education Committee, to make decisions as to how that should shake out. But in this
budget the President has proposed significant increases in the core educational programs. In special education he is up $450 million; in title I, he is up $1 billion; and in No Child Left Behind, up $1 billion; in Pell, which is not reflected appropriately, in my opinion, in this budget but is reflected appropriately, he is up half a billion.

We have specifically raised the cap—hopefully, it will end up there, but we have no control over how the allocations occur—to give Senator SPECTER’s subcommittee an additional half billion specifically for Pell. So the grants can go from $4.150 and give it authority to allow the Pell grants to be restructured so you can get a $5.100 Pell grant under the new structure which is being proposed under this bill should Senator Enzi’s committee decide that is how they want to proceed.

In addition, we have set aside $5.5 billion in the budget in a reserve fund specifically to fund a new Higher Education Act that I propose of which is to dramatically expand the Pell grants and take them up to $5,100 for those who go to school 4 years and dramatically expand borrowing for students through the Guaranteed Student Loan Program.

Education is strong in this budget and I hope we will stay within the terms of this budget rather than expanding beyond that.

I recognize the problems the Senator from Pennsylvania has are difficult, probably the most difficult of any of the Appropriations subcommittees, and I understand why he brought this amendment forward. I presume I have used all my time.

Mr. SPECTER. One minute and 20 seconds remains.

Mr. SPECTER. I disagree strongly with my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire. When he says we shouldn’t redirect the funds, that is the purpose of this bill. That is what the President said is about to be an essential part of education. So as we have done in the past, we will take money from other areas and put it into vocational training. The President wants to put money from vocational education and put it into high school No Child Left Behind Program. Those numbers are even in the President’s budget, but we have chosen that there are other ways we can do high school improvement other than taking away this vocational money and putting it into the high school No Child Left Behind Program. What we are doing is flexing even within the President’s budget to see if we could take money from the vocational education and put in some increased testing and accountability and moving them back into vocation.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the Senate from Wyoming does the best job of career and vocational training. The Senate from Wyoming has pointed out that it was a 99-to-0 vote. He voted for it, and I say to my colleagues, I say, that it is absolutely essential to have career and vocational training, and if you don’t there will be an increase in the dropout rate. But the budget which was submitted by the education department of my subcommittee zeros out the Perkins grant.

How can we reconcile the importance of the Perkins educational grant and eliminate the funding?

What I am asking, Mr. President, again I say what we are looking at when we see the President’s proposal is their suggestions for how we get to the budget cap number they talk about.

The House and the Senate agree and have made a decision—I am pretty sure the House voted on it—that is going to be an essential part of education. So as we have done in the past, we will take money from other areas and shift it into vocational training. The President wants to put money from vocational education and put it into high school No Child Left Behind Program. Those numbers are even in the President’s budget, but we have chosen that there are other ways we can do high school improvement other than taking away this vocational money and putting it into the high school No Child Left Behind Program.

Mr. ENZI. I yield back my time.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HARKIN be added as a cosponsor to this amendment. Senator HARKIN has other commitments, but had he been here he would have offered superb arguments at decibel levels substantially higher than that which has taken place here today.

If the Senate from Wyoming is prepared to yield back his remaining time, I am prepared to do the same and that would conclude the presentation on this amendment.

Mr. ENZI. I yield back my time.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded.

Is there a sufficient second?

There is not a sufficient second.

Could the Senator restate his request for the yeas and nays?

Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from North Dakota is to be recognized.

The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent we move to the Cantwell amendment regarding ANWR and use up that time and recognize the Senator from North Dakota when he returns.

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

Under the previous order, there will not be 5 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form in relation to amendment No. 168.

The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I have submitted to the desk the amendment to strike the language out of the budget that would recognize revenue from drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. We started this discussion last night with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to talk about why America should not be focusing on drilling in a wildlife refuge, turn down the recognition of this revenue, and focus instead on an energy policy that will put America in better stead, get us off our dependency on foreign oil, reduce pollution, and focus on the technology that will truly make us energy independent.

Many have discussed or seen the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. To remind my colleagues, we established this refuge because we believed in protecting the wildlife that is there—such as the porcupine caribou herd, the polar bears, grizzly bears, wolves, sheep, falcons, migratory birds as shown in this
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picture. We wanted to fulfill our international fish and wildlife treaty obligations. Also, we wanted to provide an opportunity for continued subsistence for local residents and we wanted to ensure water quality and necessary water quality in the refuge.

The pictures from the refuge show a delicate coastline area in the northern parts of our country. The purpose of designating and protecting the wild- life refuge was because of its unique nature. One of the Episcopalian bishops from New York here yesterday spoke about the refuge as actual sacred ground and the fact that the preservation of it means so much to many Alaskans as it does to many people throughout America.

But we are here today on what I call a budget end run to recognize revenue in the budget as a way to try and open drilling in ANWR, to open drilling in this pristine wildlife area.

Now, why, if you want to support drilling in Alaska in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, do you want to try to do it on the budget? My point is, it starts a precedent for opening other areas by simply putting money in the budget. Why not expedite timber sales by simply recognizing revenues in the budget? Why not open drilling on the coastal regions of the country by recognizing revenues in the budget? Why not open drilling in Yellowstone National Park by recognizing revenues in the budget as a way to achieve the goals of this process of sticking money in the budget resolution are even valid, whether the numbers are even correct. That is because current law requires that there be a 90–10 split between revenues that go to Alaska and the Federal Government. This budget resolution supposedly recognizes a 50–50 split, which I do not understand how one gets to that conclusion, because it is not current law. In any case, that split means Alaska residents would get $117 per person per year. So I get why it is a great deal for Alaskans. But it is not a great deal for Americans.

Americans need to move ahead and produce a variety of sources of energy supply. I am going to talk about that in a few minutes, but I want to recognize some of my colleagues who also want to speak.

What we need to recognize is that drilling in the refuge only increases America’s reliance on fossil fuel, and that, according to another newspaper editorial in our country, is being recognized by Americans all over. They know that would increase America’s reliance on fossil fuels and do little to limit our dependence on imported oil.

That is what the other side would like to say the debate is about, improving energy supply and giving us a secure future. What we should like to say the debate is about, improving energy supply and giving us a secure future. What we want to do instead is invest in new technologies and change our strategy. We do not need to open a wildlife refuge and continue to depend on something that we know has a very high chance of polluting the environment and harming the wildlife, but get on to investing in the technology that will diversify our energy supply and give us a secure future.

Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I would like to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for 10 minutes.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank Senator CANTWELL for her leadership. I regret we are here at this time on the budget about a major legislative issue, a major energy policy issue which is being approached through the backdoor. This is the equivalent of the “nuclear option” that is being talked about with respect to judges. This is de facto a “nuclear option” on the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

You cannot drill, you cannot have oil exploration and preserve a refuge, nor even a wilderness. The oil companies themselves have said that. They have made it crystal clear. ConocoPhilips pulled out the other day and said they do not want to drill in Alaska. BP does not want to drill in Alaska. And these companies have had the courage to admit publicly that wilderness and drilling simply do not coexist. But, because you do not exist to do this through the proper channels of the Senate, there is a new process being put in place to do this on the budget.

It is symptomatic of what is happening in the Congress. The Ethics Committee in the House is tinkering to change the rules for Congressman Tom DeLay. Now they are talking about changing the rules for how to get judges. They do not like the rules; change them.

This does not belong in the budget. It belongs in a debate on the energy policy of the United States. But even on the merits, every single argument that has been made about the Arctic Wildlife Refuge fails to withstand scrutiny. We have heard that drilling in the refuge can be done in an environmentally friendly manner. But even the administration’s own reports, the National Academy of Sciences, and others, all show that is not true.

We have heard that drilling in the refuge will reduce our dependence on foreign oil. We have heard that drilling in the refuge is going to bring gas prices down at the pump. We have even heard that drilling in the refuge belongs in the national budget because of the revenues from the lease sales. We have heard it is the only available location to look for new oil, notwithstanding that the largest unexplored and as yet unexploited area of oil for the United States is in the offshore gulf, not in the refuge. We have heard the oil industry is eager to do this even though oil industry executives tell you otherwise in private, and several major companies in public have pulled out of the effort.

We say that less than 1 percent will be affected and only 2,000 acres is going to be the footprint. Yet there is nothing containing that 2,000 acres into one contiguous area.

The fact is, that 1.5 million acres will be opened and you could have 20 different sites or 40 different sites of individual drilling. The maps show the roads, the gravel pits, the gravel roads, and other needs of airport, and so forth, to service those particular areas. I would think most of my colleagues would understand that by definition wilderness and an industrial zone do not coincide. By definition they cannot occur, cannot overlap, cannot share the same space.

In 1960, the Eisenhower administration first recognized the extraordinary wilderness value of the area and it was established to provide a unique wildlife landscape. Building a massive oilfield, no matter how you describe this imprint—we do not have time, unfortunately, to go into great detail, but every description of how this would actually be done defies the notion that there is going to be contained to an area the size of Dulles Airport.

Oil companies want you to think whatever oil may be found in the refuge is in one compact area. But if you go look at the North Slope oilfields west of the Arctic Refuge, that development sprawls over an extraordinarily large area. It stretches across the Coastal Plain.

According to the U.S. Geological Survey, potential oil under the Coastal Plain is not concentrated in one large reservoir but across the Coastal Plain in many small deposits. To produce oil from this vast area requires a network of pipelines. Roads will be built. And that will change the habitat of the entire Coastal Plain.

Now, I acknowledge there is new technology. I know we have made progress with respect to horizontal drilling. We all understand that. And it is more efficient. And yes, it is less harmful than we have been in the past. But the advantages are extraordinarily exaggerated, particularly with respect to what will happen to the imprint in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge. Even new technology such as directional drilling does irrevocable damage. Permanent gravel roads, busy airports, are still used for common oilfield facilities that are scattered across more than a million acres of coastal plain. And the entire complex, according to the analyses made by independent groups, will produce more pollution than the city of Washington itself.

No matter how well done, oil development has significant and lasting impacts on the environment. The industry itself has said this. British Petroleum has said:

We can’t develop fields and keep wilderness.

And if the facts and the frank admission of an oil company are not enough, colleagues ought to read the National Academy of Sciences study. They should read the Department of Interior study and others who have all come to the same conclusion.

In addition, let me point out that every onshore oilfield today on Alaska’s North Slope has permanent gravel roads. Every single one, even the original Alpine field predicated to this day as a roadless development. I read Secretary Horton’s article in the New York Times on the weekend talking about roadless development. It isn’t roadless. It has a road connecting its drill sites from the time it began pumping crude oil in the year 2000. In December of 2004, a new road into the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska, connected the initial oilfield pump to 33 miles of Alpine roads, and BLM predicted 122 more miles are going to be needed for the next phase of Alpine expansion.

Even today this promotion of “nuclear option” is fictitious. It is not going to happen. The roadless concept has not been abandoned. This is what the Bureau of Land Management says:

The roadless concept has not been abandoned. Roadless development never meant no roads, only that the construction of permanent roads would be minimized.

How many times do the American people have to listen to clear skies that aren’t clear, healthy forests that are stressed, wilderness which is managed as if it is going to be the footprint. Yet there is enough unexploited oil to last America 25 years. The oil companies want you to think there is not enough. And with a new road into the Arctic, America will not bring gas prices down. The price of gasoline will not drop. The price of energy will not drop. The consequences.

And if the facts and the frank admission of an oil company are not enough, colleagues ought to read the National Academy of Sciences study. They should read the Department of Interior study and others who have all come to the same conclusion.

In addition, let me point out that every onshore oilfield today on Alaska’s North Slope has permanent gravel roads. Every single one, even the original Alpine field predicated to this day as a roadless development. I read Secretary Horton’s article in the New York Times on the weekend talking about roadless development. It isn’t roadless. It has a road connecting its drill sites from the time it began pumping crude oil in the year 2000. In December of 2004, a new road into the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska, connected the initial oilfield pump to 33 miles of Alpine roads, and BLM predicted 122 more miles are going to be needed for the next phase of Alpine expansion.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, in listening to the debate, I will tell you what people in the real world care about and that is not process. What people care about is how do you see them in the hallways, or anywhere across our country, they care about these high gasoline prices they are having to pay. I agree with the Senator from Washington, to some degree, that we do need to emphasize a policy that utilizes the advances of technology. We need more electricity being produced by clean coal technology, propulsion by fuel cell vehicles, and also we need to look at nuclear as a part of the mix, as opposed to natural gas for electricity base-load generation.

Rather than talk about process, let’s talk about reality. The Senator from Massachusetts is talking about process that no one in the real world cares about. But what I understand is my colleague from the North Slope, Prudhoe Bay in late November. It was like the dark side of the moon. I also studied this over the years and have seen that Prudhoe Bay has development. I think it is a magnificently pristine wilderness area. And the summer, it is full of mosquitoes, and at other times there are herds of animals that have to be fairly hardy animals to live up there.

So the argument ends up being, gosh, if there’s a pipeline, there will be a gravel road. All of what happened in Prudhoe Bay has not had an adverse impact on the animals up there, or the mosquitoes, and if there is a gravel road in an area the size of Dulles Airport in a refuge the size of South Carolina, a few gravel roads won’t have much impact. I know the occupant of the Chair, who is from South Carolina, knows that doesn’t stop deer in his State. It certainly doesn’t stop any other animals.

The reality is we have high gas prices, gasoline, and natural gas. It is affecting our travel and people in their homes. There are three reasons this amendment needs to stay and we get this revenue from this production. No. 1, security. We are overly dependent upon foreign sources of energy. We are being jerked around and sitting here reading e-mails to see what OPEC is going to do. Are they going to increase production by a few hundred thousand barrels or is it what they have? Yes, other countries, such as India and China, are taking coal and taking energy, such as oil.

But the point is we should be less dependent and reliant for our own security on OPEC and Venezuela and all these different countries, primarily in the Middle East, for our own security. We are presently 58-percent dependent upon foreign oil. It is going to go up to 68 percent in the next 15 years. That is the estimate.

Second, it is for jobs. Jobs will be created. Hundreds of thousands of jobs in everything from manufacturing, mining, trade, services, construction, and others. It is going to have an impact mostly on Alaska, but also across the country. That is good for our country as well.

Talking about this being Yellowstone, it would not open up exploration at Yellowstone. Nobody is suggesting that. The west coast of Florida, the people there, if they want to have a reasonable distance from oil production that doesn’t draw the line all the way to Mississippi. Respect the will of the people of the west coast of Florida. If the people of Charleston, SC, don’t want drilling off the coast of South Carolina, we ought to respect those people.

In Alaska, having been chairman of the Republican Senatorial Committee, looking at poll after poll last year, it is amazing how uniform the support is among the people of Alaska—Democrats, Republicans, Indians, Eskimos, and even in the sub-categorized liberals; liberals in Alaska are in favor of this pipeline. They understand it can be done in an environmentally sound way. It means jobs, revenues. And for the people of Alaska, that is good. For the people of Hawaii, this means energy security.

Finally, in addition to security and jobs, there is competitiveness. This country needs to have a reliable, affordable source of energy, whether that is coal, nuclear, gas, or wind and chemical manufacturers, paper, plastic—even in Danville, VA, where they manufacture tires at a Goodyear plant, they are concerned about the skyrocketing costs of natural gas. Natural gas is available in other countries around the world at a more affordable price. They are competing to get Air bus airplane tires. They got the contract, but obviously tires can be made in Southeast Asia, or elsewhere in the world.

It is important for our competitiveness that we have a more stable and affordable energy supply. So I ask you all, my colleagues, to do what is right for security, for the competitiveness of our country. Support what the Budget Committee has done. Let’s use those resources on the North Slope of Alaska for American job security and competitiveness and do what is right by the people in the real world, who would like to see us act, as opposed to worrying about what people in OPEC say about our gas prices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes off the resolution to the Senator from Massachusetts so he may be able to answer the questions that were put to him.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I would like to take 1 minute to say something about what we have heard, because the Senator from Virginia tried to minimize the impact of what would happen out there. Let me read what happened from the Clean Air Act Violations in 2004:
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The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation imposed an $80,000 civil penalty on ConocoPhillips for Clean Air Act violations in the Alpine oil field. In addition, over 2.3 million gallons of drilling mud—triturated, manmade fluids pumped into wells—disappeared into the Colville River in 1998. The following year, 26,654 gallons of hazardous drilling mud was spilled at the Colville River pipeline crossing.

Oil industry activities for the Alpine fields caused 170 spills, totaling 36,000 gallons of hazardous substances by 2004, and that is according to the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation.

So this is not without harm. I stand by what I said about this being a violation of the rules, going outside the rules. I ask the Senator from North Dakota this, as he is a budget expert, respected by everybody in the Senate on the subject of the budget. The reconciliation process was put into place not to permit legislation for something that has been voted on as a matter of emergency. This is far beyond deficit reduction. This is not deficit reduction. I ask the Senator from North Dakota if that is not correct, that under the budget reconciliation rules, reconciliation is for the purpose of deficit reduction?

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I would say, in answer to my colleague, my own belief is whatever one’s views on opening the Alaska national wildlife refuge for exploration, whatever one’s views are, my own belief is this is an inappropriately high way to reach that policy conclusion.

The Senator is correct. Reconciliation is a process outside normal rules of the Senate. Reconciliation takes away from every Senator their most fundamental right, and that is the right to unlimited debate, the right to have an amendment, and the right as a member of the minority to resist the passage of legislation.

Reconciliation is a fast-track procedure that was put in place to try to address what was then record budget deficits. It was an attempt to provide a special protected procedure, not for the purpose of making policy changes that were incidental to the budget process but that were central to the budget process.

I do not think there is much question that this is a policy change being put in reconciliation that is incidental to the budget process. It is an attempt to change legislative policy that is far beyond an attempt to affect budget policy. For that reason, I personally believe, whatever one’s views on ANWR, that this is an abuse of the process.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator. If I could also ask him one further question, according to the expectations of drilling, the time it will take and when revenues would flow to the United States, there will be no revenue that will flow from this legislation that will reduce the deficit; is that correct?

Mr. CONRAD. I do not have before me the anticipated flow of revenue.

But, really, that is not so important as the fundamental underlying question: Is this an attempt to do something by way of a policy change that is merely incidental to the budget process? I think one would have to answer: Clearly, it is. That makes it an abuse of the process.

Reconciliation, again, for my colleagues, was designed to be used for deficit reduction. This cannot be seen, seriously, as a deficit reduction plan.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Senator. This is not a deficit reduction plan. That is the fundamental choice here.

For those colleagues who are wavering about this, who wonder about it, this is a precedent. Some people around here may take these precedents casually, and the moment may seem very opportune. What goes around comes around. Someday these folks over here may be in the minority and they will want the rules played by properly. That is really what is at stake, not just the issue of the Arctic Wildlife Refuge but how the Senate is living up to its own standards and its own rules.

I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

MS. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes from our side to the Senator from Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, during the past several weeks, my office and I have received faxes, telephone calls, e-mails, most of them condemning drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Some were threatening. Some were very sensitive. I would like to take this opportunity to respond to these letters and telegrams and e-mails.

I do this with mixed feelings because I am well aware that the majority of my colleagues on the Democratic side are not with me and that I may be one of the very few on our side. But I have taken this position for many years. This is not the first time. So I think I have a few things I would like to share with you.

Last night, I watched a television ad put out by people who are not for the drilling. If one looked at it objectively, you got the impression that the drilling would be done in all of Alaska. It showed pristine scenes of wildlife, of plants. You could not help but feel, my God, are we going to destroy all of this?

How large is ANWR? As the Senator from Virginia stated, it is about the size of the State of South Carolina. The area that will be set aside for this drilling would be about 2,000 acres—2,000 acres out of 19 million acres.

Put another way, if ANWR were the size of a page of the Washington Post, and you put something on it about a square quarter inch, that would be about the size of the drilling footprint of ANWR.

We are not devastating the State of Alaska. We are not devastating ANWR. This debate has gone on for a long time. Many of the debates centered around the statements of an Indian tribe, the Gwich’in. The Gwich’in village at one time offered their lands for lease to drill and develop oil. They had no conditions to it. They said just go ahead and drill on our land, we would like to have that done. But when the test drills were made and they found that there was no oil or gas, then, suddenly, the Gwichins found themselves in opposition.

There are 230 Indian tribes and tribal villages in the State of Alaska—230. One tribe is against it, the Gwich’in tribe. For the past 15 years I was chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee. My mandate from my colleagues was that we should listen to the Indians. Mr. President, 229 tribes said yes, we want it. One tribe said no.

The Gwichins have cousins on the Canadian side, and the Canadian side GNU land is being drilled at the same time, and they seem to be happy.

The question comes up, how many barrels will ANWR produce? The U.S. Geological Survey suggests that ANWR has between 5.7 billion and 16 billion barrels of oil, an average of about 10 billion barrels. The site will produce an additional 876,000 to 1.6 million barrels a day. This makes it the single greatest prospect for future oil production in the United States. It will produce over 36 million gallons of much needed gasoline, jet and diesel fuel and heating oil. To put this in perspective, while ANWR can produce 1.6 million barrels a day, Texas and California each offer about 1 million daily.

Development of ANWR alone will reduce U.S. dependence on foreign sources by 4 percent. Some would say: 4 percent, that’s not much. Tell that to the driver who has to go to the pump today and pay those prices. Four percent makes a big difference.

But equally as important, I have heard many of my colleagues suggest that the war in Iraq is a war on oil. If I believe so, why don’t we produce our own oil so we don’t have to fight for it?

I close by sharing with you something that happened many years ago when the Trans-Alaska Pipeline was being debated. It was a long time ago, and most of the Members of the Senate were not here at that time. Dire predictions were made. Environmentalists came forward and said: You are going to destroy Alaska. The caribou herd will be demolished and diminished. They will become extinct. Those are the words that we heard. At the time the Congress authorized the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, there were 2,000 caribou. Today, 2,000 caribou. Instead of diminishing the herd, the pipeline apparently has helped them. But this is not a debate on the pipeline, it is a debate on ANWR.

I hope my colleagues will give this opportunity to the people of Alaska. When 229 out of 230 tribes tell me they want it, I am ready to respond.
Thank you very much. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

How high do gas prices have to get? How high do oil prices have to get? How high does OPEC have to get us before we realize what the American people realized a long time ago that we have an energy crisis in America today? We have gas prices that continue to soar. We have supply problems because we rely on the geopolitics of the Middle East.

Earlier this month, I was glad to join Energy Secretary Sam Bodman, Interior Secretary Gale Norton, and four of my colleagues, including the Senator from Alaska, Ms. Murkowski, on a trip up to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. It is a big place.

Alaska is 386,000 square miles. My home State of South Dakota is 77,000 square miles. We think we have a lot of wide open space in South Dakota. But you can put seven of my States of South Dakota into the State of Alaska.

If you look at Alaska in its totality and look at what we are talking about in terms of the exploration and possible production in ANWR, it is 19.6 million acres, 19.6 million acres. Eight million acres of that is wilderness. The area we are talking about for development and exploration is 1.53 million acres.

Furthermore, the area that would be used under the legislation limits it to 2,000 acres.

That is the equivalent in South Dakota of about three sections of farmland in an area that is 19.6 million acres in a State that is 386,000 square miles. We would put seven of the State of South Dakota.

We had the opportunity when I was up there to look at technology. It is remarkable what has transformed over the last 30 or 40 years. You probably can't see it on the map, but Prudhoe Bay technology is 1970s vintage technology compared to 1980s vintage technology. We went to a site called the Alpine site, which is the millennium technology. The changes that have taken place are dramatic, and the way it has evolved minimizes the impact and the footprint that is left. In fact, at the Alpine site, there were 97 acres, which included the runway where they land the planes to provide their supplies and the lake they get their water from. They are generating 120,000 barrels of oil a day on 97 acres. Why? Because the technology allows them to go underground, to drill horizontally, and to drill directionally. It minimizes the impact above and below ground.

We saw where they use ice roads for exploration to get back and forth. In the winter, the roads disappear. Below the frozen tundra is the single largest and most promising onshore oil reserve in America—somewhere between 6 billion and 16 billion barrels of oil. The average of that would be 10 billion barrels.

How much is that? A million barrels a day that we could add to our production in this country. That is 5 percent of what we use—20 million barrels a day in the United States. We get 10 million barrels a day today from outside the United States.

This would lessen our dependence on foreign sources of energy.

Put another way, it could power the State of South Dakota for 499 years.

We are talking about a significant resource that we need because America is facing an energy crisis.

Gas is over $2 a gallon. A barrel of oil is near record highs. Make no mistake about it. America's energy crisis is an economic crisis that impacts every American. This country needs energy legislation which fosters more oil production and increases the alternatives, such as renewable fuels and ethanol that we produce in my home State of South Dakota.

I hope we can get a comprehensive energy bill that increases the use of ethanol in this country. Right now, we do about 3.5 billion gallons a year in ethanol, but we use 120 billion gallons a year of gasoline in this country. It has to come from somewhere.

Right now, we are paying all the money to the folks in the Middle East who have gotten us over a barrel. We need to change that. We need to reduce our dependency on politically unstable foreign sources of oil.

Specifically, the United States imports about 3 million barrels of oil a day from the Persian Gulf. The estimated daily domestic supply from ANWR would reduce that number by half.

Passing this legislation will reduce America's dependence on foreign sources of oil, strengthening our economic security, ensuring our energy security, and strengthening our national security.

When I was in the House, we passed an energy policy, but it got stuck in the Senate.

We have an opportunity to finally finish the job that the American people sent us here to do and to reduce our dependence on foreign sources of oil.

Listen to the people of Alaska. Mr. President, this is my favorite, a polar bear.

Listen to the people of Alaska. Mr. President, this is my favorite, a polar bear.

I hope my colleagues here today will join with me and with those in the past who have supported this and vote for this so that we can begin the process of lessening our dependence on foreign sources of energy.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I yield an additional 10 minutes off the resolution under the control of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank Senator CANTWELL for her wonderful leadership on this issue.

Wilderness experience listening to this debate which we have been involved in so many times. Now I know why Christie Todd Whitman wrote her book "It is My Party, Too."

When you look at who sit aside the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, it was a Republican President. Here the biggest forces for opening drilling are coming from the Republican Party, fervor about how this is going to solve our energy problems when everyone admits if we get oil out of their at all it is not going to be for another 10 years, and the economically recoverable oil is 6 months, maybe. So the zealotry that we hear shows the changes in the Republican Party. That is the future of that State.

Now, let's see what President Eisenhower's Secretary of Interior, Fred Seaton, said about this area. He said this was "one of the most magnificent wildlife areas in North America ... a wilderness experience not duplicated elsewhere." Senator GEORGE ALLEN called it the dark side of the Moon. So who is right—President Eisenhower or Senator ALLEN? Let's take a look at some of the photographs because we need to see this dark side of the Moon.

The first thing we see is the porcupine caribou herd, the mother and the little calf. Quite beautiful. It does not look much like the dark side of the Moon to me. The U.S. Geological Survey Biological Resource Division found the porcupine caribou herd may be particularly sensitive to oil development.

Let's take a look at the effects on the caribou and other animals, including being taken off the map, but Prudhoe Bay technology is a 1970s vintage technology compared to a 1980s vintage technology. We went to a site called the Alpine site, which is the millennium technology. The changes that have taken place are dramatic, and the way it has evolved minimizes the impact and the footprint that is left. In fact, at the Alpine site, there were 97 acres, which included the runway where they land the planes to provide their supplies and the lake they get their water from. They are generating 120,000 barrels of oil a day on 97 acres. Why? Because the technology allows them to go underground, to drill horizontally, and to drill directionally. It minimizes the impact above and below ground.

We saw where they use ice roads for exploration to get back and forth. In the winter, the roads disappear. Below the frozen tundra is the single largest and most promising onshore oil reserve in America—somewhere between 6 billion and 16 billion barrels of oil. The average of that would be 10 billion barrels.

How much is that? A million barrels a day that we could add to our production in this country. That is 5 percent of what we use—20 million barrels a day in the United States. We get 10 million barrels a day today from outside the United States.

This would lessen our dependence on foreign sources of energy.

Put another way, it could power the State of South Dakota for 499 years.

We are talking about a significant resource that we need because America is facing an energy crisis.

Gas is over $2 a gallon. A barrel of oil is near record highs. Make no mistake about it. America's energy crisis is an economic crisis that impacts every American. This country needs energy legislation which fosters more oil production and increases the alternatives, such as renewable fuels and ethanol that we produce in my home State of South Dakota.

I hope we can get a comprehensive energy bill that increases the use of ethanol in this country. Right now, we do about 3.5 billion gallons a year in ethanol, but we use 120 billion gallons a year of gasoline in this country. It has to come from somewhere.

Right now, we are paying all the money to the folks in the Middle East who have gotten us over a barrel. We need to change that. We need to reduce our dependency on politically unstable foreign sources of oil.

Specifically, the United States imports about 3 million barrels of oil a day from the Persian Gulf. The estimated daily domestic supply from ANWR would reduce that number by half.

Passing this legislation will reduce America's dependence on foreign sources of oil, strengthening our economic security, ensuring our energy security, and strengthening our national security.

When I was in the House, we passed an energy policy, but it got stuck in the Senate.

We have an opportunity to finally finish the job that the American people sent us here to do and to reduce our dependence on foreign sources of oil.

Listen to the people of Alaska. Mr. President, this is my favorite, a polar bear.

Listen to the people of Alaska. Mr. President, this is my favorite, a polar bear.

I hope my colleagues here today will join with me and with those in the past who have supported this and vote for this so that we can begin the process of lessening our dependence on foreign sources of energy.

I yield the floor.
My friend from Alaska says we are going to do this very sensitively. They were very sensitive at the Exxon Valdez. They were very sensitive in Santa Barbara when we had the unbelievable oil spill that led to, actually, the very first Earth Day because it was so devastating and what happened. We know that the economic activity that comes from oil drilling is going to have an impact. So anyone who tells you anything else simply is thinking in a wishful fashion. We are alive today, we see with the spills it’s be careful what we are doing. If this is something that will make us energy independent, that is one thing. But the fact is, it won’t.

Let’s look at some of the scenes because there was talk about how barren this area is. We will look at some of the landscapes because it is important to look at this and decide for ourselves if it is worth risking this for 6 months’ worth of oil.

This is along Marsh Creek in the coastal plain, in the very area they say is completely barren. One of my colleagues said it only looks that way for a few weeks. Well, it certainly looks that way at a point in time. When I went into the coastal plain, the bears were over there. It is true there are other magnificent areas of Alaska, but this is one of those beautiful areas.

Here is the issue. The oil companies are backing out. They do not want to go there. They are backing out. They do not want to open it. Many have already backed out. BP, ConocoPhillips, and ChevronTexaco have pulled out because they know what they are walking into here, and they don’t want to drill. It may be that even if we get the vote, no one will drill there. We are not sure of that. Why is this happening? I say it is happening because if they could open this area, they could open any area. Don’t take what you read for it; you can take the Bush administration’s word for it. That is what they have said in essence. They admit it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time has expired.

Mr. CONRAD. I alert my colleagues of the time situation. I gave 10 minutes off the resolution to Senator Cantwell to control to even up the two sides. Here is the problem: I only have 3 minutes left on the resolution before the 1 o’clock vote. I would be happy to give the Senator from California 1 of those 3 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Here is the point. This area was set aside by a Republican President who found it to be most pristine. We understand there are certain times in this Senate when we do something as radical as this, which is to open up a wildlife refuge, we may want to have a few more votes. That is kind of the rules of the Senate. They are doing a backdoor, so they may get 51 votes and, with 51 votes they open this—for what, maybe 6 months’ worth of oil. If we close the SUV loopholes, if we said over time they should get the same mileage as cars, we would have seven ANWR fields over 40 or 50 years. We do not need to do this. If you believe this is God-given land, let’s protect it. At the end of the day, that is our job. I hope we get the votes. If we do not get them today, this will be a big issue out in the country. I hope the oil companies will continue to walk away from this because clearly it is very controversial to go into this pristine area.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LOTT. I have an inquiry.

The Senator from Washington has 5 minutes she was going to use. I was under the impression that the Senator from Washington had 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LOTT. If she is willing to wait, I ask unanimous consent I be yielded 10 minutes off the underlying resolution.

Mr. CONRAD. Reserving the right to object, let me make certain I understand the request. The problem we have, I say to the Senator, all of the time has been allocated. Maybe there is some additional time you have on your side. We have linked in a 1 o’clock vote, and if you add the time for the veterans amendment and the ANWR amendment, there is 2 minutes remaining before 1 o’clock to come off the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. If I could, I understand there is a substantial amount of time on the underlying resolution. I was hoping to speak not just on ANWR but also on NIH and Amtrak. I thought it should come off the underlying resolution, not just Amtrak, and I have been sitting here for almost an hour. I thought, with the flow back and forth between supporters and opponents of the amendment, that it would be appropriate I be allowed to speak at this time.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, how much time do we have on the resolution on our side before we get to the 1 o’clock vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 24 minutes 53 seconds. There is 4 minutes of unpromised time on the resolution before 1 o’clock.

Mr. GREGG. And we have coming up 45 minutes on the two veterans amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield?

The Senator from Washington has already taken 10 minutes off the resolution on this amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. If I might, I gave time off the resolution on our side, but I was very careful to check with the time-keeper that there was time that would not impinge on the 1 o’clock vote. That is the problem we have.

Mr. STEVENS. But it still unbalances this time. I ask unanimous consent I have 10 minutes, equal to the Senator from Washington, off the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I believe it was my request that is pending.

Let me make a couple of observations. First, whenever Senator Stevens wishes to speak, I will defer to him. Second, since we only have 4 1/2 minutes of time, I would be willing to take just 4 1/2 minutes to speak only on ANWR and come back on the other issues at another time.

I amend my request to ask that I be allowed to take this 4 1/2 minutes if it is off the resolution so I can address this issue.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I have a pending request, also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has a request, and the request is to be recognized for 4 1/2 minutes. Does anyone object?

Mr. CONRAD. Off the resolution. And that uses all the time until 1 o’clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is my understanding.

Mr. CONRAD. I do not object.

Mr. LOTT. Parliamentary inquiry. Could I inquire, has Senator Stevens’ time already been identified before this 1 o’clock vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has made the request.

Mr. LOTT. Has not been—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has made the request. The Senator has been recognized for 5 minutes on the ANWR amendment. But as the Chair understands it, the Senator from Alaska is asking to speak for 10 minutes before 1 o’clock and the time be taken off the underlying resolution.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, as a way to resolve this, I ask unanimous consent that Senator Stevens be given 10 minutes off the resolution and that the vote occur at 1:10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object. Let me say to Senator Stevens, that is the last agreement I will enter into because we are rapidly running out of time on the resolution. We have spent a great deal of time on this matter. Certainly in recognition of Senator Stevens’ long service, and his intense interest on this issue, we will agree to that one moving back of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the Chair’s understanding we will proceed as follows: that the Senator from Mississippi will speak for 4 minutes, that the Senator from Alaska be given 10 minutes, and the vote will be at 1:10, and the Senator from Washington has 5 minutes to be taken off the underlying resolution yet to be used. Is that correct?

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, then how much time remains on the ANWR debate for both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 17 minutes 4 seconds for the minority; 24 minutes 33 seconds for the majority.

Ms. CANTWELL. Thank you.

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

The Senator from Mississippi.
Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am glad I could assist the Chair in clarifying the time at this point. This is a very important issue. It is time, I agree, we should get it resolved. I think it should be resolved with a majority vote. We can argue over the rules as long as we like. But this is a critical issue. It symbolizes what we are going to do about the future in the energy area.

I do not have some beautiful picture I am going to show today. If I were going to show one, I would show one of my four grandchildren. Are we going to have energy production in our country or not? Are we going to continue to put various areas off limits where we cannot have more production? There are some people, I guess, in this institution who think we can conserve ourselves into an energy policy.

We need to produce more oil, more natural gas, more coal with clean coal technology, hydropower, all of it, and have conservation and alternative fuels, but we should produce this oil in Alaska, or natural gas, or whatever it is up there.

When I came to the Senate, I spent some time talking to the experienced hands around here, and I asked about how we approached different issues. One of the things I was taught by my predecessors here in this institution is you pay attention to the Senators from their State when it is an issue involving their State.

This is an issue that is supported by the two Senators from Alaska, supported by an overwhelming number of people in that State. It is supported by the Native Americans in that State. This is the right thing to do from their standpoint. I do not understand why Senators from Massachusetts and Washington and Maine are trying to dictate what should happen in this area in production that we need as a country. I am absolutely floored by all of this.

I think it is time we consider what is for the good of the overall country and get over all these dire threats of doom of what we might do if we have exploration in this very limited area. And, ladies and gentlemen, it is about jobs. They understand it would involve more revenue coming into the Federal Treasury. They understand it is about energy independence.

When are we going to learn? The price of a barrel of oil is $54 a barrel. Venezuela made it clear recently they would like to cut us off completely. We are dependent on a very volatile area of the world for our oil supply. Probably about 60 percent of our energy needs is supplied by foreign oil.

Even in this remote area of Alaska we are saying we cannot produce more oil and gas. Who is going to lose if we do not have energy sources? We are going to have it in my State. We are going to produce our own oil and natural gas and coal. We are going to have excess power. By the way, if they are willing to pay for it, we will be glad to wheel it up to Pennsylvania and Massachusetts and Connecticut. We will share.

But I will tell you, if we do not have oil and gas and coal to run our powerplants, the electricity is going off. It is not working under the normal rules. Now, we are going to have to be more dependent on foreign oil. In fact, a recent attorneys general office statement stated that gasoline producers marketed up prices 152 percent between January and March of 2003. In the first 3 months of 2003, average gasoline prices increased 57 cents in California alone.

A trade industry magazine talked about the peculiar incidence of export distillate. That is taking our supply and exporting it. What does that do? It decreases the supply in the United States, and it increases the spot market prices at refineries. There is nothing in the budget resolution that guarantees we are going to lower gasoline prices. And then the language of the budget resolution that guarantees any supply recovered from the Arctic Refuge will even stay in the United States.

I wish my colleagues would embrace this realism and guarantee that if we are doing go into a wildlife refuge and drill for oil, at least we should require that we keep whatever oil we produce in the United States for our domestic use. But I doubt they will vote for that. They are talking about drilling in a wildlife area. In doing so, we will increase pollution and not get our country off our foreign oil dependence and certainly not lower gasoline prices any time in the near term.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for the Cantwell amendment to strike the reconciliation instruction to the Energy Committee that allows for drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I first thank Senator CANTWELL for her tremendous leadership on environmental issues in general and especially her strong leadership on this very important environmental issue.

The other side can say what they want; we have a minority. The fact is, this provision is an abuse of the reconciliation process. Yes, it is. The Senator from New Hampshire may be right that it is technically not a violation of the rules of the Senate, but it is an abuse of the process. It is what you do not want to accept. You cannot win under the normal rules, 60 votes, the way we have debated this issue year after year. You get frustrated and you say: Here is what we will do. We will use a revenue assumption in the budget so we only have to have 51 votes.

We should be debating this issue when we take up the Energy bill rather
than engaging in a backdoor maneuver on the budget resolution. I feel strongly, as a Senator who has always worked on a bipartisan basis year after year on the budget and the budget rules, that this one is over the line.

The proposal is clearly evidenced by the speculative nature of the revenue assumptions from drilling in the Wildlife Refuge. A February 21, 2005 New York Times article about the refuge quotes a Bush adviser as saying that “even if youampions the drilling, it’s for free, they wouldn’t want to drill there.” He continued: “No oil company really cares about [the Arctic refuge].”

British Petroleum, ConocoPhillips, and ChevronTexaco have all pulled out of the pro-drilling Arctic Power lobbying group. BP abandoned a test well right next to the Arctic Refuge because of a lack of production. ChevronTexaco has moved its executives from Alaska to Houston. The point is that “enthusiasm of government officials about ANWR exceeds that of the industry” and that “evidence about ANWR is not promising.”

CBO concedes it did not address the oil company's interest in drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge in its projections. So these projections don’t add up. Authorizing drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge through the budget process is simply the latest in a series of abuses of Senate procedures, and I believe the American people know it.

This is a backdoor scheme for drilling because the drilling proponents don’t have enough votes to deal with this issue in the Energy bill. The public doesn’t want it; major oil companies don’t appear to want it; and it does not belong in the budget resolution.

The proposed transfer of revenues from drilling in the Arctic Refuge to fund pork-barrel projects elsewhere, on its face, also an accounting gimmick. The President’s budget zeroed out the State recreation grant program of the land and water conservation fund and reduced Federal lands acquisition and maintenance to its lowest funding level in 10 years. To further erode our environmental protections by drilling in this pristine wildlife refuge to generate public revenues for these important conservation programs underscores the administration’s insincerity in claiming to support conservation.

Even if you think we should drill in the Arctic Refuge, this is not the time or place for this debate. If we can contort the budget process to authorize drilling in a wildlife refuge, why couldn’t we use the budget process to allow drilling off the coasts of Florida or California or the Carolinas or the Great Lakes? When you abuse the budget in this way, it invites even greater mischief down the line and undermines the very purpose for which these procedures were established.

We should not abuse the budget and the budget reconciliation process, as one of our colleagues put it years ago, “in order to be immune from unlimited debate.”

Allowing oil drilling in the Wildlife Refuge which many of us believe should be protected as pristine wilderness is too important an issue to be handled in this way. We should have this debate in the open during an energy debate, not a debate on the budget resolution. Therefore, I will vote for the Cantwell amendment and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for Senator CANTWELL’s amendment to the budget resolution protecting the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Senator CANTWELL’s amendment aims to strike a controversial provision that effectively paves the way to allowing oil and gas exploration in one of our Nation’s most pristine and unique wild places. This is a common-sense amendment, which upholds the will of the American people in preserving this remote area. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

There is a strong consensus among all of us here, on both sides of the aisle that decisive steps need to be taken by this Congress to secure our Nation’s future energy needs. We know that energy demand is not only in our own country but around the world, especially in nations such as India and China. We also know that there are grave national security implications for remaining reliant on foreign oil.

And we know from our constituents, many of whom are struggling to heat their homes this winter, that the price of oil remains disturbingly high.

Drilling proponents want us to believe that resource exploration in the Arctic Refuge will be a one-stop solution to these critical energy challenges and that by doing so we will be closer to securing our future energy needs. This insinuation is flat wrong.

Even drilling proponents concede that any recoverable oil that the coastal plain would yield would not reach world markets for at least another 7-12 years. This will do absolutely nothing to help my constituents who have sticker shock at the gas pump or are seeing record home heating prices today. Even during peak production, expected around 2025, the amount of oil from the Arctic Refuge would reduce American imports by only around three percent according to the Energy Information Agency.

On numerous occasions I have come to the Senate floor urging my colleagues to adopt real solutions to our Nation’s pressing energy challenges. We should be increasing the nation’s fuel economy standards, which have remained unchanged for over 10 years. We should also be making a stronger commitment to the development of renewable energy and energy conservation technologies by offering tax incentives to manufacturers and consumers.

It is mind-boggling to me that drilling proponents have provided so little leadership in forwarding these policy solutions. Instead they continue to offer the American people a false choice between environmental protection and energy security.

In another bold move, the administration has tried to sugarcoat oil development in the Arctic Refuge by massively inflating the projected revenues from anticipated lease sales there. The administration claims that lease sales will generate $2.5 billion in revenue in 2007. To get to that amount, leases would have to sell for between $4,000 and $6,000 per acre. In comparison, leases on the North Slope of Alaska have averaged only $50 per acre over the last 20 years. When I questioned Interior Secretary Norton about this discrepancy, she could not explain how the administration got to its $2.5 billion estimate. What Secretary Norton and the administration don’t want to acknowledge is that these revenues are disturbingly inflated. They also don’t want to admit that they may have lost interest in drilling in the refuge. Only one company is still a member of the lobbying group pushing for this provision in the budget resolution. The fact is that there are other places the oil companies prefer that it is cheaper to drill and where the environmental impacts are far less.

So why are we here today? Opening the refuge will do nothing to help reduce gas prices. It will do nothing to make us less dependent on foreign oil. Most oil companies are not asking for it. I can certainly tell you that Vermonter’s do not want to see this special place developed. In Vermont, we cherish the natural resources of our state. We cherish the special resources of this country—Yellowstone, Acadia, the Grand Canyon. I would put the Arctic Refuge on the same level as these national treasures.

Let me make clear though, I do not oppose energy development in this country. But not here, not in the Arctic Refuge. It’s time to put this issue behind us and devote our time to working together on a sustainable, reliable energy supply for this country. We cherish our natural treasures.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Cantwell amendment to strike the language in the budget resolution that would allow oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

The decision whether or not to allow drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is a defining moment for national energy and environmental policy.

This debate reflects two divergent views of our Nation’s values and future.

We have a choice: either we can continue building oil wells in environmentally sensitive areas, or we can broaden our Nation’s energy base while honoring our commitment to our natural heritage.

Instead of diversifying our energy supply, investing in new energy technologies and promoting energy efficiency, the Bush administration’s priority is to look for the next domestic oil field.
No matter how clever they view this backdoor scheme to insert this proposal into the budget, the proponents of drilling in the Arctic Refuge cannot escape the facts.

The Arctic Refuge is home to an unparalleled diversity of wildlife including 130 species of birds, caribou, polar bears, musk oxen, grizzly bears, and wolves.

Estimates show there may be only 6 months of work, and it would not be available for 10 years.

The three largest oil companies in Alaska have stated they are not interested in drilling in the Arctic Refuge.

This proposal will do nothing to reduce the price of gas at the pump and will do nothing to make our country more energy independent.

This issue is too important to the public and to future generations to be snuck through in the budget bill. It should be brought to a vote on its own merits.

Supporters of oil drilling will not stop at the Arctic Refuge. The White House and its allies continue to push to drill in the Arctic Refuge because they believe it will create momentum to drill in other environmentally sensitive areas in the Rocky Mountains and off the coasts of California and Florida.

Ninety-five percent of Alaska’s North Slope is already open to drilling and exploration. The last 5 percent—the Arctic Refuge—is the only wild stretch of Alaska’s North Slope that remains off-limits.

Alaska produces just 3 percent of the world’s oil, yet we consume 25 percent of that supply.

The answer to our energy challenge will not be found in the Arctic Refuge. It will be found in our willingness to encourage American innovation and break the habit of spiraling energy consumption.

We have met this test in the past. In the 1970s, Congress increased fuel efficiency standards and began to encourage the development of renewable fuels.

Today, those fuel efficiency standards save our country the cost of three million barrels of oil every day, and renewable energy technologies produce the equivalent of the oil we currently import from Iraq daily.

I believe we have a moral responsibility to save wild places such as the Arctic Refuge for future generations. Our national wildlife refuge, and wilderness systems are a living legacy for all Americans, present and future, and are widely envied and emulated around the world. The Arctic Refuge is one of the greatest treasures. It should be protected.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Cantwell amendment to strike the language to allow drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

MS. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Cantwell amendment.

First, as a member of the Senate Budget Committee, I strongly believe that the Arctic Refuge language does not belong in the budget bill and I am deeply concerned about the precedent this sets. The Arctic Refuge provision in the budget resolution provides special reconciliation protection to allow a major policy change. This is wrong and an abuse of the budget process. Reconciliation was designed to help Congress pass a large package of measures to reduce the deficit, not to be used to resolve one major policy.

If this provision is allowed to stand, those who advocate drilling in Alaska could pass a bill opening up Arctic Refuge and we would not be able to offer amendments to increase our use of renewable fuels unless we got 60 votes. This is unfair and would not allow for a full debate on energy and environmental policy like we had in last Congress.

Now let’s talk about the facts when it comes to drilling in the Arctic refuge.

First, the Arctic Refuge would provide a 6-month supply of oil—which would not be available for 10 years. This is equivalent to the amount of oil the U.S. consumes in about 6 months. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, production from the Arctic refuge would not even come on line for 10 years or more.

The Arctic Refuge would not affect current oil or gasoline prices. The price of oil is a world price and is largely determined by the international market. The Arctic Refuge production would not significantly impact global oil prices, or U.S. oil or gasoline prices.

Ninety-five percent of Alaska’s North Slope is already open to oil and gas drilling. Ninety-five percent of the potential oil reserves of Alaska’s North Slope are already designated for potential leasing or open to exploration and drilling.

The last 5 percent—the coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge—is the only wild stretch of the coast of Alaska’s North Slope that remains off-limits. Established by President Dwight Eisenhower in 1960, the Arctic Refuge remains the only conservation area in North America that protects a complete range of arctic and sub-arctic landscapes.

The Arctic Refuge would not reduce U.S. dependence on foreign oil. According to the Energy Administration, EIA, the independent analytical agency within the Department of Energy, drilling in the Arctic Refuge is projected to reduce the amount of foreign oil consumed by the U.S. in 2020 from 62 to 60 percent—only a 2 percent decrease! Drilling in the Arctic Refuge will not make a dent on our dependence on foreign oil.

One of the arguments I have heard from across the aisle is that drilling in Arctic Refuge would create jobs. My home State of Michigan currently has the second highest unemployment rate in the country. There is nothing more that I would like to see on the Senate floor than a bill to create jobs and I would vote wholeheartedly for such a proposal. But that’s not what we have before us now.

We are not debating a well-funded highway bill that would create jobs. Last year’s Senate bill would have created over 830,000 jobs across this country—99,000 jobs in Michigan alone—but it died in conference because of the Bush administration’s opposition. We are not debating the rising cost of health care and how it’s hurting our manufacturers. In 2003, General Motors, the largest private purchaser of health care in the world, spent more covering 1.2 million individuals than it did on steel.

We are not debating how to stop Chinese currency manipulation which unfairly taxes our U.S. goods overseas, and is forcing our American manufacturers to close their plants and send their jobs abroad.

We are not even debating the construction of the Alaska natural gas pipeline which would create more than 400,000 jobs and provide a huge opportunity for our steel industry.

Instead we are debating drilling in one of the most environmentally pristine areas in the world just for a 6 month supply of oil. This isn’t an energy solution and it certainly isn’t a jobs solution. I urge my colleagues to support the Cantwell amendment.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to outline my reasoning for my vote today against the Cantwell amendment to remove the assumption of Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, ANWR, oil and gas exploration lease revenues from the fiscal year 2006 budget resolution.

I have looked at this issue very closely. I have read a great deal of information, met with many concerned groups, and listened to arguments on both sides. And I have come to my own conclusions.

First, I believe exploration will have a minimal impact on the environment. The plans include drilling on a footprint the size of the Philadelphia Airport. It can be done safely by limiting the acreage eligible for exploration, combined with today’s technology to minimize the environmental footprint of exploration in the area. Such technological advances include: The extended reach of multi-directional drilling, which can decrease “footprints”, reduce waste, and increase the amount of productivity. The technology is imaging that produces more precise well locations and consequently reduces the number of wells needed to access reserves; and the use of ice roads and winter season drilling techniques to maximize the season and reduce the amount of time to bring the reserves to market, while recognizing the needs of wildlife.
While there could be a network of pipelines, I have visited ANWR and looked at it personally. I saw caribou near the existing pipeline near ANWR. The environment in Alaska can be protected consistent with our laws and values.

Second, ANWR exploration can be part of our overall effort at oil independence. We should be doing a lot more, and I have led the fight on conservation measures. While debating energy policy during the 107th and 108th Congresses, I supported significant increases in renewable energy, generated from wind, the sun, biomass, water and geothermal sources. I have also supported expanding tax credits for clean coal technologies and I led efforts to mandate a reduction of U.S. oil consumption by one million barrels per day by 2013.

It is only through concerted efforts to reduce projected U.S. oil consumption and to utilize domestic energy resources that our Nation will be able to become energy independent. If we do not take the steps I have outlined, our dependence on OPEC will grow. While fighting these energy policies, I have pressed for the U.S. to sue OPEC under antitrust laws. I have urged the current and former administrations to take OPEC to the U.S. Federal courts for conspiracy to limit oil production and raise prices. These energy policies have increased the oil markets in violation of U.S. and international law, and it should be pursued.

We must take action to address the rising costs of home heating oil, diesel fuel, and gasoline. At the pump, I led efforts to mandate a reduction of U.S. oil consumption by one million barrels per day by 2013.

President Teddy Roosevelt once stated: "I recognize the right and duty of this generation to develop and use our natural resources, but I do not recognize the right to waste them, or to rob by wasteful use, the generations that come after us." Americans have a right to develop our energy resources, but not to waste them. We could do far more to reduce our reliance on foreign oil by increasing the efficiency of our automobiles, which would help reduce our oil consumption by 2.2 percent per year. This is a much greater benefit than drilling in ANWR would provide, and the benefits could start almost immediately.

According to one scientist who testified before the Senate Government Affairs Committee several years ago, the United States could cut reliance on foreign oil by 25 percent by increasing energy efficiency by 2.2 percent per year. This is a much greater benefit than drilling in ANWR would provide, and the benefits could start almost immediately. The United States has a tremendous record of increasing energy efficiency when we put our minds to it: Following the 1979 OPEC energy shock, the United States increased its energy efficiency by 3.2 percent per year for several years. With today's improvements in technology, 2.2 percent is attainable.

America needs to increase fuel supplies and decrease demand, but in our effort to meet current energy needs we should not use up our last major reserves. If we increase energy efficiency and further develop alternative energy sources, we will reduce our reliance on foreign oil, save consumers money, increase our economic competitiveness and energy effectiveness, and protect the environment.

In his parting words from the Oval Office, President Dwight Eisenhower—who first set aside the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge—said to us: "As we peer into society's future, we . . . must avoid the impulse to live only for today, plundering for our own ease and convenience, the precious resources of tomorrow."

I call upon my colleagues to leave intact the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Let us instead develop a balanced energy policy that protects our environment, improves efficiency, and develops our energy resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today as a cosponsor of Senator Cantwell's amendment to strike the reconciliation instructions in the budget resolution to allow for the opening of the Arctic.

I am strongly opposed to opening the Alaskan wilderness to drilling for oil. Stated simply we cannot drill our way out of this problem.

While I agree that we are too dependent on foreign oil, and need to reduce that dependence, drilling for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is simply not the answer.

Reducing oil consumption is the answer and raising our corporate average fuel economy—or CAFE—standards is the superior route to energy security.

The bottom line is that, according to estimates from the United States Geological Survey, drilling in ANWR would likely yield less than 10 billion barrels of economically recoverable oil—less than a million barrels of oil per day at peak production, or less than 4 percent of the country's projected daily needs of oil. The oil would not flow for at least 10 years.

In contrast, simply raising average fuel economy standards for sport utility vehicles could save us more than a million barrels per day by 2020. The savings would come sooner than oil from ANWR, and unlike oil from ANWR, the savings would not run out. Raising the standards for all vehicles would reduce even further the amount of oil consumed in the United States.

The United States contains only 2 percent of the world's oil reserves and only 4 percent of the world population. And yet Americans consume 25 percent of the oil produced worldwide. Almost two-thirds of that oil goes to fuel the Nation's transportation sector.

Given our current level of consumption in relation to our domestic reserves, it is clear that modest increases in domestic production—as from ANWR—will not solve our energy problems. Reducing consumption is the key to increasing America's energy security.

Drilling in ANWR would not save consumers money because drilling would not decrease the quantity consumed and would not affect the world price of oil.

So, unlike increasing CAFE standards, drilling in ANWR would not significantly increase energy security, would not fight climate change, and would not save consumers money.

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is a crown jewel of the National Wildlife Refuge System. It is the only congressionally established unit encompassing a complete range of arctic ecosystems and serves as critical habitat for caribou, muskox, snow geese, polar bears and other species.

The coastal plain, which proponents of drilling paint as small and relatively insignificant, is the ecological heart of the refuge and the center of wildlife activity.

Developing the coastal plain would threaten the refuge's abundant wildlife. The approximately 130,000 caribou of the porcupine herd rely on the coastal plain as a calving area. One hundred thirty-five species of migratory birds use the coastal plain during the summer months.

The coastal plain provides critical habitat for many of the refuge's species.

Drilling would also threaten the traditional livelihoods of the Gwich'in people dependent upon the porcupine caribou for subsistence.

Proponents of drilling would have us risk all of this damage for a small
amount of oil that would not even begin to flow for 10 years and would barely reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

In short, the refuge’s coastal plain is too precious, and contains too little oil, for us to allow drilling to take place.

Increasing fuel efficiency is the better solution.

Future generations will thank us for our foresight in protecting the coastal plain and its wildlife. They will thank us for finding other avenues to increased energy security.

I urge my colleagues to support Senator Cantwell’s amendment.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, today is a sad day for the environmental movement in this country. The Senate has taken the first step toward opening up the vulnerable Arctic National Wildlife Refuge by using an arcane budget maneuver that will protect this provision from a filibuster. Supporters of drilling in the Arctic, knowing they could not defeat a filibuster, have shoehorned a provision into the budget process that goes against the spirit, if not the letter of the rules. This is a shame and a precedent that will certainly come to haunt this Chamber.

I oppose drilling for oil and gas in ANWR because of the irreparable damage that would be done to its fragile ecosystem that is inhabited by 45 species of land and marine mammals. I do not believe the short-term economic considerations should take precedence over permanent damage to the environment. We only have to look at ANWR’s neighbor in Alaska to see what environment cost drilling would have to this pristine landscape. At Prudhoe Bay, home to one of the world’s largest industrial complexes, 43,000 tons of nitrogen oxides pollute the air each year. Hundreds of spills involving tens of thousands of gallons of crude oil and other hazardous materials occur annually. Decades-old diesel spill sites still show little re-growth of vegetation. Why would this be different for ANWR if oil companies are allowed to drill there?

Along with the grave environmental impact drilling would cause ANWR the amount of useable oil is not sufficient to make a significant impact on oil prices. U.S. consumption of oil exceeds 18 million barrels per day, an amount higher than the current consumption of all of Europe, all of Africa, or all the States of the former Soviet Union. Based on the United States Geological Survey and Energy Information Agency, there are roughly 10.3 billion barrels of oil in all of ANWR’s 19 million acres. Of this, only 2.6 billion barrels are “economically recoverable,” the equivalent of a 6-month supply of oil. In addition, the cost of the infrastructure necessary to transport the oil to the lower 48 States makes this an economically losing endeavor for the United States.

Supporters of drilling would have us believe that this oil will improve the energy security of the United States, but this is not accurate. The oil companies that will drill in ANWR have no commitment to sell this oil in the U.S. In fact, the oil that comes out of Alaska will be sold on the world market to the highest bidder. No one who supports drilling requires that the oil that comes out of our soil stay in our country. We should not be surprised then when oil from Alaska ends up in China, Korea, and Japan instead of Wisconsin.

I think it is clear that drilling in ANWR will look like a domestic oil supply to minimize the control that OPEC has on the petroleum market. Insulating ourselves from the world prices of oil will not come from increasing domestic production. We cannot drill ourselves out of our oil dependency, there is simply not enough oil within our borders. Instead, the U.S. can reduce its vulnerability to oil price shocks by decreasing its demand for oil altogether. The way to ease the impact of this is to give consumers tools to reduce their demand for oil. Cleary this debate should be about alternative energy sources, such as ethanol or hybrid vehicle technology, and not wasting our time with an oil reserve were the costs outweigh the benefits.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Cantwell amendment to protect America’s National Arctic Wildlife Refuge.

I traveled to Alaska in the aftermath of the Exxon Valdez spill in 1989. What I saw there was terrible. More than 11 million gallons of oil had spewed into the Prince William Sound. I saw animals covered in oil, many of them dead. I saw workers wiping oil off of wildlife. I saw there was terrible. More than 11 million gallons of oil had spewed into the Prince William Sound. I saw animals covered in oil, many of them dead. I saw workers wiping oil off of birds and other wildlife. It was a devastating tragedy, and it made a big impression on me.

I thought about my children and grandchildren. I felt that they deserve to inherit the earth in its beautiful natural State not ravaged at the hands of man.

In 1990, Exxon released a video claiming that long-term effects of the massive oil spill were minor. That’s what Exxon said in 1990. But today, 16 years after the disaster, nature tells a different story. Today, large portions of the Prince William Sound remain contaminated.

Several Alaskan families visited my office last year. They told me that due to the neglect the old fisherman said, “I-and my grandson will never get to fish for herring. We’ve been fishing for herring for three generations in my family. But since the spill, there is no more herring.”

Even today, pools of toxic oil can be found just below the surface and sometimes on the ground. In my office, I have a sample that the Alaskan families left with me when they traveled all the way to Washington to ask for our help. They found rocks drenched in oil just a few inches beneath the surface of the ground.

Some might say nothing on such a scale could ever occur in the Arctic Refuge because the oil would be transported by pipeline, not tanker. But nothing built by humans is perfect or accident-proof. And even under a best-case scenario, drilling for oil could ruin the Arctic Refuge.

I had the privilege of visiting the Arctic Refuge a few years ago. It is a remarkable place where more than 100 species of birds breed. Caribou migrate 1600 miles to reach the Refuge, where they give birth to their calves.

Supporters of drilling in the refuge say it will have a negligible effect, barely noticeable in that vast expanse. I have seen the oil drilling complexes on the North Slope and I would hardly call them negligible.

The fact is the exploration for oil in the Arctic Refuge has already marred its pristine beauty. I visited there, I saw the debris of human intrusion, acres of rusting pipes and dilapidated structures. As my plane flew across Deadhorse, near Prudhoe Bay, I saw the tundra littered with refuse, oil rigs and other abandoned equipment.

This was left behind by the same oil companies that now promise they will be good stewards of the Arctic Refuge. Why would we risk devastating this national treasure just to save a barrel or two? Even under the most optimistic projections, the U.S. Geological Survey says the Arctic Refuge could provide about a million barrels of oil a day for 20 years. Compared to our total energy needs, this is a drop in the bucket.

There is a better way.

Simply by closing the loophole that exempts large SUVs from our fuel efficiency standards, we can save as much oil as the oil companies could possibly produce in the Arctic Refuge.

Mr. President, when President Eisenhower designated this special place as a Wildlife Refuge, our nation made a promise to future generations. We promised that some places on earth would always remain unspoiled by the hand of man.

Let’s not break that promise. Let’s not sell our children’s birthright for a few barrels of oil.

Instead, let’s develop a real energy strategy for the 21st Century—a strategy that uses oil more efficiently, and employs American know-how to harness new sources of energy.

Mr. President, the American people know what that is at sixty-one. My office has received 15,000 messages this week urging the Senate not to despoil the Arctic Refuge.

I will vote for the Cantwell amendment, and I urge all my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment to strip ANWR from the budget resolution. I am pleased that ANWR is in the budget this year. As a matter of fact, I returned from ANWR just last week. Not visiting it. I am even more confident in my support for drilling there.

I went with a group of Senators, Secretary Norton, and Secretary Bodman
to ANWR to see firsthand what all the talk was about. We met with environmentalists and villagers on the border of ANWR and talked to them about the United States’ desperate need for more domestic energy sources. There were a few residents who expressed opposition, but the majority, the majority. The majority of the people living near ANWR—more than 75 percent—support drilling in ANWR.

I know that there are some in the Senate who are desperate to stop us from moving forward. The debate about ANWR, however, are not on their side. Some of these facts I think need to be repeated, especially for those Senators who are new to the debate.

ANWR itself is roughly the size of South Carolina. It’s absolutely enormous. It’s 19.6 million acres or 30,000 square miles. But, when we talk about drilling in ANWR, we’re talking about clean drilling in an area of less than 2,000 acres—that’s 0.001 percent of the total area of the ANWR. It’s smaller than many airports.

To say that drilling in this limited portion of ANWR threatens the entire environment of the refuge is far fetched and just plain wrong. During my trip, I visited the sites at Alpine and Prudhoe Bay. There is now no doubt in my mind that we can develop ANWR in a safe and effective manner.

Drilling will only be a small footprint in ANWR that can be carried out in an environmentally sound manner. State of the art techniques will lessen the environmental impact. The old stereotypes of dirty oil drilling just don’t apply anymore. In fact, if we do start drilling in ANWR, the drilling operations would be conducted under the most comprehensive environmental regulations in the world.

We all want to do what we can to protect the environment.

But it’s just not credible to say that looking at this small, limited part of ANWR is a dangerous threat to the entire region. I also think that many environmentalists fail to see that if we do not begin oil production in ANWR, foreign oil companies will take up the slack and drill in places such as the Middle East where environmental regulations are much less restrictive than ours. Opening ANWR could actually be more environmentally sound than the alternative.

We produce 20 million barrels of oil a day and our consumption is expected to increase to 28 million barrels a day over the next 20 years. Yet, we haven’t built an oil refinery in the last 25 years. We must increase our energy supplies to keep up with the demand of our growing economy.

ANWR is the most promising domestic source of oil that we have. If the Senate passes ANWR, it will make a huge difference for our domestic consumption. Three are 10 to 30 billion barrels of oil recoverable in ANWR. Just to put this in perspective, that’s enough to fuel all of Kentucky’s oil needs for at least 79 years.

ANWR would boost Alaska’s oil production. And with the new Alaska pipeline, we could get it quickly to the rest of the United States. It would provide the United States with nearly 1 million barrels a day or 4.5 percent of today’s consumption for the next 30 years.

Inupiat who have been the caretakers of the coastal plain and cared for the land for many, many generations. For me, this is an issue about economic self-determination of an indigenous people and their homeland. The Inupiat, who live within the boundaries of the coastal plain, are a people with strong cultural values, and are deeply in touch with their environment and their culture.

ANWR would provide more than just oil to meet our energy needs. The region also has a vast amount of natural gas. We don’t have enough natural gas supply in this country to meet our demand. Natural gas prices keep going up and up. In the area where drilling would take place, there is up to 10.9 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

Right now, they are circular pumping the natural gas back into the reserves in Alaska.

Instead of pumping ANWR’s natural gas back into the earth, we should use this for our energy needs. Opening ANWR up for drilling won’t change our dependence on foreign sources of energy overnight. No single source can totally end our dependence on foreign energy.

But opening ANWR and boosting production will definitely be a huge step toward America becoming self sufficient for our own energy needs and strengthening our national security.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this amendment and to support the energy independence which ANWR offers. Mr. AKAKA, Mr. President, I rise today in support of Alaska’s indigenous peoples, the Alaska natives. I will oppose the Cantwell amendment. My position is based on my experiences in Alaska when I visited the village of Kaktovik in Prudhoe Bay and talked to the Inupiat people who greatly desire this opportunity for economic self-determination. My position is not new—I have remained firm in the position for the last 10 years. In developing this position I have met with individuals and organizations who have advocated on both sides of this issue.

For me, this vote is not a vote just about preservation of the environment. It’s about development about the self-determination of an indigenous people and their homeland. The Inupiat, who live within the boundaries of the coastal plain for thousands of years.

To some of my colleagues, the debate about ANWR is about energy. To others, it is about the environment. To me, ANWR is really about whether or not the indigenous people who are directly impacted have a voice about the use of their lands. The Inupiat know every mile, every curve in the landscape of the coastal plain, and every animal that must survive there, for their own survival depends on this. They have the greatest incentive of anyone to preserve their environment, including the plants and animals that live on the coastal plain, in order to maintain their way of life.

They also depend on the caribou and they have participated in the protection of the caribou while monitoring and working with the oil industry at Prudhoe Bay for their experience has demonstrated that a careful balance is possible, and that preservation and development are not mutually exclusive.

My colleagues, I do not live on the coastal plain. For that reason, I trust the wisdom and knowledge of those who have lived and cared for the land there for many, many generations.

I will vote to provide the Inupiat with the opportunity to provide for themselves and their future generations. They have shown us they are steadfast in their position for many, many years. I am confident that they will protect their homeland and utilize its resources with the native values that have served them well since time began. Their position is supported by the Alaska Federation of Natives, which represents 110,000 Alaska natives, and the native village of Kaktovik.

This has not been an easy decision for some given the fact that this is one of the few times that I am voting against the majority of my colleagues in my party. As much as I would like to vote with my colleagues, I must remain true to myself and my values. For me, this is an issue about economic self-determination. This is an issue about allowing those who have lived on the coastal plain and cared for the coastal plain for many, many generations, to do what they believe is right with their lands.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I don’t know what all the fight is about. If the
comments are true, that they think no one will bid, why do they oppose this? I am interested in the Senator from Wisconsin and his great defense of wildlife refuges. This area we are talking about is not within a wildlife refuge. It is not wilderness. But in his State, there are pipelines running through wildlife refuges. Wisconsin has stood aside for all that they want.

And as a matter of fact, the Senator from Washington, Ms. CANTWELL, said that he would not support this budget because I am supporting the budget Committee. That smacks very much of privilege, and I shall consider that my colleague from Washington who represents the area of the North Slope. That is an ostrich-like approach that I am supporting the budget Committee. That smacks very much of something that is a subject of personal privilege, and I shall consider that later on. I think the Senator from Washington would like to come explain why he has singled me out for unethical conduct. But beyond that, I must express my amazement that my colleague from Washington has offered this amendment.

In the former Senator from Washington and my good friend, Henry “Scoop” Jackson wrote a letter discussing the importance of ANWR and this 1.5 million acres. He said ANWR was:

...crucial to the nation’s attempt to achieve energy independence. One-third of our known petroleum reserves are in Alaska, along with an even greater proportion of our potential reserves. Actions such as preventing even the exploration of the Arctic Wildlife Range ... is an ostrich-like approach that sill serves our nation in this time of energy shortage.

That is the former Senator from Washington. Not only does ANWR serve our important national security interests, it serves the economic interests of the State of Washington. As a matter of fact, Washington gets a great deal more out of Alaska’s oil development than anyone. The economic health of the Puget Sound is tied directly to Alaska, as is illustrated by a report commissioned by the Tacoma-Pierce County and Greater Seattle Chambers of Commerce. Of particular importance is the oil production from the North Slope. Washington’s refining industry purchases almost its entire crude stock from Alaska.

The report states that:

Direct impacts from the refining of Alaska crude oil within the Puget Sound region includes 1,990 jobs and $144.5 million in labor earnings. In 2003, oil refineries in the Puget Sound imported $2.8 billion worth of crude oil from Alaska. Alaska oil provided 90 percent of the region’s oil refinery needs. Oil development is a major contributor to the health of Washington’s economy. As oil wealth in the State of Alaska increases, so does demand for Puget Sound goods and services. That is why the chambers of commerce of Washington State support ANWR. They understand that with Prudhoe Bay declining — today it only produces about 950 thousand barrels a day; it used to produce 2.1 million barrels a day — additional oil resources must be developed to ensure the continued economic viability of communities in Alaska. The Puget Sound region has the luxury of purchasing our oil. Otherwise it would be purchasing oil from distant foreign shores.

The development of Prudhoe Bay has contributed more than $1.6 billion to the Washington economy. And ANWR alone is estimated to create over 12,000 new jobs in Washington State alone, in addition to the revenues it will generate. None of these benefits will take place if the amendment is not passed. Not only are decreasing oil output and declining revenues affecting the health of Washington, its major businesses are feeling the heat, particularly the aviation industry. The rise in fuel prices is greatly impacting Washington’s aviation industry. Our airline industry has lost over $25 billion in the last 3 years. Sustained high jet fuel costs of $1.50 per gallon, which is almost three times that of 1999, continues to hamper the health of this critical industry. Every dollar per barrel the cost of oil rises costs the airline industry an additional $2 million a month. High energy prices also prevent job creation in the transportation sector. The Air Transport Association estimates that for every dollar increase in the price of fuel, they could fund almost 5,900 airline jobs. That should be worrisome to a person who represents the area of the aerospace industry of this country and wants to deny us access to this oil.

Let me speak about access to this oil. Washington consumes 17.6 million gallons of petroleum per day, including 7.3 million gallons of gasoline and $2.5 million for jet fuel. It produces no oil at all. Were it not for oil from my State, the Puget Sound region would be destitute.

Now, some people argue we should not develop ANWR because it would devastate the traditional lifestyle of Alaska’s Natives. I think they do a disservice to the Alaskan Native people. They talk about the Gwich’in people. Let me be sure that everybody understands that the Gwich’in, which the Democrats parade around this town, are from the South Slope. They are not in the North Slope. They have no traditional lifestyle. The only thing they share with the North Slope is the fact that the porcupine caribou herd, which comes from Canada up to the North Slope, goes through their area on up to the North Slope. But not every year. Some years they don’t go. Why? Because their relatives in Canada kill too many.

The Gwich’ins hunt caribou in Canada and they can serve it commercially. For them, it is a sports animal versus a subsistence animal on our side. They have benefitted from oil production. They have provided revenues for schools, clean water, sanitation, electric power, health clinics, roads, and Natives.

I don’t think most people understand that because of the situation in terms of the Alaska Land Claims Settlement Act, when one region gets money from natural resources, it must share with the other 11 regions. The 7(i) concept is the most unique concept in America. That is why all of the Natives in Alaska have an interest in ANWR.

If the Natives of the North Slope get money—and they will—from this development, they must share that with the other 11 regions. I have worked closely with them to enact the strictest environmental standards on the planet, dealing with the developments on the North Slope.

People don’t realize that the petroleum industry has been able to coexist with wildlife in the Arctic, and it really has the support of the Natives who live in that area. Thirty-three percent of unemployed Alaskans are Natives. Twenty percent of Alaskan Natives have incomes below the poverty line. Development of ANWR holds the potential to improve their situation. That is why they are in this city now trying to tell Members that they want ANWR developed.

We have been accused of trying to use strange procedures. I don’t think it is strange. We had the same provision in last year, and they were able to take it out. They knew they had the votes in last year and they were not screaming like they are now. This year, things have changed. There has been an election.

Mr. GREGG. Will the Senator yield for a quick point?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of the times the reconciliation process has been used for actions very similar to this, many of which were in periods when the Democrats controlled this Senate.

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

SAMPLE OF "POLICIES" ENACTED IN RECONCILIATION BILLS
(Not an exhaustive list)

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1982
Froze dairy price supports Reduced COLAs for food stamps Required home buyers to pay a lump-sum premium for FHA mortgage insurance

CONSOLIDATED OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1985
Raised offshore drilling revenues Increased PBGC premium rate Made Medicare HI tax mandatory for State and local government employees

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1990
Required sale of government’s share of Conrail
OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1997

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1993

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1990

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1989

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1987

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1986

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1985

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1984

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1983

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1982

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1981

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1980

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1979

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1978

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1977

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1976

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1975

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1974

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1973

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1972

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1971

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1970

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1969

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1968

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1967

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1966

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1965

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1964

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1963

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1962

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1961

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1960

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1959

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1958

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1957

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1956

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1955

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1954

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1953

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1952

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1951

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1950
for their cultural survival, and the Native peoples of eastern Siberia, have only recently begun the difficult task of trying to reclaim and reinvigorate subsistence whaling traditions suppressed under decades of Soviet rule; and

Whereas, the people of Southeastern Alaska are threatened on both sides of the Bering Sea border; and

Whereas, all Alaska Natives are dependent on the river ways for their traditional lifeways and Salmon; and

Whereas, all of these subsistence traditions are currently threatened by multinational political and economic interests that place them at risk.

Whereas, the cultural survival of the Gwich’in people is threatened by multinational oil and pro-industry officials in the highest ranks of the United States government forces that would callously place the survival of the Porcupine Caribou Herd at risk, by gambling that oil exploration and development on the Herd’s calving grounds in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge of Alaska would not have the devastating effects on the herd that many biologists and people with indigenous knowledge of the Caribou believe such actions would; and

Whereas, the cultural survival of the Inupiat people, the Saint Lawrence Island Natives, and the indigenous peoples of Eastern Siberia are likewise threatened by recent disruptions that will follow us

Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut, who has been so outspoken and important to this debate. I thank him for his leadership on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for her principled leadership on this fight.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I come to this debate with some long history here, as other Members of the Senate have as well. This was one of the reasons I ran for the Senate. I was troubled by the plans to drill for oil in the Arctic refuge. It was an issue in my 1988 campaign. I have been battling this ever since.

Why does it matter so much to me? Sure, it relates to our national energy policy. Does it develop enough oil to really make a difference?

No. Can we drill our way out of energy dependence on foreign oil? No. We have to think and innovate and entrepreneurize our way out of it.

This all begins, for me, with the beginning of the Bible and the instructions God gave to Adam and Eve that they should both work and guard the Garden of Eden, which is to say that they should develop and cultivate that land, but we are accessing those resources here for a short time. The Psalms tell us that the Earth is the Lord’s and the fullness thereof. You have a responsibility to protect the beauty of nature that has been given to us for the generations that will follow us—to work and to guard.

Let me come to the North Slope.

We come to this day with a judgment having been made. Ninety-five percent of the North Slope in this part of Alaska, for two reasons, exploration and potential drilling. We drew a line. Our predecessors drew a line: This 5 percent should be preserved as a wildlife refuge; if you will, a small piece of Eden, preserved in this magnificent state.

Now we are going to break that line, we are going to destroy that remaining part and have an inevitable negative consequence, both on the wilderness, the wildlife there, and also on the native people and heritage that it is part of.

We can go back and forth about which side the native people are on.

I ask unanimous consent have printed in the RECORD a letter from Robert Thompson, Kaktovik Arctic Adventurers, containing a petition drive, which has secured 57 signatures from the people in Kaktovik, likely a major factor.

I want to go to someone else who’s representing the culture there—Dr. Thompson. His name sounds like Dicksville Notch, doesn’t it? Who support Senator CANTWELL’s proposal.

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


To the Senators of the United States: I am writing in regards to concerns relating to the protection of the culture there, the Inupiat, and the culture of my friends, the Gwich’in.

There is an area that is being considered for oil and gas exploitation, the 1002 area of the arctic national wildlife refuge, for years there has been a perception that the Inupiat of the north slope were all in favor of this. Perhaps previously this was so as it seemed the oil infrastructure was far away and people benefited from it. This is changing rather dramatically. A resolution passed in Kaktovik, which is still in progress, has secured 57 signatures that is likely a majority of the voting adults in Kaktovik.

A small amount of oil would mean the larger population of the U.S. If this drive were to have taken place a month ago it is doubtful that there would have been more than ten sign. We have had many events happen in the Bush administration that make people realize that we don’t really count for much in their plans.

The ocean is aggressing being leased. On Feb. 22, Gov. Murkowski clearly stated the state’s position on developing state near shore, off-shore areas. He implied that if the residents were told that restrictions to drilling during whale migrations were offered we wouldn’t mind. He did not consult with us. Our concerns go way beyond that. Oil spilled in the arctic ocean can not be cleaned up to any standard that is acceptable to us.

Federal offshore areas are being offered to oil companies also. This is the area that is central to our culture, our whaling culture.

People are realizing that the 1002 area being sold is the last 5% of our lands. Big oil has access to these areas, but we are accessing the arctic national wildlife refuge, for years.

The oil infrastructure was far away and people benefited from it. This is changing rather dramatically. A resolution passed in Kaktovik, which is still in progress, has secured 57 signatures that is likely a majority of the voting adults in Kaktovik.

The arctic national wildlife refuge is the last refuge of the grizzly bear, the wolverine, the porcupine and the Gwich’in.

Many members say that in doing so they would possibly be losing a large amount of money, it is magnified to an honorable action, it is people standing with their people for the good of all. I am not in a corporation here so my involvement is not for profit. The signers are doing it for the preservation of our culture for future generations. I hope that you senators will give full consideration to this event. We are attempting to use the democratic process to save our culture.

Before this it could be said and often was, that we wanted all that oil money. You are going to destroy the culture. I am saying that no amount of money is worth exchanging our culture for. However this goes, future
generations of inupiat can look back and say, those who signed tried to do the right thing. Somehow, I feel that it will be important to them to know that someone cared.

In closing I would like to thank our friends in Hawaii for their efforts to help us save our culture. I have visited there and have heard people there express concerns similar to ours. I have also heard that there are adverse effects on their culture and their stated desire to help us prevent that from happening to us. Your many efforts are sincerely appreciated.

mahalo,

ROBERT THOMPSON.

Kaktovik’s people don’t want development on ANWR. Petition has a large number of votes for keeping open the Refuge for oil development.

No doubt the oil industry has become cornerstone for the Inupiaq of the Slope. A tolerant culture of the oil industry has long been acclaimed as a righteous society of the North Slope as a result of the oil boom over the past 30 years. No taking into consideration the impacts to the traditional, the subsistence lifestyle of the Inupiaq & the corruption of the subsistence lands & the Inupiaq people have accepted the oil industry indoctrination’s by allowing them to sponsor our village events & celebrations designed to foster this for revenue & not willing to examine if this is a desirable outcome for the Inupiaq. Oblivious to the oil industry’s subtle invasion & eradicating our subsistence hunting lands, as well as our cultural & practices.

Perhaps it was a good idea in the beginning to use the revenues of the oil industry for the economy of the North Slope. But the oil & revenues have declined & the “for profit firms” & those that have become dependent on the oil revenue are now going after the last 5% of the land that is not open to drilling. This beautiful Arctic ecosystem that has sustained & provided the Inupiaqs in the past and a cultural identity. It is valued for its contribution to independence, self-esteem, respect from others, psychological well-being, and healthy lifestyle.

The caribou herd is not our main concern, because hunting and the relationship to the land that has sustained Inupiaq for thousands of years. A sense of personal pride and fulfillment is gained from providing food from the land for family and sharing with others in accordance with age-old tradition. With the increasing threat of offshore development, which a majority of Inupiaq whalers across the Slope oppose. Many are beginning to realize that opening of the Arctic Refuge will provide the jumping off point to develop a ring of oil rigs just north of the Refuge off shore in the Beaufort Sea. In fact Governor Murkowski has stated there is a good possibility that offshore will develop in the future but mentions the interest on the oil companies is to wait for the determination of ANWR. Offshore leases have been offered in the past by the State of Alaska, in which no oil companies bid. It is more profitable & less hazardous to have the ground to lay the infrastructure down permanently then go offshore from there. The Inupiaq people have had so much of their traditional lands & subsistence lifestyle dis- vested; now even the whaling culture is at stake.

A petition circulated has nearly half of the votes in opposition to opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil development. In fact we are still collecting signatures & we are only short a few signatures to get the 50 people that Kaktovik’s voting adults that oppose oil development. We haven’t seen other Kaktovik residents that are away from the village at this point. Many across the Slope are beginning to feel the land of ANWR is essential to the longevity of our subsistence livelihood & our traditional ways. For oil development will lose not only the Slope, not only the residents of Kaktovik, but others as well. For the precedent it will set for offshore development. The message in the past has been that the Inupiaq want ANWR opened for oil development, which has been spoken mainly by the “for profit corporations” which are paid interests of Arctic power. The Regional Corporation have signed exploration and option agreements with oil companies, and these regional corporations have begun to appear to be politically aligned with their partners. And often has been the voice in Arctic for oil development.

A protest was held against Arctic Power paid group (Gail Norton, Lisa Murkowski & others senators) on their visit to Kaktovik on March 6th. But we did not get much media coverage opposing ANWR development despite the fact that the media had accompanied the Senators. For another thing the coverage they let out is very misleading & are in favor of ANWR. In fact the Baker’s representatives. For another thing the coverage opposing ANWR development de- spite the fact that the media had accompanied the Senators. For another thing the coverage they let out is very misleading & are in favor of ANWR. In fact the Baker’s representatives.

A petition has been circulated by 50 people. That is why the filibuster is there. People talk about the “nuclear option” with regard to judicial nominations. We have been looking over in this direction. The nuclear weapons have been fired from over here. This is the nuclear option. It sets a precedent. It allows anything that generates revenues, whether incidental or at the heart of the purpose, to be attached to the budget resolution and only require 51 votes.

Just listen to the advocates, my dear colleagues, and respected friends, proponents of the drilling in the Arctic Refuge. They are not talking about generation of revenue as its main purpose. They are talking about the provision of oil, provision of jobs, energy independence. We can debate that. But the revenues obtained here are incidental, and our rules make clear that when that is so, this kind of provision should not be on this budget resolution.

It does set a precedent, where anything else, where the generation of revenues is merely incidental, whether on environmental matters or anything else, and something that has not been able to obtain the supermajority 60 will be able to be adopted by 51, when put on a budget resolution.

Incidentally, one effect of this budget process in Congress is the budget process has broken down. We do not pass a budget resolution anymore. If we start putting what I believe respectfully are extraneous amendments, substantive bills onto the budget resolution, it is going to be harder and harder to follow the orderly budget process that the law and our rules provide.
So for reasons of substance and reasons of procedure, I ask my colleagues to support the Cantwell amendment.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, let me thank the Senator from Alaska for those few moments to speak to what I believe and many of us believe to be a phenomenally important issue for the Senate to be addressing. Let me try to set the record straight.

I believe it is now the noon hour, in the middle of the day, The Sun is up. The lights are on in this Chamber of the Senate. We are in the middle of a workweek. And somebody says this is not the time to debate this issue? It is not midnight. It is not in a smoke-filled room. The lights are not turned down. C-SPAN is on and the American public is watching and you darned well bet this is the right place and the right time to debate a critical issue that can mean the difference in whether we suffer the illusion or play the rhetorical game that says, ‘ain’t never happened before.’

The chairman of the Budget Committee has just submitted a long list of times for opening remarks on other sides with the budget resolution to produce major public policy. So it is the right time, the right place, the middle of the workweek; and we are doing the job of the American people, to debate this very critical and important issue.

I am always amazed when someone takes the coastal plain of Alaska, where today it might be 60 below and the wind may be 40 miles an hour, and calls it an Eden. That is not my vision of Eden. I am not suggesting it is not a rare place—it is. It is unique to the world, and we recognize that, and all of the environmental safeguards are in place. If we are allowed to go there and find oil and bring it to the lower 48, there will not be any damage to the environment. That is a fact for anybody who has been there.

Let us adjust the vision of Eden just a little bit. I don’t think we are allowed to interpret it every way every day.

My last thought is quite simply somebody said—I believe the Senator from Washington just said—it will not bring down the price of oil. It probably will not. What it might do is stop the price of oil from going up. I just paid $2.11 a gallon for regular gas in the District of Columbia. I drive a very efficient small car. It still costs me $25 to fuel it. I have the good fortune of having a pretty-good-paying job, but there are a lot of Americans who do not. Just keeping the price of oil down, not getting it up, would be a major victory for energy policy in this country. And it would fill the refinery at Anchorage that is now operating at 50-percentage capacity. It would provide the jobs in the State of Washington that the Senator from Alaska spoke to. That is the reality of what we are talking about today—getting our country back into the business of producing energy for every American. They have high-paying or low-paying jobs. We live on our energy and it is time we put our country back into full production. I strongly support the resolution.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on our side?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. There remains 19 minutes 50 seconds.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask the Chair to let me know when I have used 9 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAIG). The Senator will be notified.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on our side?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. There remains 19 minutes 50 seconds.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ms. MURKOWSKI, the time has expired on the Senator's time. The time is 1:43 p.m., the Senate is in recess until 5:00 p.m., at which time Senator Moinester of New York will be recognized for purposes of debate.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, let me thank the Senator from Alaska for those few moments to speak to what I believe and many of us believe to be a phenomenally important issue for the Senate to be addressing. Let me try to set the record straight.

I believe it is now the noon hour, in the middle of the day, The Sun is up. The lights are on in this Chamber of the Senate. We are in the middle of a workweek. And somebody says this is not the time to debate this issue? It is not midnight. It is not in a smoke-filled room. The lights are not turned down. C-SPAN is on and the American public is watching and you darned well bet this is the right place and the right time to debate a critical issue that can mean the difference in whether we suffer the illusion or play the rhetorical game that says, ‘ain’t never happened before.’

The chairman of the Budget Committee has just submitted a long list of times for opening remarks on other sides with the budget resolution to produce major public policy. So it is the right time, the right place, the middle of the workweek; and we are doing the job of the American people, to debate this very critical and important issue.

I am always amazed when someone takes the coastal plain of Alaska, where today it might be 60 below and the wind may be 40 miles an hour, and calls it an Eden. That is not my vision of Eden. I am not suggesting it is not a rare place—it is. It is unique to the world, and we recognize that, and all of the environmental safeguards are in place. If we are allowed to go there and find oil and bring it to the lower 48, there will not be any damage to the environment. That is a fact for anybody who has been there.

Let us adjust the vision of Eden just a little bit. I don’t think we are allowed to interpret it every way every day.

My last thought is quite simply somebody said—I believe the Senator from Washington just said—it will not bring down the price of oil. It probably will not. What it might do is stop the price of oil from going up. I just paid $2.11 a gallon for regular gas in the District of Columbia. I drive a very efficient small car. It still costs me $25 to fuel it. I have the good fortune of having a pretty-good-paying job, but there are a lot of Americans who do not. Just keeping the price of oil down, not getting it up, would be a major victory for energy policy in this country. And it would fill the refinery at Anchorage that is now operating at 50-percentage capacity. It would provide the jobs in the State of Washington that the Senator from Alaska spoke to. That is the reality of what we are talking about today—getting our country back into the business of producing energy for every American. They have high-paying or low-paying jobs. We live on our energy and it is time we put our country back into full production. I strongly support the resolution.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on our side?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. There remains 19 minutes 50 seconds.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask the Chair to let me know when I have used 9 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has yielded the balance of his time.
When I took these colleagues North with me 2 weeks ago, they were amazed at the environmental culture within the industry. It is not necessarily because the industry has said we should do it; it is because we in Alaska care, and we make sure you are going to do it right. If you are not going to do it right in our State, you are not welcome to do business. It is more expensive to do business in Alaska because we are a long way away, which sometimes makes it difficult. Part of it is we demand that you do it better.

Where does that put us? We are a nation reliant on oil. We are 58 percent reliant on foreign sources of oil. Oil just hit $56 a barrel, and we are 58 percent reliant on foreign sources.

We have an opportunity to make a difference in this country. I have had some of the opposition say, 'Who cares if we need foreign oil?' We are really talking about every single chin there. Let us take the median. Let us just assume for purposes of discussion there. Let us take the median. Let us take 20 percent of the Prudhoe fields, we were supplying 20 percent of the Prudhoe fields, we were delivering 1 million barrels of oil a day. At the height of the Prudhoe fields, we were delivering 8 million barrels of oil a day. If we just assume for purposes of discussion there. Let us take the median. Let us take 20 percent of the Prudhoe fields, we were delivering 1 million barrels of oil a day. At the height of the Prudhoe fields, we were delivering 100 million barrels of oil a day. It is enough fuel to replace all of our home in Washington State for 68 years. It can fuel every car in every home in Washington State for 68 years. It is enough fuel to run the State of Maryland for 100 years. It can fuel every car in every home in Washington State for 68 years. It is enough fuel to replace all of our imports from Saudi Arabia for 25 years to 25 years. It is enough fuel to double all of the oil taken out of Texas for the past 75 years. It is enough oil to save America from writing a $54 million check to OPEC every day at the current prices. Fifty-four million dollars is what we are writing to OPEC today. Actually, I think that number goes up because the price of oil has now bumped up to $56 a barrel.

The fact is, it is not just about increased domestic production. We need to have energy policy. We know we can’t drill our way out of it. We know we can’t conserve our way out of it. We know we have to work on balance, promote conservation, efficiency, developing alternatives, but it has to also include more domestic production to reduce our dependency on OPEC and other unstable regimes.

We have to do more. I used the phrase yesterday: We have to do more globally and act locally. Let us not export our issues overseas. Let us not be reliant on Russia, Columbia, Africa, or Venezuela. We need to recognize, though, if we park every single car in America today and say that is it, we are not going to do so reliant on oil, the fact is we would still need oil, whether it is for Band-Aids, CDs, or heart replacement valves. We use oil every day in our world. We need to do what we can at the domestic level to meet our energy needs to the fullest extent possible. ANWR offers us that opportunity.

Please give us in Alaska the chance to show you how we will continue to do it right for years to come. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator controls 8 minutes.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I yield the remainder of the time to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time is on the other side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The other side has 5 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Thank you, Mr. President.

(Ms. MURKOWSKI assumed the Chair.)

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, let me say to Senator STEVENS that it has been a pleasure working with him on this issue.

Some people have asked: Why don’t we just say, look, the people of Alaska? It is their energy, their livelihood. They live there. I had the pleasure of going up there and talking with them. I can tell the Senate without any doubt that the overwhelming majority—maybe 70 to 75 percent—of Alaskans wants this to be developed. And I mean, at a minimum, they have seen some development, they have seen the benefits of it, and they have assured themselves that it can be done in such a way that it will not harm the environment which they so much cherish and in which they live. They don’t want it to be destroyed.

Now, I want to talk about some comparables. Many ask—not that there is a direct relationship—why don’t we do it more in the States? I want to talk about what 1 million barrels of oil a day means compared to a renewable source of energy such as wind production. For those that say we ought to do more in renewables like wind, to make sure we do things in an environmentally sound way, here is the evidence. One million barrels of oil a day is the equivalent to 24,000 megawatts of powerplant production per day. That equals 24 powerplants, which in turn equals 92,500 windmills. The antecedents from ANWR would be the equivalent of 5,781 square miles of windmills, the combined size of the States of Rhode Island and Connecticut. And 70 percent of the surface of the State of Massachusetts would be covered with windmills in order to equal 1 million barrels a day in electric generating capacity.

I want to talk about a couple of things. First, how important this production is and that we proceed with it. The United States of America is in a predicament. Some people wonder whether this is serious. Indeed, it is. We do not know what to do and how to get out of our need for oil and oil products for America’s daily lives, for our economic well-being, and for our transportation needs. I don’t have an answer to that. We will all work hard to try to change that, but it will take many decades to change.

Some say we ought to conserve more and some say we need to conserve instead of producing this oil. I can only say we need to do everything. We are in such a crisis we have to conserve and we have to produce where we can, because right now the United States of America is absolutely vulnerable to the fact that we import oil from a dangerous and fragile world.

What happens if oil is denied America by unfriendly foreign countries? Would you believe that this big superpower called America will be brought to her knees? We talk about our future security. We will not be a world power if somebody decides to deny us oil. I regret to say we are there now—not 10 years from now, today. And it will only get worse.

Alaska, of course, is a State in our own country. This is not a foreign country. It is part of the United States. And we have by far the most promising site for onshore oil in the United States in this 1.5 million acres in the State of Alaska. You can call it what you want, but it says in the law that this 1022 area is open for exploration if Congress wants to so vote. That is what we are talking about here. We are not here to destroy anything. We are here to vote on the proposition that Congress originally set this 1.5 million acres aside for—to go and look for oil. The laws says Congress will make the decision. We are making the decision here today. Do we want to do that or not?

Let’s talk about the United States and what a predicament we are in. The American reserves of oil–reserves in all of our States, is 21.9 billion barrels. That is terrible. We are the 11th in the world for oil reserves. According to the estimate arrived at by the United States Geological Survey, the area at issue contains 10 billion barrels of oil. The USGS did a similar estimate for Prudhoe Bay but they underestimated it by 30 percent. But let’s just use their numbers, which I call low: 10 billion barrels. With the oil estimated from ANWR, America’s total reserves would be over 30 billion barrels of oil. That means this particular part of America contains one-third of the total reserves of oil of the United States of America.

Imagine saying we don’t need it. Opponents want us to do something else instead.

Senator Everett Dirksen used to say about dollars, a billion dollars here and a billion dollars there and pretty soon it adds up. I can say to Senators and those listening, as far as America’s energy future, a billion barrels here and a billion barrels there really adds up. And pretty soon it is terribly important to America’s future. That is the first point.
No one knows how to get off this dependence. We have to find ways to minimize the damage while we conserve, change our ways and go to hydrogen cars, but none of that will happen for a long time.

In the meantime, we send all our money overseas, to foreign countries. The distinguished junior Senator from Alaska was talking about how many dollars a day we send out. On a yearly basis this 1 million barrels adds $13.6 billion to the merchandise trade deficit; a trade deficit between us and the world. What we pay for foreign oil is almost 26 percent of the trade deficit. But it is not important, say some, that we increase our reserves by 10 billion barrels, which is adding one-third to our reserves for the future.

My second point has to do with the fact that some say this is not the right way to do it, that we should not be using a budget resolution. I said last night it happens to be that this Senator knows a little bit about budget resolutions. I know a little bit about reconciliation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask for 1 minute off the resolution.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. And I want to make sure our Senator, the senior Senator, speaks in wrap-up.

I close by saying there is no doubt in my mind that America must do something. This is an opportunity to do something very significant. We are not going to damage anything.

This is a picture of a production well. All of that is done off of ice roads. When we are finished, we take it away and you see the little speck is what remains, the end product of an exploratory well. You can go there and prove up the reserves and leave that speck in a 15,000-acre piece of America. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for 2 minutes off the resolution.

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

Mr. STEVENS. For the information of Senator KERRY, British Petroleum is currently investing over $500 million annually in Alaska and is drilling now over 100 new wells.

I hope my colleagues consider this amendment. What I really want to ask, finally, is to vote no. I have been fighting now for 24 years to get Congress to keep its word. In a fight such as this, the Senator really learns and realizes who his true friends are. I know those who vote against this amendment are doing so because it is the right thing to do for the country. But I count you among those of us from the World War II generation who understood that oil is ammunition and understand what it means to keep a promise. And I shall not forget it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 5 minutes remaining. The Republican side, voting in favor of the Cantwell amendment.

Ms. CANTWELL. As we close debate on the Cantwell amendment, which I hope my colleagues will support, I feel we have had a heartly discussion this morning about what America should do as it relates to the Arctic Wildlife Refuge but, more importantly, what we should also do about planning for America’s future.

I point out that today a Gallup poll was released that shows where the American people are. We may be very divided in the Senate, but the American public is consistent in its concern about and interest in conservation. In fact, Americans by a 2-to-1 margin say the United States should emphasize greater conservation over existing energy supplies, rather than production of oil, gas, coal, or other supplies.

Now, that is what the American public wants. That is certainly what people in the State of Washington want. The Puget Sound wants. The people in Puget Sound want. I say that because I think they are like many Americans in that they want to reduce CO2 emissions. They want to do something about global warming. They want to do something about diversifying our nation’s energy supply. We have great companies in my state that are adding to the Washington economy, and they want to diversify into various energy technologies that will help us in the future.

So, no, the majority of Washingtonians do not want to see drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. They want to see it protected. In fact, it is the one thing I think they feel most strongly about; that is, they want to lead the way on a new energy economy and show that we can have higher energy conservation plans moving.

But when it comes to gasoline prices, I think they are like every other American, they are darn concerned about the high gasoline prices in America and wonder why they are so high when four refineries were closed in the State of Washington. And for a market that was manipulated on electricity prices, and with very little help from the other side of the aisle in getting those market manipulation contracts voided, the Puget Sound economy remains concerned about why the price of gasoline, which is a commodity that is refined so close to home, is the highest price in the country.

Now, there is nothing in the budget resolution language that says that oil produced in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge will stay in the United States. That is right, no guarantee at all. The oil will be exported to other countries. So as the President’s economist has said, it will have negligible impact on the price of gasoline. To open up a wildlife refuge for a minimal amount of oil, that even the President’s economist says will have a negligible effect on price and supply, is an ill-considered plan.

My colleagues have already talked about the pollution and the environmental problems caused by drilling. But I want to point out, America does have a different future. I will work with my colleagues from Alaska on a proposal that is three times the job creation for us and for Alaska—the Alaska natural gas pipeline.

America was small enough, in the 1970s, to get off our dependence on home heating oil because we decided as a country we could not continue to be held hostage by Middle East oil policy. We had a 35-percent reduction in home heating oil use. It is time to do the same with gasoline, but not by producing more oil, but by changing and focusing on developing alternatives.

We can focus on building a pipeline to capture Alaska’s natural gas; it is the equivalent of 6 billion barrels of oil. We can focus on efficiency and renewables. We can focus on ethanol. We can focus on improvements in efficiency of transportation, of tires, and increasing the fuel efficiency of our cars, which some of the speakers on the other side, I should note, do not support a high automobile fuel efficiency standard. That would be a great way to reduce the need for 10 billion barrels of oil over the next 10 years, of saving and getting us off of our overdependence.

A young woman who came in to see us yesterday presented us with a tire gauge, and she showed us that if Americans had the right level of inflation in their car’s tires it could save over 200,000 barrels of oil a day. We have a choice about whether we are going to continue down this road of a fossil-fuel economy to the degree that we are going to say it is even worth it, it is even worth it to go into a wildlife refuge to find oil, or we are going to move our country forward on a new energy plan.

I encourage my colleagues to support the Cantwell amendment and strike this language from the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator SNOWE be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 35 minutes of debate on the
veterans amendments No. 171 by Senator ENSIGN and No. 149 by Senator AKAKA.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. AKAKA. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 10 minutes of time to make this statement about my amendment.

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

Mr. AKAKA. Madam President, the budget resolution fails veterans. It is that simple. I am pleased to stand with my colleagues who joined me in offering this veterans health care amendment to add $2.85 billion for VA health care.

Let me say that I agree with the President on the overall amount needed for VA health care. But we differ in where to get the funding. And I must say, I enjoy working with my friend, the chairman of the committee, Senator Specter, but I also believe legislation is needed more funding than it has. We are offering different amendments to try to reach that funding.

The President asks veterans to shoulder the burden with a higher copay for medications and a new user fee for middle-income veterans. And VA requires funding to absorb 39 percent increase since FY 2001, spending in the Veterans health care system increased 47 percent during this President’s tenure.

While funding has increased, it has been based on the efforts by Congress to constrain ourselves a little bit? In two of those years, 1998 and 1999, the Clinton administration said: “Let’s cut veterans. Congress said no. Let’s look at the other portion of the veterans budget called discretionary spending in the veterans care. In 2001, $21.07 billion, again, billions of dollars. What was happening during the Clinton years? In two of those years, 2001, $21.07 billion; 2005, $29.64 billion, a phenomenal increase, not millions, not hundreds of millions, but billions of dollars that the American taxpayer has committed to the quality care of veterans.

Here are the numbers: Medical care, 2001, $21.07 billion; 2005, $29.64 billion, a phenomenal increase, not millions, billions of dollars. What was happening during the Clinton years? In two of those years, 1998 and 1999, the Clinton administration said: “Let’s cut veterans. Congress said no. Bush said no. We said no. We plused up what our President offered us. This President’s budget is an increase. But we don’t like the level of increase or how he has arrived at the increase. So we are changing those numbers substantially.

But the bottom line still remains, how much is enough to sustain this quality, to assure the door remains open, to assure our veterans are served effectively? Do we turn money at it or, in a tight budget environment, do we constrain ourselves a little bit? Do we shape the issues? And in so doing, do we sustain levels of increase? Here is what has happened in the last 4 years, to assure that the numbers—a 43 percent increase. Probably no other area of the Federal Government has gone up that much outside of defense,
and it hasn’t, to my knowledge, gone up that much. But it does show a clear recognition on the part of Congress as to the importance of veterans to all of us.

If I may, for a few moments, I will break that there is utility of what we are doing because we recognize, as certainly the Senators from Hawaii and Washington, that there are needs out there and that those needs must be met. We recognized in the President’s budget that there were items we simply would not advance—copays, a non-starter. I was willing to look at fees for sevens and eights in certain categories with higher incomes. But collectively Congress says, at least on this side of the Rotunda, no to that also. I accept that.

Here is what I recognize and here is what the Ensign amendment does. The President pluses up the budget by $751 million. The chairman’s mark pluses it up again by $90 million. The Ensign-Craig amendment pluses it another $410 million, a net increase without reconciliation instructions. And that is very important. While that may be inside language for those of us who work the budget, it is very important. While that may be inside language for those of us who work the budget, it is very important.
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100,000 soldiers requiring mental health treatment when they come home. If we cannot care for the veterans who are already here, how will we take care of the veterans who will be returning in a few years?

I urge my colleagues to join me in sending veterans the right message. Our amendment will provide funds for VA staff so veterans who are waiting to file disability claims can be told that their case will be handled in a timely manner. When our troops return from battle, we should welcome them with the promise of opportunity, not the threat of poverty.

Senator Ensign’s amendment is a modest improvement over the President’s original budget. But as Senator Akaka has already stated, it still leaves the veterans short. It is time to reassess our priorities. A budget is more than a series of numbers on a page; it is the embodiment of our values. The President and everyone in this Chamber never hesitate to praise the service of our veterans and acknowledge the debt we owe them for their service, and I commend my colleagues and the President for that. But this budget does not reflect that praise or repay that debt. Neither does the budget resolution on the floor today.

Mr. Craig. Mr. President, I ask what time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 4 minutes. The minority has 6 minutes.

The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I commend my colleagues from Hawaii and Illinois for standing up for veterans in this country and for their passion for their States and the people they represent.

We are here this afternoon because veterans throughout our country are waiting for the health care they have been promised, and it is our responsibility to make sure it is delivered. They are facing understaffed and overcrowded VA hospitals. They are dealing with paperwork and red tape, and they are not getting the service we promised them when we sent them to fight for all of us.

Every day the system is getting more and more crowded and the waiting lists are growing longer, and this body has to do something about it. I have heard several claims from the other side, and I want to take a few minutes to refute a few of them.

They claim we are going to be raising taxes. I remind you there will be $65 billion in this budget for tax cuts when our amendment passes. I believe we have a responsibility in this country to make sure we keep the promise to our veterans, and that is why I believe our amendment is responsible in its funding mechanisms.

Second, we have heard our opponents say that veterans funding has gone up by 43 percent, so veterans do not need another dime. I remind my colleagues that the number of veterans in VA care has gone up by 88 percent at the same time that medical inflation has gone up 92 percent. Inflation has risen, the cost of care is rising, and the number of veterans is rising. Forty-three percent is commendable, but it does not meet the promise we made to our servicemen when we sent them overseas that we would care for them when they returned.

Another claim we have heard over and over again is that the VA is setting on $500 million. That does not stand with this Senator. I believe the VA officials here in Washington, DC, have a responsibility to get those funds out to our veterans across this country. They are in waiting lines. We see clinics that are not opening or are closing. Our veterans need the services and the care that the VA should be providing and they should be able to get that money and it should go out there.

We have also heard from our opponents that veterans funding has increased by $900 million. That is simply not true. We had printed in the Record last night the true cost, which is $80 million, far less than the $500 million we have heard on this floor.

Let me just say I know veterans organizations across this country—VFW, AMVETS, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Disabled American Veterans, American Legion, Vietnam Veterans—many other veterans organizations are watching us. They know there is a difference between the amendments offered on the Republican side and Democratic side. On the Republican side they are offering an additional $410 million; on our side, $2.85 billion—the difference between serving 68,000 additional veterans and 475,000 veterans; the difference between telling veterans, some of them, that they will be in a new waiting line that will get their service, and the ability for us to serve all of them.

Let me end my time today on this amendment by reminding all Senators what George Washington said back in 1789. I think it holds true today more than ever.

The willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, shall be directly proportional as to how they perceive the veterans of earlier wars were treated and appreciated by their country.

These words hold true today. Voting for our amendment on this side will assure that we show these veterans that we appreciate and support their service. It will send a message to the next generation of young men and women we are asking to serve that we keep the promise.

I appreciate the Senator from Idaho, the chairman of the Veterans’ Affairs Committee, for offering his amendment. But I say the veterans will know which amendment will make a difference in the lives of veterans across this country and I urge my colleagues to support the Akaka-Murray amendment.

Mr. Jeffords. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the Akaka-Murray amendment. This amendment by Senator Akaka and Senator Murray is a desperately needed funds to this budget for veterans health care. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this amendment.

The spending level in this budget for veterans health care defies logic. We are 2 years into a war. Yet, this budget fails to provide adequate resources for those who have served this country so valiantly. American servicemembers are wounded in Iraq each day. Thanks to new advances in battlefield medicine, more wounded soldiers than ever before live to return home. But in a greater percentage of cases, they come home with horrific wounds, both visible and invisible. The Department of Defense should be commended for keeping wounded soldiers in its medical system for longer periods of time and for shouldering a greater share of the costs. However, the long-term costs of health care and rehabilitation still fall heaviest on the Veterans Administration. This budget responsibly funds those wounded soldiers by using $16 billion over the next 5 years. This is simply not acceptable!

Over the past year, unprecedented numbers of National Guard and Reservists have been mobilized. When these Guard members and Reservists come off active duty, they are entitled to 2 years of access to the VA health care system. In my home State of Vermont, over 1400 National Guard members have been called to active duty. While I am incredibly proud of the White River Junction VA Hospital, which has done award-winning work in their field, even they cannot be expected to handle this new influx of veterans without additional funding. We owe it to both the veterans and the VA employees to provide them with the funding and services they require. The Akaka amendment would provide an additional $2.85 billion to the VA for just this mission.

A significant number of Iraq veterans have complex and long-term care issues. Improved body armor has saved many lives, but among the wounded, we now see a higher percentage of lost limbs and head injuries. These traumatic injuries have an emotional component to their care. It has been estimated that as many as one-third of all returning service members have some type of mental health needs. VA hospitals are working hard to ensure these needs are met immediately, before they develop into more serious manifestations such as post traumatic stress disorder. It has become increasingly clear that we need a better understanding of the emotional and mental health aspects of both the war and the treatment. In fact, we must increase VA research on mental health and post-traumatic stress disorder, research that is critical to both
the Department of Defense and veterans health care. The National Center on Post Traumatic Stress Disorder is doing excellent work along these lines, but a great deal remains to be done. We must pass the Akaka amendment if we hope to keep this score.

The Budget Committee thankfully removed two provisions from the President’s budget that have caused a great deal of concern among veterans. The President proposed to charge some veterans a $250 fee just to enroll in the VA health care system. The President also put forward an increase in the co-pay for prescription drugs from $7 to $15. I am pleased that the Budget Committee saw the error in both of these provisions, and cut them out of its budget.

Mr. President, it is critical that we pass the Akaka amendment. This should not be a partisan vote. Support for our troops is not a partisan matter. Taking care of their health care needs should not be a partisan issue either. If we cannot see this, then our mental issue of fairness, what can we agree on? For the sake of our veterans, and in honor of their service, I urge all my colleagues to support the Akaka amendment. We owe our veterans this, and much more.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Akaka amendment to increase funding for VA medical care.

When America is at war, there should be no greater priority than to sustain our brave men and women in uniform. And just as we owe a debt of gratitude to those brave men and women that are fighting to keep us safe in Iraq and Afghanistan and the far corners of the world, we owe that same debt to the veterans who served before them. We need to get behind our troops and our veterans, and use this budget to support them. Our veterans need to know that America is behind them, and behind them 100 percent.

As the former ranking member on the VA-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, I fought to add more than $1 billion to last year’s Presidential budget to make sure our veterans had the health care and benefits that they earned. Yet as Yogi Berra would say, we have deja vu all over again with this year’s budget resolution.

Once again the White House has sent us a budget that does not keep the promises we made to our veterans.

At a time when private insurance is failing and the cost of prescription drugs is skyrocketing, the VA’s 2006 budget request puts new toll charges and means tests on our veterans. It fails to fully cover the costs of medical inflation, and it cuts back on services for vulnerable veterans. And it fails to do enough to expand care for veterans returning from the Middle East—especially those with special mental health or prosthetics needs.

Specifically, the budget proposes four things. First, the budget proposes to keep the VA closed to Priority 8 veterans. These are veterans who are not disabled as a result of their service, whom the VA considers to be higher income.

Second, the budget proposes a new $250 enrollment fee for middle-income veterans in Priority Groups 7 and 8. This is the budget proposal to increase prescription drug copayments from $7 to $15 for these same veterans. These two measures have been twice rejected by Congress, yet the administration included them yet again in the 2006 budget.

Finally, the budget proposes to slash long-term care availability for veterans in Priority Groups 4 through 8 who are not “catastrophically disabled.” What does this mean? That means that VA won’t provide long-term institutional care for many veterans, even some who are below the poverty line or have serious medical conditions that are not service-connected. The VA budget shifts the cost of paying for long-term care to Medicaid and private insurance, leaving some of the most vulnerable veterans without a safety net.

More than 2 years ago, the VA health care system stopped accepting new Priority 8 veterans. Manufacturing is failing and our economy is faltering. And many of those affected are Priority 8 veterans. Many corporations involved in manufacturing had defined benefits plans that included health plans with guaranteed retiree coverage. For these veterans, VA health care is their last safety net, until they turn 65 and are eligible for Medicare.

Many of my colleagues have heard me talk about the plight of veterans who worked for the former Bethlehem Steel Corporation—in Maryland there are more than 10,000 Bethlehem Steel retirees alone. Their situation sums up the needs that too many of our Nation’s veterans face.

Many former Bethlehem steelworkers are Vietnam veterans. They came back from serving their country at war, and they continued to fight for America’s national and economic security by working in our steel mills. But now, many have lost their health insurance because of Bethlehem Steel’s bankruptcy. They are not eligible for Medicare yet. Under this budget, many will be turned away from VA—the safety net they counted on will not be there because VA will continue to shut out Priority 8 veterans. Bethlehem Steel’s veterans, and other veterans who worked in manufacturing or for other businesses that don’t offer health insurance, fought for their country and now they will have to fend for themselves. Yes on the open market health insurance. I am deeply concerned that this policy and many other potholes in VA’s budget leave our veterans paying toll charges, standing in lines, or without any health care at all.

In the last 3 years, the VA-HUD subcommittee has provided large increases for medical care—$1.3 billion in 2001, $1 billion in 2002, $2.4 billion in 2003, $3 billion in 2004, and $1.2 billion in 2005. We did this to honor our commitment to our veterans, to give them the health care and benefits they have earned on the battlefield. We did it because our veterans didn’t stand in waiting lines when they were called up to defend our country. So they shouldn’t have to stand in line to see a doctor, and they shouldn’t have to face toll charges to get the health care that is owned to them.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support our veterans in this budget by voting to support the Akaka amendment.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I rise in support of amendment No. 149 by Senators AKAKA and MURRAY and to praise them for their years of work on veterans issues.

This is a needed amendment because the budget resolution, as written, will break our promises to America’s veterans.

The budget resolution closely tracks an administration request that will do little to meet growing costs and will force the VA to continue to ration care.

I am angry that thousands of veterans are being turned away from the VA. This represents a fundamental breach of trust with our fighting men and women. Since January 2003 when the VA announced suspension of enrollment of new Priority 8 veterans, 192,000 veterans across the country and 2,000 Colorado veterans have sought VA care and been turned away. The administration’s new budget hopes to kick 1.1 million more so-called low-priority veterans out of the system next year with draconian cuts in service and increased fees.

The administration’s budget also would kick thousands of veterans out of nursing homes. It would limit the VA’s per diem reimbursement to State nursing homes to priority ones, two, and three. These heartless cuts could kick 80 percent of State nursing home residents out onto the street. Last week, I met with the administrator of a State nursing home in Walsenburg, CO. She told me that these cuts would force her to kick out 93 of her 100 residents. State administrators tell me that these cuts could force the entire system to go under. These are our most vulnerable veterans, who often have no place else to go.

Another problem is waiting periods. Administrative backlogs at the VA have been reduced, but there are still 332,000 veterans waiting for disability and pension claims to be processed. At the VA clinic in Grand Junction, there is a 400-person waiting list. That is a 4 to 5-month wait. Just last week I asked Secretary Nicholson to explain to me why numerous Coloradans are waiting to get their GI bill benefits, forcing them to miss tuition deadlines. This budget agreement will do little to cut these administrative backlogs.
Senator AKAKA’s amendment would go a long way to restoring needed funding and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this budget comes to Congress from the White House budget office, the one that is now operating under a constitutional fighting two wars. In Iraq and in Afghanistan, the young men and women of our Armed Forces are on the front lines, risking life and limb in service to our country.

These troops follow in a proud tradition that stretches back for generations. The troops who now serve in Baghdad or Kabul may well have fathers who served in Saigon or the Mekong Delta. The fathers of these fathers may have fought at Okinawa or Normandy, and their fathers might well have served in the second battle of the Marne. But no matter where these troops were sent to defend our country, no matter when they served our country, they all have earned the title, veteran.

Veterans have sacrificed for this country, but the budget proposed by the Bush Administration, and the budget resolution being debated on the floor of the Senate, forces more sacrifices on our veterans. This budget short-changes veterans health care by billions. This budget would force many veterans to pay $250 dollar annual enrollment fees. This budget would require veterans to pay more for prescription medications.

In fact, this budget is intended to drive so-called “low priority veterans” out of the VA health care system. The Department of Veterans Affairs budget documents foresee a 16 percent reduction in the number of “low priority veterans” that can receive care in VA hospitals.

What a shameful phrase that is: “low priority veteran.” There were no “low priority soldiers” during the Tet offensive. “Low priority sailors” at the battle of Midway. There were no “low priority Marines” at the battle of Fallujah.

But when these same soldiers, sailors, and Marines go to the VA hospital to get the health care they earned through serving our country in times of war, the Bush Administration is trying to give some of them the brush-off: “Go somewhere else,” this budget says to hundreds of thousands of veterans.

“You health care is a low priority for the U.S. Government.”

It is no wonder that the Disabled American Veterans call the Bush budget proposal “one of the most tight-fisted, miserly budgets for veterans programs in recent memory.”

I stand shoulder-to-shoulder with our nation’s leading veterans service organizations, as I have always stood with them, in calling for Congress to correct the President’s ill-considered budget proposal that underfunds veterans health care and raises fees for millions of so-called “low priority veterans.”

During markup of the budget resolution in the Budget Committee, I voted for an amendment offered by Senator MURRAY to increase spending on veterans health care by $2.85 billion in the next fiscal year. This amendment would have provided the funds necessary to reverse the administration’s policy on cutting access to VA health care by certain veterans. It is shameful that this amendment fell victim to a party line vote. Providing adequate funds to support our veterans should never be a partisan issue.

Mr. President, I am proud to once again support an amendment to add $2.85 billion to the veterans health care budget. I commend Senator AKAKA and Senator MURRAY for bringing this important amendment to the floor of the Senate. I stand with the veterans of West Virginia and the 49 other States of the Union in supporting these funds that are owed to those who have served our country in times of war, and I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I have 7 minutes remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CRAIG. Let me again thank all who participated in this debate. There are differences as to how we approach providing for our veterans. You see those differences embodied in part in the two amendments that are before us, either the Murray amendment or the Ensign amendment. I think it is important, though, that we do, for the record, provide some information to some of the statements. My colleague from Illinois is concerned, as we all are, about PTSD. The Ensign-Craig amendment would provide an additional $100 million that can be devoted to, of course, mental illness. It is of great concern to us as our veterans come home from Iraq, Afghanistan, possibly whole in body but not whole in mind. That is recognized both by the President, by the Veterans Administration, and us.

Another area that has not been mentioned is what is critically necessary for rural veterans who find themselves in an emergency environment and need to gain access to emergency rooms of the hospital and the community and not a veterans facility—we have $43 million in the budget to ensure that veterans who seek emergency care in non-veterans facilities are treated exactly the same as they would be as if they were in veterans facilities.

Let’s do the numbers. The Senator from Washington says the President’s numbers only include $80 million. That general revenue and the balance is in collections and that is real money and that is there all the time and that is in the budget and that is $751 million. You have to do all the math, all the time. That is what we are doing here to make sure the numbers are accurate.

So you take the $751 million in the President’s request, general fund revenue and collections, and you take the chairman’s mark of $40 million, and you take the Craig-Enzi amendment or Enzi-Craig amendment of $410 million and add it up and it is a 1.201 increase, health care, 3.7 percent increase over last year. It is not a tax cut. If you don’t enact it, it is a tax cut. Those cuts have already in place. This is the assurance of the continuum of those tax cuts. Take them out, it is a tax increase. It is a matter of semantics. It is also a matter of fact. What is being offered by the Senator from Washington, as she pluses up the veterans budget, is gained by tax increases.

Let me put it this way: Taxes that would be asked to be paid by working men and women, America’s workforce, America’s veterans, paying them now. They would pay them then. My suggestion is that is a tax increase.

Let me close with a couple of more analyses. We are mighty proud of what our President and what we have done over the last 4 years for the veterans of America and for the quality of health care and service delivery of the Veterans Administration. Here it is, a 43-percent increase. We have gone from $148.8 billion in 2001 to $698.8 billion in 2005, and we are now plusing that up into the $70-plus billion range, $71 billion. That is total spending.

Let us take a look at health care for a moment. There are substantial increases there. We increased health care when veterans were asking for it. They went from over 4 million vets into the services in 2001 to now almost 8 million vets, and we have an increase from $21 billion in 2001 to $29.6 billion. In doing so, America now says the veterans health care service is one of the finest health care delivery services in the country.

Hutchison amendment does exactly what most Senators would want to ask of us in relation to the care for our veterans. It is a responsible approach. It is clearly a defensible approach. We believe that we have approached it in the right manner to solidify and retain the consistency of quality, of improvement and access to the veterans health care system.

I believe all time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields the remainder of his time. The Senator from New Hampshire.
Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that prior to the vote which is about to occur on the amendment by Senator BYRD, there be 1 minute on both sides.

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

Mr. GREGG. I also ask that be applied to the next vote, which will be on ANWR.

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

The Senator from Mississippi.

AMENDMENT NO. 158

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Amtrak amendment and would use the 1-minute time I believe was just allocated. Is that appropriate parliamentary procedure at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have a long history of being supportive of Amtrak. I was chairman of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee when we passed the last reauthorization. I have the honor of serving there again this year. I am committed to trying to find a way to get a reauthorization and get a reliable stream of funds for Amtrak so its future can be certain and so this does not have to depend just on annual appropriations.

We are going to get that done. This puts the cart before the horse, before we get a reauthorization. We are going to deal with the issues with it. To make matters worse, the $1.2 billion, while it is significant, will just continue the drip, drip, drip of funds for Amtrak but yet not enough for them to do what they need to do in track improvements and capital improvements. I believe this is the wrong place to do this amendment.

Last but not least, it does it by raising unspecified taxes.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the Byrd amendment to restore funding to Amtrak—a critical mode of transportation in Illinois.

I want to emphasize that there are serious consequences with Amtrak operations. I do not support the restoration of Amtrak funding because I believe in a return to the status quo. I do believe, however, that the elimination of all funding, as the President has proposed, and as this budget resolution reflects, would lead Amtrak not to reform but to ruin.

A strong national rail system is not just a convenience for travelers. It also serves other important national objectives, such as ensuring multiple travel options, the event of regional or national emergency, reducing our heavy dependence on foreign oil, and improving air quality. In recent years, Amtrak has increased the number of trains it operates and has achieved a record level of ridership, with more than 25 million passengers using Amtrak last year.

In Illinois alone, more than 3 million people use the 50 daily Illinois trains, including business leaders traveling to and from smaller cities and towns; tourists who visit Illinois attractions, and students who attend world-class Illinois colleges and universities. Responding to calls for reform, Amtrak’s leadership has streamlined its operating costs, engaged in ongoing discussions to evaluate current policies and increase efficiency, and created a strategic plan for future improvements. The proposed cuts in Federal funds would cripple Amtrak beyond repair.

We cannot—and should not—allow that to occur. I urge my colleagues to support the Byrd amendment and restore Federal funding for Amtrak to this year’s budget.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I stand today to speak in support of Senator BYRD’s amendment to restore funding for Amtrak. The amendment would provide one-time funding for Amtrak by $200 million over last year’s level of $1.2 billion.

Starving Amtrak into bankruptcy may appear to be the quick and easy solution to the bleak picture that some have painted of America’s transportation system. Nonetheless I remain convinced that the simplest and most effective answer lies with the amendment before us. I join my esteemed colleague Senator BYRD to insist that we fully fund rail travel in this country and guarantee Amtrak the opportunity to secure its future in the 21st century.

In just over three decades, Amtrak has grown to encompass a passenger rail network that connects 46 States, including my home State of Vermont. Through the years Amtrak has stood resilient in the face of financial peril and today it carries 24 million passengers annually and employs 22,000 Americans.

Amtrak serves a diverse ridership that depends on the continued existence of safe and reliable transportation. Amtrak shuttles commuters to their jobs, brings college students to campus, and increases mobility for the elderly and the disabled. In urban areas, passenger rail relieves traffic on overcrowded highways. In rural States like Vermont, passenger rail ensures access to metropolitan centers and provides public transportation to regions where it might otherwise be too costly or unavailable.

As fuel prices remain unstable and our Nation’s highways and airports suffer ever-increasing congestion and delays, Amtrak offers an invaluable alternative upon which Americans have come to rely.

I think one of my Vermont constituents expressed this sentiment best in a letter I recently received. Colby Crehan of Burlington, Vermont wrote of her Amtrak trip across the United States: “I was able to travel safely and comfortably on a train while seeing the beautiful landscape that covers so much of this country. Amtrak introduced me to the American way that a car or plane trip could never do. These trips confirmed my feeling that train travel is the safest, most convenient and relaxing way to travel perhaps you can share my story.”

Our choice today is clear. We can forfeit our prior investments and the investments of State and local governments back home, or we can uphold our responsibility to ensure that passenger rail remains an integral part of our Nation’s transportation system. The future of passenger rail in this country belongs in the hands of Congress, not in the bankruptcy courts. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator BYRD and my other colleagues to offer this amendment, to repair a major flaw in the budget resolution. I was shocked when the President sent his budget here earlier this year, without a dime for intercity passenger rail. Not a dime. Not one red cent.

How could they possibly refuse to fund our passenger rail system, that carries 25 million passengers a year? What are they thinking? Where will those 25 million travelers go? Back onto our overcrowded highways? Should they take a place in the security lines in our airports?

We know what they are thinking, Mr. President. We have been told, in many public statements by the administration, that they intend to blackmail us in the Congress into accepting a plan to breakup Amtrak, in exchange for what the system needs to keep running.

Instead of fixing that problem, this resolution repeats the blackmail threat: breakup the system, or no funds.

No passenger rail system in the world operates without support. Almost no passenger rails system in the world operates on the low level of support inflicted on Amtrak over the years.

We have starved the system of one of its basic needs—capital. From the day we created it over 30 years ago, Amtrak has been put in the impossible position of trying to increase its ridership, to increase its own revenues, while we have refused to provide it with the resources needed to do the job.

Railroading is a classic capital-intensive industry. The huge costs for the right of way itself, which Amtrak owns all along the Northeast corridor, the costs of maintaining the locomotives and passenger cars—those are the costs that virtually every other advanced industrial economy in the world undertakes today.
They don’t do it out of nostalgia for the golden age of rail. They don’t do it because they lack other kinds of transportation. They do it because modern economies need a full mix of transportation options, a balanced system. They do it because it takes pressure off highway and airport systems, because passenger rail is clean and safe.

Here on the Senate floor, we are told: ‘Don’t worry, we aren’t serious. We didn’t mean it when we refused to put a dime in this budget for passenger rail.’

But the administration put it differently in its budget. They actually propose zeroing out Amtrak with the goal of causing a bankruptcy, which, and I quote, “would likely lead to the elimination of inefficient operations and reorganization of the railroad through bankruptcy procedures.”

That is their idea of reform. That is their idea of how to make transportation policy: Let a bankruptcy judge figure it out.

They are creating a crisis, and using the threat of bankruptcy to force changes on the system.

What is their plan? What do they propose?

First, they want to push more costs off onto the States. That is a theme we are seeing throughout the budget. It looks like saving money, but it simply shifts costs. Ask our mayors, ask our Governors what they think of the Federal Government shifting costs onto them. That is not a plan that will work.

They also want to break Amtrak up into capital and operating units. They tried something like that in Great Britain, and they regret it. Then they tried something like that in Great Britain, and their idea of reform. That is breaking up Amtrak as it struggles to improve. I am sure Senator BYRD feels the same way. But the $1.4 billion this amendment would provide would remove the threat of bankruptcy and keep the system running.

It is the only responsible answer to an irresponsible budget.

While I am speaking Mr. President, there is one other aspect of passenger rail I want to mention: security. In the aftermath of the tragic events of September 11, over 3 years ago. I came to the floor with an amendment to the $15 billion airline bailout and security spending bill. That amendment would have begun the process of raising security on our rails, just as we recognized the need to increase security on our airlines.

In deference to the emergency in the airline industry, I withdrew that amendment. In the years since, I have tried to work with Senators McCAIN, HOLLINGS, CARPER, SCHUMER, CLINTON, and others, to move legislation to upgrade rail security.

Over 3 years later, in the face of explicit warnings and evidence that terrorists are targeting passenger rail here in our country, a year after the tragic bombings in Madrid, we have done virtually nothing about Amtrak’s security needs.

It should be a scandal that this Congress and this administration have not even authorized, much less spent a dime for, a plan to secure our rail system.

More people pass through Penn Station in New York City than through La Guardia and JFK airports combined. Union Station, just two blocks from here, is the busiest site in Washington, DC, with 25 million people passing through.

Amtrak is expected to patrol those sites with only one officer in every ten cars. In Penn Station, only six to eight security guards patrol on weekdays. And they have the weekends off.

Whatever you think of passenger rail, it is uncontrollable to propose no money—zero, nothing—to increase the security of the 25 million Americans who ride Amtrak every year.

This amendment by itself will not take care of those security needs, but it will address the basic needs of passenger rail in our country. I urge my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDENTING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from West Virginia. Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, for fiscal year 2006, the President’s budget seeks the complete elimination of direct subsidies for Amtrak. The budget resolution preserves enactment of the budget proposals for transportation which would result in bankruptcy for Amtrak. My amendment, which has co-sponsors on both sides of the aisle, would increase Amtrak funding by $1.05 billion in fiscal year 2006.

If Senators really desire all Amtrak services to come to an immediate and guarantee bail for lack of a Federal subsidy in 2006, they will vote against the amendment. Across the Northeast corridor, the busiest urban transportation corridor in the Nation, elimination of Amtrak’s premier service would be a transportation disaster. Elimination of Amtrak service would have disastrous results in both rural and urban America.

The elimination of an Amtrak subsidy is not a recipe for a streamlined railroad; it is not a recipe for a more efficient railroad. It is a recipe for a dead railroad—dead, dead, dead railroad.

I urge Senators to vote for my amendment.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDENTING OFFICER. The question is now on agreeing to the Byrd amendment No. 158.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENTING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant journal clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENTING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 52, as follows:

(Recall Vote No. 51 Leg.)
The amendment (No. 158) was rejected.

The amendment (No. 168) was rejected.

Mr. CONRAD. May we have order in the Chamber.

The amendment (No. 168) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Cantwell amendment. We have an opportunity today to open a very tiny portion of Alaska’s coastal plain to exploration and opportunity. This is an opportunity for us to focus on energy security, economic security, and environmental security. The price of oil just jumped up to 56 bucks a barrel this morning. What we are talking about in terms of the security for domestic reserves is on average a million barrels of oil per day.

The other side has said it doesn’t mean much. Let me tell you what it means. It is enough fuel to run the State of Maryland for 100 years. It is enough fuel for every car and every home in Washington State for 68 years. It is enough fuel to replace all of our imports from Saudi Arabia for 25 years. It is enough fuel to double all of the oil taken out of east Texas in the past 75 years. This needs to be part of an overall energy policy.

I urge the Senate to oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. President, I urge Members to support the Cantwell amendment. It is clear what our options are today. We can continue this proposal to try to drill in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge, even though Congress previously has said let’s not do that and let’s preserve the wildlife. We know that the amount of oil generated, according to the President’s own economic advisers, will have a negligible impact on oil prices. Maybe that is because there is no guarantee that the revenue collected from this or the oil from the Arctic Wildlife Refuge will be kept in America. This oil will be exported, part of international markets, and do nothing to help us get our over-dependent country off this track and on to the right track.

I urge my colleagues to turn this argument down and to start on an energy future that is about renewables, about conservation, about new energy technologies.

Our legacy on this floor is not going to be a pipeline in Alaska but preserving a wildlife area and getting on with an energy future that America wants and needs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 168.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

YEA—49

Baucus  Baucus  Baucus  Baucus  Baucus  Baucus
Bayh   Bayh   Bayh   Bayh   Bayh   Bayh
Biden  Biden  Biden  Biden  Biden  Biden
Borum  Borum  Borum  Borum  Borum  Borum
Boxer  Boxer  Boxer  Boxer  Boxer  Boxer
Byrd   Byrd   Byrd   Byrd   Byrd   Byrd
Cardwell Cardwell Cardwell Cardwell Cardwell Cardwell
Carper  Carper  Carper  Carper  Carper  Carper
Chafee  Chafee  Chafee  Chafee  Chafee  Chafee
Clinton  Clinton  Clinton  Clinton  Clinton  Clinton
Coles  Coles  Coles  Coles  Coles  Coles
Collins  Collins  Collins  Collins  Collins  Collins
Conrad  Conrad  Conrad  Conrad  Conrad  Conrad
Conway  Conway  Conway  Conway  Conway  Conway
DeWine  DeWine  DeWine  DeWine  DeWine  DeWine
Dodd   Dodd   Dodd   Dodd   Dodd   Dodd

NAY—51

Akaka  Akaka  Akaka  Akaka  Akaka  Akaka
Alexander  Alexander  Alexander  Alexander  Alexander  Alexander
Allard  Allard  Allard  Allard  Allard  Allard
Allen  Allen  Allen  Allen  Allen  Allen
Allen  Allen  Allen  Allen  Allen  Allen
Baucus  Baucus  Baucus  Baucus  Baucus  Baucus
Bayh   Bayh   Bayh   Bayh   Bayh   Bayh
Biden  Biden  Biden  Biden  Biden  Biden
Borum  Borum  Borum  Borum  Borum  Borum
Boxer  Boxer  Boxer  Boxer  Boxer  Boxer
Byrd   Byrd   Byrd   Byrd   Byrd   Byrd
Cardwell Cardwell Cardwell Cardwell Cardwell Cardwell
Carper  Carper  Carper  Carper  Carper  Carper
Chafee  Chafee  Chafee  Chafee  Chafee  Chafee
Clinton  Clinton  Clinton  Clinton  Clinton  Clinton
Coles  Coles  Coles  Coles  Coles  Coles
Collins  Collins  Collins  Collins  Collins  Collins
Conrad  Conrad  Conrad  Conrad  Conrad  Conrad
Conway  Conway  Conway  Conway  Conway  Conway
DeWine  DeWine  DeWine  DeWine  DeWine  DeWine
Dodd   Dodd   Dodd   Dodd   Dodd   Dodd

The amendment (No. 168) was rejected.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. May we have order in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ISAACSON). The Senator will come to order.

The President from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, pursuant to the request of the Chair, I ask unanimous consent to offer. We are going to spend an hour on this section, which Senator FEINGOLD is going to move to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any one of the three applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “applicable time period” means any 1 of the 3 following periods:

(A) The first year covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget;

(B) The period of the first 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget;

(C) The period of the 5 fiscal years following the first 5 fiscal years covered in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To fully reinstate the pay-as-you-go requirement)

On page 57, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 408. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of Senate enforcement, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any one of the three applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “applicable time period” means any 1 of the 3 following periods:

(A) The first year covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget;

(B) The period of the first 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget;

(C) The period of the 5 fiscal years following the first 5 fiscal years covered in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) DIRECT-SPENDING LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2) the term “direct-spending legislation” means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending as defined below, and is interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(4) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms “direct-spending legislation” and “revenue legislation” do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget;

or

(B) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

(5) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this section shall—

(A) use the baseline surplus or deficit used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) PRIOR SURPLUS.—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget
deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with other direct spending and revenue legislation and since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that direct spending or revenue legislation that is in net deficit reduction enacted pursuant to reconciliation instructions since the beginning of that same calendar year shall not be available.

(c) APPEALS.—(1) In the Senate the appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) ANNUAL BUDGET RESOLUTION.—(1) For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of each budget resolution made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(e) SUNSET.—This section shall expire on September 30, 2010.

Mr. Feingold. Mr. President, I am pleased to offer this amendment with the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. Chafee, and a bipartisan group of other Senators. Our amendment is the same amendment we offered last year and that this body passed with bipartisan support. It simply would stipulate the pay-as-you-go rule that had been such an effective restraint on the fiscal appetites of both Congress and the White House.

Over the past 4 years, we have seen a dramatic deterioration in the Government’s ability to perform one of its most fundamental jobs, and that is balancing the Nation’s fiscal books. We are all familiar with the history. In January of 2001, the Congressional Budget Office projected that in 10 years thereafter, the Government would run a unified budget surplus of more than $5 trillion. Little more than 4 years later, we are now staring at almost a mirror image of that very positive 10-year projection, except that instead of healthy surpluses under any reasonable set of assumptions, we are now facing immense deficits and a backbreaking debt.

The answer is simple. We have to stop running deficits because they cause the Government to use the surpluses of the Social Security trust fund for other Government purposes rather than to pay down the debt and help our Nation prepare for the coming retirement of the baby boom generation. We have to stop running deficits because every dollar we add to the Federal debt is another dollar we are forcing our children to pay back in higher taxes or fewer Government benefits.

The amendment that the Government and this generation choose to spend on current consumption and then to accumulate debt for our children’s generation to pay, it does nothing less than rob our children of their own choices. We make our choices to spend on our wants, but we saddle our children and our grandchildren with the debts that they have to pay from tax dollars, their tax dollars, and their grandchildren’s tax dollars.

We all know that is not right. That is why I am offering this bipartisan amendment to fully reinstate the pay-as-you-go rule. We need a strong budget process. We need to exert fiscal discipline. Mr. President, I remember when the pay-go rule was in effect, tough fiscal discipline governed the budget process. Under the current approach, it is pretty much the opposite. It is the other way around. What happens now is that the annual budget resolution determines how much fiscal discipline we are willing to impose on ourselves. This just hasn’t worked. When Congress decides it would be nice to create a new entitlement or enact new tax cuts and then adjust its budget rules to permit those, you are really inviting a disastrous result, and that is just what we have seen happen.

As an example, if somebody wants to lose weight, you set the total number of calories you are allowed to consume each day, and that is how the meals fit under that cap—not the other way around. Imagine if you tried to lose weight by deciding what you want to eat first and then setting a calorie limit to accommodate your various cravings. If you are eating a cake, fine, you just dial up that calorie intake limit and you are all set. If you want a couple of extra beers, that is fine, too, under this kind of system: you just raise the calorie limit accordingly. It may taste pretty good at the time, but you will probably end up gaining weight, just like this Nation is racking up massive amounts of debt. The pay-as-you-go rule, if this were left intact, the pay-as-you-go rule that had been such an effective restraint on the fiscal appetites of both Congress and the White House.

When the Government and this generation choose to spend on current consumption and then to accumulate debt for our children’s generation to pay, it does nothing less than rob our children of their own choices. We make our choices to spend on our wants, but we saddle our children and our grandchildren with the debts that they have to pay from tax dollars, their tax dollars, and their grandchildren’s tax dollars.

We all know that is not right. That is why I am offering this bipartisan amendment to fully reinstate the pay-as-you-go rule. We need a strong budget process. We need to exert fiscal discipline. Mr. President, I remember when the pay-go rule was in effect, tough fiscal discipline governed the budget process. Under the current approach, it is pretty much the opposite. It is the other way around. What happens now is that the annual budget resolution determines how much fiscal discipline we are willing to impose on ourselves. This just hasn’t worked. When Congress decides it would be nice to create a new entitlement or enact new tax cuts and then adjust its budget rules to permit those, you are really inviting a disastrous result, and that is just what we have seen happen.

As an example, if somebody wants to lose weight, you set the total number of calories you are allowed to consume each day, and that is how the meals fit under that cap—not the other way around. Imagine if you tried to lose weight by deciding what you want to eat first and then setting a calorie limit to accommodate your various cravings. If you are eating a cake, fine, you just dial up that calorie intake limit and you are all set. If you want a couple of extra beers, that is fine, too, under this kind of system: you just raise the calorie limit accordingly. It may taste pretty good at the time, but you will probably end up gaining weight, just like this Nation is racking up massive amounts of debt. The pay-as-you-go rule, if this were left intact, the pay-as-you-go rule that had been such an effective restraint on the fiscal appetites of both Congress and the White House.

Let’s remember, that was not an era where one side had control of all the cit— the House and the Senate or the White House or the other side of the White House. The Senate had control of the White House. The Senate budget was passed, the President signed it, and we had a balanced budget. And when we had a balanced budget, we had to work together, and the only way we could work together was to work in a bipartisan way.

Mr. President, you remember when the pay-as-you-go rule was in effect, tough fiscal discipline governed the budget process. Under the current approach, it is pretty much the opposite. It is the other way around. What happens now is that the annual budget resolution determines how much fiscal discipline we are willing to impose on ourselves. This just hasn’t worked. When Congress decides it would be nice to create a new entitlement or enact new tax cuts and then adjust its budget rules to permit those, you are really inviting a disastrous result, and that is just what we have seen happen.

As an example, if somebody wants to lose weight, you set the total number of calories you are allowed to consume each day, and that is how the meals fit under that cap—not the other way around. Imagine if you tried to lose weight by deciding what you want to eat first and then setting a calorie limit to accommodate your various cravings. If you are eating a cake, fine, you just dial up that calorie intake limit and you are all set. If you want a couple of extra beers, that is fine, too, under this kind of system: you just raise the calorie limit accordingly. It may taste pretty good at the time, but you will probably end up gaining weight, just like this Nation is racking up massive amounts of debt. The pay-as-you-go rule, if this were left intact, the pay-as-you-go rule that had been such an effective restraint on the fiscal appetites of both Congress and the White House.

Let’s remember, that was not an era where one side had control of all the Government or the other side did. For most of the nineties, most of this time, we had a Democratic President and Republican control of both Houses, and we all agreed and we all worked together on the principle that the pay-go rules were helping us move toward the goal—in fact, the achievement—of having a balanced budget by the year 2000, by the time President Bush took office. Many of us here lived under that rule, and we know just how effective it was. If this budget does nothing else, it should reinstate the classic, the old pay-go rule. If we do that, maybe we can begin to turn these annual budgets around and stop racking up these deficits and adding to the already enormous Federal debt.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, time-tested fiscal discipline.

I reserve the remainder of my time. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields the floor to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask the Presiding Officer to let me know when I have spoken for 5 minutes. I would appreciate that.

This amendment should be opposed purely because there is a big difference between requiring offsets for spending increases and requiring offsets for tax cuts. They have dramatically different effects on economic growth. The goal here should be a strong private sector economy.

Let’s go back to basic principles. Money does not belong to the Government, so we should not be concerned about how much a particular policy “costs.” The Government, Money belongs to the people and when allowed to work in the private sector economy it can become a powerful engine for economic growth and job creation and a better standard of living and productivity for all Americans. And one more thing: it could really help the Federal Government because the more wealth that is produced, the more that is taxed, and the more revenues go to the Federal Government as taxes. So a growing, vibrant economy not only helps us all as individuals and families, it helps the Federal Government, too, because there is more economic growth and revenue and wealth to tax.

The key here is to keep economic growth going strong. We are also concerned about the size of the deficit, and that is why we have the so-called pay-as-you-go rule for spending. If we are going to raise spending in one area, what the budget says, and correctly so, in another area is we need to reduce it someplace else because we need to net it out at an even amount. We don’t want to go above the spending level in the budget that the President and the Budget Committee have set. That makes sense.

But with respect to tax cuts, what is the purpose of a tax cut? The purpose of a tax cut is to ensure that we can continue to sustain economic growth, to create jobs, basically, to provide more capital to be invested into businesses which can hire more people, can produce more goods, which can create more revenue. And again, what happens with that growing economy—revenue increases to the Treasury.

The purpose of the tax cuts is to keep all of that going.

Suppose you had a pay-go rule that said you have to “pay” for tax cuts by giving the Federal Government an equivalent amount of money that you are reducing as a result of the tax cuts; in other words, that somehow the money belongs to the Federal Government, and if you are going to let people keep more of their own money somehow this has to be made up to the Federal Government.

That makes no sense at all. That is basically robbing Peter to pay Paul by
taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another pocket—basically saying if we reduce taxes in the private sector in order to stimulate economic growth, somehow we have to go back in that private sector and pull an equivalent amount of money out to give to the Federal Government to make up the difference. It makes no sense at all.

All you have do in that case is reduce the amount of money in the private sector, producing revenue by reducing the amount that goes to the Federal Government in revenues. This has been demonstrated. As a matter of fact, since the tax cut of 2003, if you judge the year from 2003 to 2004 in the same period, we saw an increase in revenues to the Treasury from taxes of 10.5 percent compared to the same time in 2003. The aftertax revenues to the Government were more than before we cut the tax rates.

How could that be? In economic theory—knowing this to be true—take the case of capital gains taxes. Since both dividends and capital gains tax reductions are presumed to be included in this budget cut, we know that when the tax rates on capital gains were high, people didn’t sell their assets. They didn’t turn them over because they would have to pay a big tax. As soon as we reduced the tax rate on capital gains, it had an unlocking effect in the economy, and then people were willing to sell their assets because they did not have to pay nearly as much taxes on the gains.

Conversely, it is also true that the higher the rate, the less economic activity.

There was a direct relationship between reducing the taxes and increased revenue to the Treasury. The Nobel Prize economist, Dr. Edward Prescott, who teaches at Arizona State University, got his Nobel Prize for pointing out that it is true with respect to individual income tax rates. It is not true that the higher the income tax rate, the more revenue you bring in.

Suppose you had a 100-percent tax rate on your income. How many people would work? You are working the entire amount of time for the Federal Government. The highest possible income tax rate produces the least possible income tax revenue.

Instead, what you need is a rate at which people would feel they can continue to work and make enough money for themselves so it is worthwhile to continue to work. But at a certain point, you are taxing that next dollar earned at a point at which people will no longer work.

That is what has happened to the European economy. Their higher tax rates over there have resulted in less work, less productivity, less income to their treasury as a result of their taxes.

Pay-go works perfectly fine for the increase in spending that need to be offset, but it doesn’t work at all—in fact, it is counterproductive—with respect to reductions in taxes, which is what we are trying to preserve by the budget by the reconciliation construction.

I reserve the remainder of the time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Colorado who cosponsored this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I rise in support of the classic pay-go amendment and commend my colleagues, especially Senator FEINGOLD for his leadership on this issue.

We took the first step in opening one of the country’s most pristine areas for potential development. I would have preferred to have given my daughters Melinda and Andrea that choice to make in the future. Let me put it plainly. I do not want to let my daughters down again. When we pass budgets with enormous deficits, that is the same as taxing our children and our grandchildren. They will be taxed to pay for our spending. They will be taxed to pay for our unwillingness to say that enough is enough.

Our kids and grandkids don’t get to vote for the Senators and Congressmen who are imposing these future taxes on them. That is the failure of representation, and that is something the leaders of our War for Independence had some thought about. It is wrong and it is un-American to impose taxes on our children and our grandchildren to pay for the spending spree of the Federal Government. It is long past time to restore to Congress the same commonsense budgetary approach that every family in America has to live by. That approach is simple. If you can’t pay for it, don’t spend it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado who made an important connection between the last vote on the Alaska refuge and this amendment.

On the Alaska amendment, one side became frustrated, so they decided to change the rules. We are going to decide that instead of having 60 votes for a normal procedure on an energy bill, we will go with 51 votes using the budget process, which I think is inappropriate. They won. Now we see a different attempt to deal with the rules.

We had rules on paying in the 1990s that worked, and worked very well. Both parties came together. We balanced the budget.

When the rules get in the way, apparently, they do not want to have any rules, any procedure, any discipline when it comes to either mandatory spending or tax cuts. They want to make sure they achieve their objective, regardless of rules.

That is a serious problem. It is a serious problem for this institution, it is a serious problem for this country, and as the Senator from Colorado said so eloquently, it is going to be a serious problem for our kids and grandchildren who will be bound by the kind of decision we make about the Arctic Refuge. I don’t want to acquire this huge debt which this Congress is refusing to address.

This Congress, frankly, becoming openly hostile to the principle of fiscal discipline—openly hostile. I thank the Senator from Colorado very much for his remarks.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota and thank him for his great leadership on these issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. He has been the leader on pay-go and budget discipline that says no spending and no tax cuts. You can have them, but you have to pay for them. There is a novel idea around here. You have to pay for them.

Our colleague from Arizona indicated this concept—that if you cut taxes, you get more money. The only problem with that concept is it doesn’t work in the real world. It is a wonderful idea. I wish it were true. But it isn’t true.

Here is what happens with revenues as a percent of our national income. In 2000, we were getting 20.9 percent of gross domestic product in Federal revenue. We passed a series of tax cuts, and what happened to revenue? It plunged to the lowest end. That is what happened when we cut taxes. We got less revenue. The revenue side of the equation simply dropped out. That is why the deficits have exploded.

I can remember so well back in 2001 when the Congressional Budget Office told us the range of possible outcomes on the deficits was expressed by this chart, which I call the fan chart. This was what would happen on the low end of the forecast, and this is what would happen on the high end. They chose the midrange, as did the President, which told them we were going to get $5.6 trillion of surpluses over the period.

When I said to my Republican colleagues, let’s be not so sure of that, let’s not bet the farm on that, they assured me: Kent, you are being much too conservative. You don’t understand with the tax cuts we are putting in place we will get much more revenue? We are not going to be at the midpoint of the range, we will be above the midpoint of the range.

We can go back now and look at what actually happened. Here is what actually happened. Here is what actually happened. Here is what actually happened.

When I said to my Republican colleagues, let’s be not so sure of that, let’s not bet the farm on that, they assured me: Kent, you are being much too conservative. You don’t understand with the tax cuts we are putting in place we will get much more revenue? We are not going to be at the bottom of the range, we are below the bottom. Here is what happened in reality: we are way below the bottom.

All these tax cuts, what did they lead to? They led to less revenue and coupled with the increase in spending for defense and homeland security as a result of September 11, the deficits exploded.
Here is what has happened: our Republican colleagues, who used to be fiscally conservative, have now become borrow-and-spend advocates. They have no intention of doing anything about these budget deficits except add to them. But that policy has achieved: record budget deficits.

The question of pay-go, which is the budget discipline we had back in the 1980s and 1990s that helped us turn record deficits at that time into record surpluses, pay-go is a budget discipline that, in my judgment, is the overriding consideration here, because, as you point out, it’s been quite effective in actually stemming budget inefficiencies and expanding during a period that it was law.

Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan:

All I’m saying is that my general view is I would like to see the tax burden as low as possible. And in that context, I would like to see tax cuts. But, as I indicated earlier, that has got to be, in my judgment, in the context of a paygo resolution.

When further asked, the Chairman made clear a pay-go approach that applies to both spending and to taxes.

The pay-go ledger in the Senate GOP budget allows massive deficit increases. It allows a $33 billion increase from 2006 to 2010. It allows almost a $360 billion increase in deficits in the period 2010 to 2015.

Finally and in conclusion, the Republican budget before the Senate is advertised as cutting the deficit in half from 2006 to 2010. It allows almost a $260 billion increase in deficits in the period 2010 to 2015.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the chairman of the Finance Committee, the senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I rise in opposition to the Feingold amendment. I do that because I believe there is a great need for deficit reduction. Who can find fault with the objectives of Senator FEINGOLD’S amendment? Those objectives are good.

I am going to demonstrate that his proposal is not realistic. It also ignores the reality of the tax relief of the current law. It unwiseley ignores a bipartisan will to maintain current tax relief for millions of taxpayers. Without maintaining existing tax policy, if we would just let that expire, we would have the biggest tax increase in the history of the country without Congress acting. It seems to me if we are going to have the biggest tax increase in the history of the country, Congress ought to make the decision to do it.

I will talk about how the Senate Finance Committee approaches tax policy. We have used pay-go on taxes, but we do it outside of the budget. Two kinds of tax relief bills have come out of the Finance Committee in the last 4 years that are set aside as widely applicable tax relief. Those bills, if you take them together, and they were done under reconciliation, were bipartisan. I emphasize that because everyone around the country thinks everything is bipartisan. But these tax cuts were bipartisan and they were net tax cuts for virtually every American taxpayer. Those bills enacted in 2001 and 2003 did not contain offsets.

The secondary category of bills our committee works on would cover all other bills coming as part of our committee business. Those bills dealt with specific categories of tax relief. I will give some examples: A charitable giving tax bill, the bill to deal with exporters, a bill to deal with the Armed Forces tax relief for our folks in Iraq putting their lives on the line—there are many other examples of tax relief fully offset by our committee.

In a few rare cases, such as the energy tax relief, for example, bills were partially offset. Now, this pattern is applicable during my chairmanship of this committee, and it is fair for me to say there was a similar pattern occurring when my Democratic colleague and I were using pay-go. Senator Bentsen was chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

By and large, then, the Senate Finance Committee, when dealing with tax policy, has produced revenue-neutral bills. The exceptions occurred when there was bipartisan support for widely applicable tax relief. And I emphasize the word “bipartisan.”

By the way, had we not responded with that bipartisan tax relief, there would have been no widespread economic stimulus that resulted. In other words, the economic depression that set in with the NASDAQ losing half of its value in the year 2000, and then with the September 11 attack on New York City and the resulting downturn in the economy, we would not have had in place an economic stimulus to bring back economic growth to where we are now.

Chairman Greenspan said tax relief was responsible for the economic turnaround.

Also, we had the most recent Nobel economic prize winner tell us that our tax relief in 2001 and 2003 was not as big as it should have been to get the maximum economic stimulus. But we have had an economic turnaround justifying, without question, those tax relief packages.

So let me be clear. With tax policy outside the budget, the Finance Committee has, in effect, operated on a pay-go basis. The exceptions were built into the budget, and those exceptions have not been bipartisan.

I would like to challenge any of the critics of this budget to show the same record on the spending side. No, it seems like others want to spend. And all of these amendments that are being offered are adding up to proof that the same people who are against tax relief do not want to reduce the deficit. What they want to do is spend more money.

I could ever find from the other side how high taxes had to be, how high they had to be to satisfy their appetite to spend money. I might go that high, if I knew I never had to go any higher. But I cannot ever get any consensus about that. So the only conclusion you come to: taxes can never be high enough.

The other point is, I might be willing to vote for some increase in taxes if every dollar increase in taxes resulted in lower deficits. But, no, every time we raise $1 of taxes around here, it is a license to spend $1.10, $1.20, and sometimes more. So we need out of the other side the same concerns about spending.

The Feingold amendment is not realistic about current tax relief. Senator FEINGOLD’S amendment would undo the tax policy resources in the budget. Let me explain why. The budget’s tax cut number covers expiring tax relief. It extends all widely applicable tax relief. It includes it all. The number covers dividends and capital gains. It also covers, through the year 2010, provisions they say they support: tuition deduction, low-income savers credit, small business expensing. The number also covers for 1-year provisions critics say they support: business extenders such as R&D, sales tax deductions, the alternative minimum tax hold harmless.

The number includes offsets that will get us $20 to $30 billion. So we are talking about $70 billion net. I repeat, that is $7 billion a year. It covers a gross tax cut of $90 to $100 billion. The amendment covers all of the items that folks, particularly on the other side of the aisle, say they are for.
Now, critics cannot say they are for these items and not provide room in this budget for those tax cuts. You cannot have it both ways. So a vote for the Feingold amendment is a vote against expiring tax relief that a lot of these folks fought to pass.

Realistically, there is probably around $30 billion in offsets. Realistically, there is about $100 billion in costs. That is a realistic position. For instance, we have heard a lot about the alternative minimum tax. "When are you going to do something about taxes?" is a question from the other side. The cost of a 1-year hold harmless on the alternative minimum tax is $30 billion. That is $30 billion for AMT for 1 year alone. So don’t tell people back home you are for AMT relief if you vote for the Feingold amendment.

Let’s go through some of these other expiring tax relief provisions. Deduction for State and local sales tax: It is covered in the number in the budget. It is important for States such as Nevada, Washington, Florida, and South Dakota.

Mr. President, could I have more time?

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I yield the chairman of the Finance Committee another 5 minutes, if that is sufficient.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Thank you.

Mr. President, we have a savers credit, an incentive for low-income savers. It is covered in the budget number. Deduction for college tuition: It is covered in the budget number. Extension of research and development tax credit—it is important to lots of States—it is covered in the budget number. Extension of wind and alternative energy tax credit: It is covered in the budget. I know that is important to a lot of people, a lot of people who are critics of this budget.

So you cannot have it both ways. If you exclude room in the budget for tax relief, you cannot say you support that same tax relief. The two positions are not in sync. The budget resolution provides room for tax relief. So a vote for the Feingold amendment is a vote against expiring tax relief. You cannot have it both ways. Either you are for a budget that has a realistic plan to maintain current tax relief—and this budget has that realistic plan—or you are for the Feingold amendment, which means you are not serious—not serious—about maintaining current tax relief levels.

Now, the Feingold amendment is also a stealth tax increase. The premise of the Feingold amendment is that tax relief should be treated less favorably—less favorably—than spending. How can that be, you might ask? Well, here is the answer. Entitlement spending such as Social Security and Medicare and discretionary spending can grow under this regime of pay-go. Publicly held debt would not tell you that. Trutishly, much of the current law of tax relief expires, and in some cases tax relief, such as the AMT hold harmless, runs out after year-end. That is 9 million tax filers, mostly middle-income families, who are hit by the Feingold regime.

There is no comparable hit on the spending side. See the bias for tax increases, no bias against spending increases. Entitlement spending would continue to grow without limit under the Feingold amendment. So the Feingold amendment backstops runaway entitlement spending. Taxpayers are left out. Taxpaying taxpayers are left out of the Feingold regime. A vote for the Feingold amendment is a vote against status quo tax relief and a vote for status quo spending. That does not sound like evenhanded fiscal discipline to me.

So I urge a vote against the Feingold amendment because it is defective on these several points. And most importantly for me, as the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, it ignores the Finance Committee’s prudence and bipartisan guidelines. Democratic chairmanship and Republican chairmanship. It ignores the reality of current tax relief which is expiring. It contains a stealth tax increase on at least 9 million taxpayers who are going to be caught up in this tax regime. It creates a double standard by treating a dollar of out-of-control spending more favorably than a dollar of current tax relief.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleagues engaging in a debate on this amendment. But I have to say, how did something that both of these Senators, the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Iowa, supported vigorously in the 1990s suddenly become a Feingold regime? These are the pay-go rules of the 1990s. This is not some new scheme or new approach. These are the rules we had to work together on and used to balance the budget.

Both Senators suggest that this is going to prevent tax cuts. I ask them: How in the world, then, did we have the 1997 tax cut bill? If this regime, as they call it, prevents tax cuts, how did that happen? These rules were in place at that time.

These rules don’t prevent tax cuts. These rules just say, either you pay for them or you get 60 votes. Last year there were a number of middle class tax cuts I supported. They received something like over 90 votes. We didn’t prevent those tax cuts. They simply met a standard that was easily met of 60 votes.

The Senator from Iowa has mischaracterized this amendment grossly when he says it doesn’t affect spending. It is my amendment that puts some rules back on mandatory spending. It is my amendment that curbs mandatory spending. The reason why we had a $400-billion unfunded Medicare bill last year is because the current rules were in place rather than the amendment I have offered. This relates to spending as well as taxes.

The entire argument that somehow this isn’t evenhanded, that it only applies to taxes and not to spending is absolutely false. That might be why we have four or five Republican cosponsors because they would never support something that favors spending over tax cuts.

It is very troubling when we have a debate and the debate is not about what is actually before us. What is before us is rules that have worked before, rules that relate to spending and taxes and merely require us to be responsible.

I now very happily yield 15 minutes to my cosponsor, Senator Voinovich.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Voinovich-Feingold amendment to restore integrity to our current pay-go process.

These are not ordinary times and it is not a time for business as usual. The United States is the Nation in the world, and our trade deficit is the worst it has ever been. The U.S. dollar is weak, and too much of our debt is in the hands of other nations.

Just 2 weeks ago it was reported that the Japanese central bank was pulling their money out of dollars which sent a shiver of panic in the markets. Alan Greenspan and David Walker have signed modern-day Paul Reverses alerting us to the need to do something now before it is too late.

I recommend to my colleagues the pamphlet issued by the GAO entitled "21st Century Challenges, Reexamining the Base of the Federal Government." It is well worth reading.

This is the beginning of my second term in the Senate. One of the reasons Ohio sent me back here is because they know I am committed to something about balancing the budget and paying down debt, fundamental, sound Republican principles to which I have been committed throughout my career.

At this stage in my life, I am more worried than ever about the legacy that our country will leave our children and grandchildren. God has blessed my wife Janet and me with three living children and six grandchildren. My daughter Betsy is expecting her third child. What kind of world will they live in?

One thing I know is that it will be more competitive than ever before, and they will have to work harder and be smarter to maintain the standard of living to which Americans have become accustomed.

I am sure you are asking: What does this have to do with pay-go? It has everything to do with pay-go because pay-go is a tool which Congress can use to enforce fiscal responsibility. Without fiscal responsibility, without responsible stewardship of the public’s money, the gathering storm clouds of debt and deficit will darken more.

That is why I encourage my colleagues to do the right thing and support the amendment offered by Senator
FEINGOLD and me to restore integrity to the current pay-go process. According to CBO estimates, the national debt increased by $600 billion between 2003 and 2004 and will increase by at least the same amount before October 2005. This is a $1 trillion increase in Federal deficit in just 2 years.

Raising the debt limit has become an annual ritual. This chart shows where we are. It is interesting that some of the charts I have seen from some of my colleagues on my side of the aisle, all they show is that over the next 5 years we are going to bring down the deficit. But they never talk about the fact that our national debt is escalating up like a rocket. We are in trouble. Where is it going to end?

I am in favor of controlling spending. My votes in the Senate reflect that. This is a very tight budget when it comes to spending, and I support that. In fact, I commend Senator GREGG for producing the most fiscally responsible and balanced budget resolution I have seen in 7 years in the Senate. I would like to point out, with all due fairness to my colleague from Wisconsin, that the fact is, in that budget are provisions that were in the Truth in Budgeting Act that Senator Feingold and I introduced a week ago: Three-year discretionary spending caps; a new 60-vote point of order against legislation that would cost more than $5 billion in any 10-year period between 2015 and 2055; a 60-vote point of order against unfunded mandates—I particularly appreciate this provision because I worked very hard to get unfunded mandate relief passed when I was Governor of Ohio and active in the National Governors Association—a 60-vote point of order against legislating exceeding appropriations spending limits; a $234 billion cap on advance appropriations; limits on the use of emergency designations. All of these provisions were in the Voinovich-Feingold Truth in Budgeting Act. So we have those in the budget.

I only wish the budget resolution also forced us to make equally difficult choices about tax policy. None of us like to take tough votes on programs we believe in, but most of us are willing to cast the difficult vote if that is what it takes to get Federal spending under control.

I say to my colleagues, how can I or any of us do this tough vote on taxing by saying that we have and at the same time say to people who are complaining: Senator, you are saying you want to do something about the deficit, but at the same time you voted to extend tax reductions. How do you justify these two positions?

I was interested to hear the chairman of the Finance Committee indicate that we are going to deal with AMT. I would like to remind my colleagues that that is not in the budget. AMT will blow up on the floor of the Senate before the end of this year. And the allegation that the Feingold-Voinovich amendment is going to prevent us doing anything about AMT is poppycock. What it will require is that a budget point of order would be made against it. We would debate it, and if there are 60 votes to waive the point of order, that would go into effect.

Another point I know is going to be on the floor of the Senate where we are going to have to borrow money is in dealing with Medicare reimbursement. We all know that today Medicare reimbursement, if we don’t do anything will be reduced by 5 percent. None of us wanted that. Again, that will be brought to the floor of the Senate.

This amendment does not prevent that from happening. It says: Pay for it or, in the alternative, debate it on the floor and get 60 votes.

Last but not least, this budget sets out $50 billion for the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, doing things in Afghanistan. In my opinion, if you are realistic, it is not going to be enough. And we need to know what the cost of the war is going to be to the American people.

One other aspect I have to point out is that this is against a backdrop in which most experts agree that by 2050, Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid alone will consume 18 percent of our GDP, about the same amount of money we are spending today for all operations of Government combined. That is why folks should read David Walker’s pamphlet. It lays it out for us.

What does pay-go do? Pay-go forces us to stop and think before proposing legislation or amendments that will increase the deficit. Pay-go demonstrates the Senate is serious about reducing the deficit. Pay-go will provide a chance to stop and more carefully consider all alternatives before increasing spending or cutting taxes. Pay-go ensures that programs that will impose additional costs on our children and grandchildren must gain an overwhelming level of support.

Some of my colleagues wanted to ensure increased spending now or cut taxes now and hope that somehow the economy will save us or Congress will simply fix the problem. This would be a major mistake. Depending on the economy to save us from the impact of fiscal irresponsibility is like hoping that a hurricane misses your house.

Over the last 4 years, we have gone from having deficits to having surpluses and back to having deficits. This is what has happened on this chart. During this period of time, we were running surpluses. We came here and then in 2003 we started to come down. Here is where we are now. The predictions are that they could go that way or that way.

I think all of us who are conservative would have to say that we have to prepare for this hurricane that may hit us and not take the rosy picture that everything is going to be all right; just keep reducing taxes, everything is going to be fine. We are going to grow our way out of this problem. I remember that during the 1980s when we saw the deficit climb substantially, which required in 1991 and 1993 the fact that we had to raise taxes. Borrowing money to run the Government is the equivalent of a future tax increase for the American people.

I urge my colleagues to look at this from a fairness point of view, to eliminate from the budget resolution the $70 billion that we have put in there to exclude some of these taxes that are now in place. Let’s pay for them. Alan Green span, David Walker, and Pete Peterson have all said the reduction on capital gains, on dividends, has helped the economy. But they all say pay for it. If you can’t pay for it, let’s sit on the floor of the Senate, as we did last year when we debated whether we were going to continue the marriage penalty relief, the lower marginal rates, the refundable child tax credit. Why would I go into the situation where we are only going to need 51 votes to get the job done? I think it is not fair.

I appeal to the common sense of my colleagues in the Senate. Here is where we are. We are putting this money in our budget resolution, instructions to the Finance Committee, to say $70 billion, and you can extend these tax reductions. At the same time we are doing that, we are telling the American people that we are going to have a flat-funded budget.

My feeling is, let’s just clean it out of there. Take these extensions that everyone thinks are wonderful for the country, and let’s debate them. See if we can get 60 votes. If they are so good, they will get 60 votes. If they are not, we will pay for them. I just don’t understand how we can continue to go this way. I think we are living in a dream world. The deficit doesn’t want to grow. We are the highest debtor Nation in the world. Our trade deficit is one of the worst we have ever seen. Unless we start to understand the seriousness of the situation we have, we are in deep trouble.

Mr. President, I think we all care about our families. We have to think about our legacy. I am 68 years old and I am running out of time. I think this country is running out of time. It is up to our generation to leave a better legacy than what it appears we are going to be leaving. There has to be some Republican who says: George, I agree with you. Let’s do it.

If they vote for this amendment, they are simply saying we are not going to put the money in the budget resolution to give the instructions to the Finance Committee to go ahead and extend taxes up to $70 billion. What it will say is: Hey, guys, we are not going to do that. If we want to extend these, let’s bring them up and debate them and let’s either pay for them or waive the budget resolution and do it that way.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleague from
Wisconsin, Senator FEINGOLD, in supporting a real pay-as-you-go system in the fiscal year 2006 budget.

This amendment is about restoring fiscal common sense to the budget. It would require 60 votes for tax cuts and mandatory spending increases that increase the deficit.

The current budget proposes a flawed paygo rule that expires in 2008, even though this is supposed to be a 5-year budget. It includes exemptions and holes that effectively amount to a "pay-if-you’d-like" approach, not a bonafide paygo system.

What we’re proposing are sensible and responsible guidelines that will reduce the record red ink that we’ve accumulated in the past 5 years.

The Federal budget outlines not only revenue and spending, but more critically how the Federal Government ranks its programmatic priorities. This budget resolution reveals only a glimpse of the long-term fiscal outlook without telling Americans the hard truth about how tax cuts and spending run amok in Washington.

For example, the budget ignores large expenses such as the costs of military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan beyond September 2006, and long-term relief from the alternative minimum tax, which could affect 41 million taxpayers in 2012 if Congress does not act. These are imminent expenses that we would be remiss to omit from the budget. Yet the President excludes the costs from his budget blueprint.

And I haven’t even mentioned the upwards of $5 trillion in transitional costs over the next 20 years for the President’s Social Security plan.

With regard specifically to paygo in the Budget Committee markup, one of my colleagues noted that a paygo rule that applies only to spending is akin to two holes in the boat. And this is precisely the fiction that this Budget Resolution promotes.

If made permanent, the tax cuts of 2001 and 2003 will cost the Federal Government $11 trillion over the next 75 years. That’s more than three times the shortfall of Social Security over that period. But the President’s budget doesn’t paygo rules to these tax cuts.

Studies show that 25 percent of these tax cuts went to the wealthiest Americans, those with the top 1 percent annual income. According to the Congressional Budget Office, 74 percent of our budget deficits since 2001 have been caused by decreased revenues. Only 26 percent of decreased spending.

We ought to be honest with ourselves about this fact. In my view, a paygo system that ignores revenues is not a paygo system at all.

If the Senate is sincere about restoring fiscal discipline, then we ought to establish rules that say, “If your legislation is going to cost money, you’ve got to pay for it, or get 60 votes.”

I believe that this amendment poses a crucial question to this body: Do we recognize that decreased revenues increase the deficit? I, for one, will not turn a blind eye to the real budget picture.

If we are to balance the budget—as we did during the Clinton administration—we should not do so solely through draconian cuts in critical programs. This budget cuts back on programs for working Americans and local governments that cannot run budget deficits as the Federal Government can.

I do not believe that fiscal responsibility necessarily requires us to shift the financial burden to our towns, cities and States as this budget does through cuts to Medicaid and the Community Development Block Grants, to name just two. As a former mayor, I know the value of these programs in California and throughout the United States.

Tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans should not take precedence over the needs of law enforcement, our children, the elderly, and veterans. If my colleagues agree, then I ask that they join me in supporting this amendment. It is time to bring fiscal houses in order, and to do so, we ought to reinstate a true paygo rule.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of the amendment offered by my colleagues Senator SMITH and Senator BIDEN to strike the reconciliation instructions to the Finance Committee and replace them with a reserve fund for the Bipartisan Commission on Medicaid to undertake a comprehensive review of the Medicaid program and make recommendations to Congress within 1 year.

The Medicaid program provides essential medical services to low-income and uninsured children and their families, pregnant women, individuals with disabilities, and others. Last year, nearly 55 million Americans were enrolled in Medicaid, including more than 300,000 in Maine where one in five people receive health care services through MaineCare, my State’s Medicaid program.

Individuals who rely upon Medicaid-funded health services have no other option. Without Medicaid, they would join the ever growing ranks of the uninsured. The enrollment now numbers an all-time high of more than 45 million Americans who lacked health coverage at some point last year. These two groups represent a total of 100 million Americans who would have no health insurance were it not for Medicaid coverage which reaches just over half of them. And to the extent that the Federal Government reduces its support for Medicaid funding, the numbers of uninsured Americans will rise even more rapidly.

Medicaid is a critical part of our Nation’s health care system. It provides health coverage for people in the doctor’s office, rather than the emergency rooms, where care is more expensive. It also plays a crucial role in preventing health care costs for the uninsured from being shifted to the private sector, which in turn increases hospitals’ costs.

The economic downturn which state economies experienced several years ago, and from which many States are only now emerging, has continued to leave many families jobless and without health insurance, forcing them to turn to Medicaid. This has put an enormous strain on our already strapped with budget scarcities. Many States reduced Medicaid benefits last year and even more restricted Medicaid eligibility in an effort to satisfy their budgetary obligations.

As the Senate considers the budget resolution for fiscal year 2006, I believe that we must take a balanced approach that is fiscally responsible yet reflects our long-standing commitments to provide health care for many of the low-income and uninsured through the Medicaid program. Decisions on Medicaid funding involve issues of fairness and balance, and it is our responsibility to balance these concerns on both the spending and revenue sides of the ledger.

I believe in fiscal responsibility, and I believe that reducing the deficit is critical for our Nation’s fiscal health. We should not pass down a legacy of debt to our children. At the same time, we should do no less than to meet our obligations to our uninsured children and their families, senior citizens, and individuals with disabilities.

My home State of Maine is a relatively poor state which relies heavily on Medicaid matching funds. Maine’s Federal match is roughly 65 percent, compared to the national average of about 57 percent. That means that for every dollar in State funds spent on Medicaid, the State receives nearly $2 in Federal matching funds. Of the $7.7 billion spent on health care in Maine in 2004, $2 billion—26 percent—came from the MaineCare program. Of the $2 billion in Medicaid spending, nearly two-thirds, or $1.4 billion, came from Federal Medicaid dollars.

Maine has suffered disproportionately from a loss of manufacturing jobs—and the health insurance coverage that goes with them. Medicaid has helped cover those uninsured, allowing our overall rate of uninsurance in Maine to stay even or improve for those with income below 200 percent of the poverty level.

Medicaid is also an essential program for providing health services to children and other vulnerable populations. Children are nearly half—44 percent—of Maine’s Medicaid clients yet they require less than one quarter of the funding, clearly a very cost-effective use of our health care dollars. Children need access to health care, not just to school, and to do well in life, and Medicaid plays a key role in narrowing the “achievement gap.” Children who are...
in pain, or sick, are not able to pay attention and learn, and those with untreated illnesses can develop long-term disabilities, such as hearing impairments, that require expensive special education and make it harder for them to do well in school.

It is crucial that we continue to provide sufficient Federal funding for Medicaid, a program which has worked extremely well since it began providing care for some of our most vulnerable populations 40 years ago. That’s why I believe we must proceed cautiously before making significant changes that could damage the program.

As we debate the budget resolution and consider the instructions for spending cuts that the Finance Committee would be required to produce with Medicaid squarely in its sights—we must recognize that the Federal Government cannot simply abandon its responsibility to help states provide health care to our most vulnerable citizens. Affordable solutions for the financial sustainability of Medicaid will take time, expertise, and bipartisan consensus and are more appropriately the province of a bipartisan medicaid commission than a budget debate.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, how much time do I have left to speak?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 24 minutes 40 seconds. The Senator from Wisconsin has 14 minutes 20 seconds.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we have had this debate before. Here we go again. It is an important debate and we need to think very carefully about it. I certainly agree with Senator FIEGOLD and Senator VONNOCH that Congress has been spending money recklessly over the past few years. We need to restore fiscal discipline. Unfortunately, this amendment does very little to address that problem.

I cannot help but remember that during the late nineties and the early part of this century, we had a balanced budget. We actually had surpluses. How did that happen? There was some fiscal responsibility. We forced President Clinton to join us in a balanced budget amendment in 1997. But we also cut taxes in a way that encouraged growth in the economy. We grew bigger.

That is one thing you need to think about. The economy is showing growth. It was pretty fragile last year, but it continues to show positive signs in terms of production, and unemployment is at 5.4 percent. It should be headed the other way. More people are being hired. There are positives in the economy. I talked to the experts about how did that happen. Part of it happened because we did tax cuts where we let people keep more of their money instead of bringing it to this city and wasting it. We encouraged growth in the economy. We encouraged family values and the scientific research and development, we cut taxes on dividends. We took some actions that made a huge difference. That is how we had balanced budgets and surpluses.

But then, for a variety of reasons, we started spending more and more again. A variety of things happened. First, we got used to having surpluses, so we started spending money, whether we should or shouldn’t. We made commitments on Medicare and Medicaid that we should have made, and then the economy started going down. Then, we had 9/11 and we had all the extra spending for the defense of our country, to protect us against terrorists. We wasted a lot of it, in my opinion. But we are doing a better job and we are doing some things that had to be done. We are going to have to have to spend money to try to make America safe against terrorists.

But the combination of overspending in the beginning of the century, a falling economy in 2000 and 2001, and 9/11, has led us to the deficits we now have. One of the interesting things to me about this is that the focus is on, by the way, you cannot let people keep more of their money unless you cut spending. The focus should be on how we control spending. Year after year, this administration, previous administrations, and we have spent more and more and more. I will be glad when we get to the point where you cannot cut spending any more. What we need to do is to have the fiscal responsibility, but this is not the way to get it, in my opinion.

On the floor this week, there have been amendments offered on the budget—mostly by Democrats, with the complicity of some Republicans occasionally—to add $50 billion more in spending—just so far. By the time the smoke clears this week, there will be amendments that would add probably 200 billion or who knows how much more than what the President budgeted, which is a significant budget; $843 billion is not chicken feed. Then you add entitlements on top of that. So we have a problem.

Here is the real kicker. If we pass this amendment, this is really a tax increase. If we don’t have the ability to extend some of these tax cuts that we have had already paid for to the American people—if you ask the experts what would happen if we didn’t extend these tax cuts in these critical areas of capital gains and dividends, they would say: We are not worried about that. We have factored that into our economic thinking. You are going to have to do that.

Well, could we get 60 votes for it? Are we going to do that? Can we be assured we are going to get that accomplished? This would lead to tax increases of 70 billion on working Americans and families with children. That is why I cannot support it. You might say, well, I can go down the list and say one after another: Ohio, South Dakota, West Virginia, or Arkansas. Do you think we ought to do something about the AMT tax relief problem, the fact that 9 million Americans are being forced into higher tax brackets because of the AMT that we got into years ago?

Do my colleagues think we should not address that? Why, the Senator from Ohio would say, we are going to have to do that; why, absolutely we are going to do that, and we should do that.

Does this mean we should not have money for the tax extenders for such things as R&D tax credit, the work opportunity tax credit which helps busi-working Americans; or would I might be employed otherwise? Oh, no, everybody says, no, I am for that. Does this mean my colleagues do not want dollars for small business expensing, which is really a tax increase on small businesses? Who would think the people in Wisconsin make decisions on where the jobs are really being created. That is where the real entrepreneurial spirit is. But most people say: No, no, I want to encourage small business, so I would want to extend that.

What about capital gains and dividends? Well, I guess some people in the Senate might say: I do not want to do that; that is the middle income or upper income people. Tell that to the millions of Americans now who do receive dividends, and they are not wealthy Americans, either.

So if we do not extend these, the result is going to be we are going to have a tax increase on millions of these people. What about a devastating effect on the economic growth that we are encouraging. There would be fewer jobs and even more dependence on the Government.

We have watched for 40 years in my own State. Year after year we were one of the poorest States in the Nation. We thought we could spend our way out of poverty. We were not in debt because we had a constitutional amendment that said we could not do it. So we kept trying to spread money out to people, saying that if we keep supporting everybody—one-quarter of the entire population in my State is on Medicaid. Finally, a few years ago, we said, no, we are not able to spend our way out of being the poorest State in the Nation. We are going to have to take some aggressive action to have better quality education, better infrastructure. We are going to have to start getting us to work rather than to solicit jobs. We are going to have to have tax reform. We are going to have to cut taxes.

What has happened? We are creating jobs. We are not the poorest State in the Nation anymore. We are glad to give that title to another State, maybe South Dakota, West Virginia, or Arkansas. They can fight over that title.
We do not want it. We finally got up off our knees and said: We are tired of being poor. We want to grow the economy. We want our people to have an opportunity to get a good education, to have jobs, and to create jobs.

We have Nielsen, Textron, International Harvester, and FedEx in my State. Northrop Grumman has two different new plants in my State to build unmanned aerial vehicles. That is why Lockheed Martin, Boeing, and Eurocopter, and now the newest steel mill in America is in Mississippi, because we quit trying to spend our way out of poverty. We started trying to figure out ways to attract people and create wealth and allow people to make more money, have a decent paying job, and keep more of their own money. Yes, we cut taxes, and we started growing. Hallelujah. We also had tort reform to get these frivolous class action law suits against people being able to keep their money, and instead we want to force tax increases and spending cuts? I like the spending orgy that we have been involved in and begin to come down. By the way, everybody on the floor, we are all screaming and holier: Oh, my goodness, you do not mean agriculture, do you? Oh, wait, are you talking about some of our beloved education programs? No, we did not mean that. You do not have money for Amtrak, you do not have enough money for shipbuilding, you do not have enough this for highways.

Everybody ought to have to ante up a little bit. The problem is not tax cuts and tax relief for working Americans and families with children, the problem is we have the inordinate size of our insatiable appetite for spending.

By the way, I acknowledge that I am guilty. I have been a participant. I tried to get more of my fair share in Mississippi because for 155 years we did not get our fair share. Why did we not get it? Because we did not stand up and ask for it. We did not play on the national team.

This is not the way to go. Senator Gregg has provided leadership and courage. I have been speaking against things today and over the last 2 weeks. I support Amtrak. I am from an agriculture State. I want more highway money anywhere, anywhere, any way I can get it, but at some point we have to ask, how much is enough?

There is an amendment to add money for NIH. I have been a part of the Republican commitment over the past few years to double the spending for NIH, but now we are being told that is not enough, we need $2 billion. We need to sober up, and this resolution will help us do it. It is not going to be easy. We are going to have withdrawal pains, but we need to stop spending. We need to try to find some way to help reduce this deficit by encouraging growth in the economy.

I urge my colleagues, vote against this so-called pay-go provision, and let us go with this resolution the way it was written. The Finance Committee would have to come up with at least a billion probably in the next Congress, to cover dealing with these tax provisions. We would not really be getting anything for it in return.

Chairman Grassley tells us that if we want to coexist with this $30 billion, it would basically max us out because that is the bare minimum we need to prevent a tax increase on Americans without looking at what we need to have some growth in the economy and help working families in America.

This is a responsible budget that we have come up with. We should not put this provision in it. Let me understand this. We want to discourage tax cuts on working Americans, we have cut taxes on people who make over $400,000, people who have to pay the 15% tax for their raises over the next 5 years to cover dealing with these tax provisions. We would not really be getting anything for it in return.

The Senator from North Dakota knows we need to do this. He wants to do it. He has some help. We have to have some ‘followership’ and courage. Now is the time to do it. This amendment is not the way to do it. I thank my colleagues. I reserve the remainder of my time.
Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly against this amendment. Really, what we are looking at is a tax increase unless this budget resolution passes. In other words, what they are saying is we are either going to increase the deficit or we want to find further cuts—and, of course, our friends on the other side of the aisle continue to oppose reductions in the rate of increase of entitlement spending like Medicaid or Medicare—but at the same time they say, in essence, you have to pay for these tax cuts. What they mean by that is you have to raise taxes to do so.

While I hate deficits as much as the next person, this budget actually works to reduce the Federal deficit by half, over the next 5 years.

We are taking a constructive approach to reduction of the deficit.

But let me point out that over the last 21 months since the last tax cut, we have seen 3 million new jobs in this country. Frankly, what our opponents are suggesting is somehow we should raise taxes on the average American worker and kill the job creation that put America back to work.

Finally, in the short time we have, I want to speak briefly in support of an amendment that Senator Hutchison and Senator Gregg and others offered yesterday that would increase the number of Border Patrol agents to 1,000 per year for each of the next 5 years. Unlike some other amendments, this one is not a permanent tax cut or a permanent entitlement. It’s actually a way to increase our budget neutrality, to increase our security.

Our security in this country ought to be and ought to remain our highest priority.

The fact is, our borders are uncontrolled and porous. While we know our Border Patrol agents do their job in a highly professional way with what they have, the fact is, they are under-equipped and outnumbered. The fact is, our 2,000-mile southwestern border is open game for anyone who wants to try to come across, notwithstanding the good work that is being done. We have a lot more to do, but we are not there yet. We need the Border Patrol agents and the equipment to get it done.

The fact is, these porous borders not only admit people who want to come to the United States and work, people for whom I have a great deal of compassion and sympathy, and we need to find a way to deal with that in a realistic way and we will—but it also allows entry into this country of people who want to come here to kill us.

Deputy Homeland Security Secretary Admiral James Loy said it is no secret that al-Qaida and other enemies of this country are going to try to take advantage of our porous borders, our lack of personnel and equipment to protect our borders, to try to infiltrate this country and commit another heinous attack on civilians as we experienced on 9/11.

It is absolutely critical that the Federal Government live up to its responsibility and not foist upon State governments that happen to have large

...
borders, such as Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California—it is absolutely essential that the Federal Government live up to its responsibility.

Only by adequately funding Border Patrol personnel, and only by continuing to deal with the porous nature of our borders can we be assured that we are doing everything humanly possible to protect America and to keep us safe.

I yield the remainder of my time to the manager of the Senate side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, let me make a couple of comments, and then I think the other side will want to close the debate. I will reserve just a couple of minutes, if anyone else would like to speak on our side.

I think there is an important point that needs to be made. When we talk about pay-as-you-go outside the Senate people might wonder what in the heck that means. On the spending side, when we increase spending, that means we also have to find a way to offset that. We have to find a revenue source or we have to cut spending somewhere else. So this is the same. Just like in your household budget, you are going to spend money in one area, and you have to reduce the spending in another area so you can get back to even. That makes a lot of sense. But paying on the tax cut side is totally different.

Who pays to make up the lost revenue to the Federal Government? Taxpayers. So it is real easy for Senators to say, well, the taxpayers have to pay for it. But that is not right. It is their money. It is not ours. The Federal Government doesn’t own any of that money.

When we make a deliberate decision to reduce taxes, our point is to let people keep more of their own money. It is not to have some new rule come in here and say, but however much you let people keep, you have to take from them some other way because the Government needs all of that money.

We are talking about the budget deficit. According to the Congressional Budget Office, which is the entity that does the scoring around here, under the assumptions of this budget, the green line is the deficit. You see it going from 2005, 3.2 percent of our gross domestic product up to 2.8, 2.5, and 2.2 percent. In less than 5 years, we cut the budget deficit in half. Those are under the assumptions that these are the same rules we had back in the 1990s. That fact is, though, they didn’t work the same way. In the 1990s, Congress passed spending increases, and we also passed some tax cuts. The result of that under the rule was we were supposed to sequester or to spread those spending increases and tax cuts out over the remainder of the budget at the end of the year. But it turned out that at the end of each year we passed a bill that said forget about it, and the President signed it.

The fact is, while the rule was in place, we violated that rule. We cannot say this is the same rule we have had forever.

Second, my colleagues, particularly the chairman of the Finance Committee, made the point that there are a lot of things people on both sides of the aisle would like to accomplish this year that they will not be able to do if the Feingold amendment is agreed to.

We are not able to do the leasehold improvement depreciation, by the way, which is a great idea. The Senator from North Dakota sponsored the bill, S. 621, to make the 15-year leasehold improvements permanent. I cosponsored that bill.

We are not going to be able to accomplish that, if this pay-go rule is adopted.

There are other things we wouldn’t be able to do, such as the R&D tax cut. The President signed that into law. The cost of that is over 5 years. In fact, to extend the R&D tax credit for 1 year, just through 2006, is almost $7 billion.

There are simply not enough loopholes to close or revenue to generate in order to pay for that.

The small business spending, so-called section 179 spending, allows small businesses to elect to deduct all or part of the cost of certain qualifying property in the year that it is placed in service instead of over a specified recovery period. This immediate extension has been critical to supporting economic growth and job creation by small businesses. They will not be able to do it.

By the way, the cost of that is over $10 billion over 5 years.

The AMT relief we talked about before, there is enough within the budget to do some relief on AMT if we want to do it. Most of us would like to do that. We wouldn’t be able to do it under the pay-go rule.

The State sales tax deduction that the chairman of the Finance Committee mentioned, the line deduction for college tuition costs, the welfare-to-work and work opportunity tax credit—if you want to do those things this year, you have to vote against the Feingold pay-go amendment because we wouldn’t be able to do that.

My point is, it is important to keep the economic growth going by ensuring that we don’t suffer the worst tax increase in the history of this country, if we are going to continue some of these tax policies that all of us would like to see extended, we are not going to be able to do it if we adopt the Feingold amendment.

I encourage my colleagues to appreciate that every one of us wants to ensure that we have the smallest deficit possible. Under this budget and under the President’s budget, we are going to cut the deficit in half within 5 years.

The chair I showed a moment ago demonstrates that. Those are the budget figures. Those are not made up. Those are the CBO numbers.

As a result, if we stay on this path, we are going to achieve deficit reduction. Part of the reason for that is because we assume the tax cuts are permanent. We assume we continue to generate job creation, economic growth, more wealth in this country which, when taxed even at the lower rates than currently exist, produces more revenue.

I hope my colleagues will not get into this notion that somehow all of the money belongs to the Government and if we are ever going to give it back to the people, we have to have 60 votes to do that instead of a mere majority vote. The reason we let people keep more of their money in the way of tax cuts is because we understand not only is that the right thing to do, but it is the most important thing for the economy. We cannot have a rule around here that if you can make a tax cut, you always have to make the money up some other way, so you never can change the amount of taxes paid by the American public. We have put in place a rule that would be grossly unfair and, as I said, unwise in wanting more revenue to be collected by the Federal Government because a smaller economy produces less revenue to be taxed.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Feingold amendment.

I yield back any time that remains on this side.

Mr. FEINGOLD. First, let me ask Senator CARPER of Delaware be added as the 13th sponsor of this amendment.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, it is fallacious for the speaker to claim this pay-as-you-go rule prevents tax cuts. It is an absolute red herring. That is not what it does.

It says, if we are going to do additional tax cuts, either pay for it—and you do not have to pay for it through tax increases, you can pay for it with tax increases or spending cuts—or get 60 votes to allow it.
How can speaker after speaker come out and say this requirement of 60 votes to go beyond the budget is preventing a tax cut? That is not the fact of what has happened.

In 1997, under these very rules, significantly higher tax cuts were enacted. I correct the Senator from Arizona regarding his statement that the rule was different then. That is untrue. He was talking about the statute. This is the rule. It does not have sequestering. That was simply inaccurate.

Last year, when the question was, Do we continue the middle-class tax cuts, we voted on it, and I think it got 90 votes for the middle-class tax cuts, well over 90 votes over the 60-vote requirement. How can someone say a rule of 60 votes for tax cuts somehow prevents tax cuts.

The Senator from Mississippi talks about the need to deal with the alternative minimum tax. He is absolutely right. The Senator from North Dakota has pointed out that is critical for middle-income families. How many votes do you think that would get? Do you think it would be close? Do you think you would get 50 or 55 votes? That would get 90 or 100 votes.

There is no barrier whatever in this pay-go rule to tax cuts as long as you get enough votes or, better yet, if you pay for it.

What has happened in the leadership on the other side is they have become openly hostile to fiscal discipline; openly hostile to balancing the budget; openly hostile to anything that gets in the way of tax cuts regardless of what the consequences are for our budget and our economy. That is a sad moment. To paraphrase an old song, “where have all the deficit hawks gone.”

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the request by my friend from New Hampshire be ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the managers of the bill. What we have is: We are going to adhere strictly to these time limits.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the request by my friend from New Hampshire be modified that there be no second-degree amendments in order regarding the Feingold amendment and that all votes be 10 minutes after the first one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. GREGG. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 186 offered by the Senator from Wisconsin. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll. The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 53 Leg.]

**YEAS—50**

Akaka Durbin Mikulski
Baucus Feingold Murray
Bayh Feinstein Nelson (FL)
Biden Feinstein Neelie (NE)
Bingaman Inouye Obama
Boner Johnson Reed
Byrd Kennedy Reid
Cantwell Kerry Rockefeller
Chafee Kohl Salazar
Clinton Landrieu Sarbanes
Collins Lautenberg Schumer
Conrad Leahy Snowe
Corzine Levin Stabenow
Dayton Lieberman Stabenow
Dodd Lincoln Voinovich
Dorgan McCain Wyden

**NAYS—50**

Alexander DeWine Martinez
Allen Dole McConnell
Allen Domenici Markowski
Allen Enzi Roberts
Bennett Risch Santorum
Brownback Rumi Sessions
Bunning Graham Shelby
Burns Graeley Smith
Burr Gregg Speer
Chambliss Hagel Stevens
Colburn Hatch Sununu
Cochrans Hutchinson Talent
Coleman Inhofe Thomas
Corzine Isakson Thune
Craig Kyi Vitter
Crane Lott Warner
Croney Lucer

The amendment (No. 186) was rejected.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. ENSI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

**AMENDMENT NO. 171**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is 2 minutes of debate on the Ensign amendment.

The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, very simply, the amendment I have offered...
The amendment (No. 171) was agreed to.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 149) was rejected.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 149) was rejected.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 55 Leg.]
to 7:30 on a Wyden amendment on bargaining, followed by debate from 7:30 to 7:45 on a Harkin amendment on education, followed by debate from 7:45 to 8:05 on a Hutchison-Ensign amendment on Border Patrol, followed by debate from 8:05 to 8:20 on a Landrieu amendment on veterans.

Mr. CONRAD. National Guard.

Mr. GREGG. National Guard, followed by debate from 8:20 to 8:35 on a Santorum amendment on HIV, followed by debate from 8:35 to 8:50 on a Voinovich sense of the Senate on budgeting, and followed by debate from 8:50 to 9 o’clock on a Dorgan amendment on

Mr. CONRAD. Dorgan amendment on runaway plants.

Mr. GREGG. Dorgan amendment on runaway plants.

Mr. WYDEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREGG. For?

Mr. WYDEN. For a question.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that be the order of the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. GREGG. Yes.

Mr. WYDEN. I just heard in the cloakroom that the amendment that I am involved in is the Snowe-Wyden amendment dealing with bargaining power with respect to holding down the cost of prescription drugs.

Mr. GREGG. That is the amendment we are presuming the Senator is going to be offering.

Mr. WYDEN. If it would be clear so colleagues understand that my colleague from Maine is the lead author of this amendment and I am her partner on our side. It will be the Snowe-Wyden amendment.

Mr. GREGG. All right. I will identify that from 7 to 7:30 the Snowe-Wyden amendment on bargaining relative to Medicare will be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator’s request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. At the end of this time, we will determine whether we are going to vote on these amendments tonight. I certainly hope we will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I might object some other refinement, that we agree on a no second-degree amendment that we reached on the floor. That is the agreement we already made between us. Maybe that would give people some comfort.

Mr. GREGG. I think we have to see amendments first, but I presume there are going to be no second-degree amendments.

Mr. CONRAD. I think one thing we could say to people is, to make clear what we are trying to do between us, the managers. We are operating in some ways on faith here, faith of trust between us.

Mr. GREGG. There will be no second-degree amendments. We may have a side by side.

Mr. CONRAD. If I have a situation that requires a side by side, then the chairperson and I will work it out so we get a side by side.

Mr. GREGG. Right.

Mr. CONRAD. All right.

Mr. REID. Has the unanimous consent been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Has the unanimous consent request been approved by the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been approved by the Chair.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 173

Mr. SPECKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senators LINCOLN, TALENT, and CANTWELL as cosponsors of my amendment.

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

Mr. SPECKER. Mr. President, this amendment provides for an additional $1.5 billion for the National Institutes of Health. Unless this funding is provided, more than 400 applications will have to be rejected.

In 1972, President Nixon declared war on cancer, and we still have not made sufficient progress. In a budget of $2.6 trillion, $28 billion for NIH is not enough.

The amendment also adds $500 million to education which would bring education up to level funding from last year. The Subcommittee for Labor, Health, Human Services, and Education has taken a reduction of $2.2 billion. When you figure in inflation, it adds up to a cut of about $6, $7 billion. Virtually everybody in this Chamber, if not everybody, comes to the subcommittee with special requests for programs and for funding on matters relating to safety, worker safety, health, and education. This is minimal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time has expired.

Mr. SPECKER. I ask for your support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask Senators to oppose this amendment. It is something we would all like to do, of course, but we are in a budget crunch and it would make some small decisions on restraining the rate of growth. This is one of those places where we need to start. It is always nice to give away money, but $1.5 billion on a fund where we met our obligation to double it is not appropriate at this time.

On the education front, we have taken a look at all of the funding that is needed. Of course, there are a lot of things we would like to do. I appreciate the Senator from New Hampshire allowing us a $5 billion reserve for higher education reauthorization as well as some obligations in the budget process. This amendment uses a little different process than the rest of them. It is the first amendment we have had that balances out of account 290, which means there is no money in 920. It takes money from every other account and puts it in 920 so it can be used for this. So it would actually be stealing from every other priority you might have in the budget. I ask that Members vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 173.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 56 Leg.]

YEAS—63

Akaka     Dole     Milinkski
Baucus     Durbin     Nelson (Fl)
Bayh     Ferguson     Nelson (IN)
Benett    Feinstein     Obama
Biden     Hatch     Reed
Bingaman    Hatchen     Reid
Boxer     Inouye    Rockefeller
Byrd     Jeffords     Salazar
Carlise    Johnson     Santorum
Chafee    Kennedy     Sarbanes
Clintom    Kolb     Schumer
Collins    Landrieu     Shelby
Conrad     Lautenberg     Snowe
Corzine     Leahy     Specter
Crapo     Levin     Stembenow
Dayton     Lieberman     Stevens
DeWine     Lincoln     Talent
Dodd     Lugar     Thune
Wyden

NAYS—37

Alexander     Domenici     McCain
Allard     Enzi     McConnell
Bond     Brownback     Markowski
Brown    Bryant     Roberts
Burns    Grassley     Senates
Burr     Gregg     Smith
Chambliss    Hagel     Sununu
Coburn    Inhofe     Thomas
Coonan    Isakson     Vitter
Cornyn    Lott     Voinovich
Craig     Martinez     Warner
DeMint

The amendment (No. 173) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 294

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be a period of debate equally divided until 6:15 p.m. on the Smith amendment.

Who yields time?

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. We are in a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, we are not in a quorum call.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, if I could just alert colleagues, if we could hear from Senator LIEBERMAN’s office and Senator CLINTON’s office about their being able to discuss their amendments tonight, that would help us reach a conclusion on tonight’s activities.

I ask Senator GREGG if it would not be wise for us to alert colleagues with respect to votes tonight before we start on this hour of discussion?

Mr. GREGG. Should we go through the list?

Mr. CONRAD. Well, I think people know who is on the list. I have just asked Senator LIBERMAN’s and Senator CLINTON’s office to get in touch
with us if they are able to proceed tonight, which I think they are. With respect to votes, if we could alert colleagues as to that, I think that would be useful before this discussion starts.

Mr. GREGG. Certainly. It is our expectation that we will run through these amendments that everyone have very vigorous debate on all of them, hopefully add a couple of other amendments, Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator CLINTON, and on our side hopefully Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator ALLEN will speak on their amendments. As a result, we will not have any further votes this evening, but my colleagues can expect that we will have a large number of votes tomorrow and plan to be here for awhile voting.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, it is not easy for me to come to the Senate floor and propose an amendment that I know makes the budget more difficult for my budget chairman. It is not easy for me to oppose the President of the United States, Secretary Leavitt, Dr. McClellan, or all those in the administration who are grappling with a budgetary tsunami approaching our country related to entitlements. I am brought here as a matter of conviction, conscience, passion, on a matter that I hold as a principle, that in good times and bad, the people we do not abandon or put at risk are those who are most needy in our society.

Twelve years ago, I first won public office as an Oregon State senator. By chance, I was given a seat on the Senate Health Care and Bioethics Committee. I went into that role knowing little about medicine and many intricacies, knowing it only as a consumer and as a businessman trying to meet a payroll. I came to that committee at a time when Oregon was leading the country in many ways as a medical pioneer.

Oregonians are used to blazing new trails, and the Oregon trail, in the spirit of my State, led to the creation of the Oregon health plan. The basis of that was to take the Medicaid resources, plus State revenues which we raised, to provide for the needy, the disabled, the chronically ill, the children of working but uninsured, preventive health medicine, and the most medical care available for the dollars available in our society.

In the course of my service on that committee, I came to know quite a bit about Medicaid and about the plan that Oregon was developing. It has been with some consternation that I have watched, during the recent recession, Medicaid budgets all over this country pushed to extremes, and for that reason I was one of the Republicans on the Finance Committee last Congress to pre-condition my vote for tax relief with the requirement that we try to find Medicaid so that we do not now take the most vulnerable of our citizens, push them out of nursing homes, deny them the basic vaccines of preventive medicine, take the chronically ill and particularly the mentally ill whose lives are often imperiled at their own hands, and put them in a position where their only recourse is the emergency rooms of our hospitals, where the care might be well meaning but the outcome is often tragic. The costs incurred then are shifted on to the plans of private employers, further making it difficult to expand health care and provide for the uninsured. So we grow the uninsured population at the expense of the private sector.

I speak to this from personal experience—trying to meet a payroll that provides health care that is growing at unsustainable rates.

Now comes along a proposal in this budget from men I care for and admire, for whom I have deep personal affection, and I understand that Medicaid is a $300 billion annual bill. I understand that in the course of the next decade it is going to double. I also understand some States system I understand wealthy people transfer their assets to their kids so they can get $60,000 in Medicaid in a nursing home at our expense. I understand there are all kinds of abuses. I am committed to Medicaid reform. But what I am not prepared to do is to put the budget ahead of the policy, and that is what is going to happen if this budget contains this provision.

I already mentioned 60,000 Oregonians—Medicaid recipients under the Oregon health plan—already lost their coverage last year. Who are they? They are the most vulnerable Oregonians, with a few exceptions of those who de-fraud the system. They are people who have no other recourse. So when it comes to saying to this Senator, let us just close our eyes, hold our nose, and vote for this budget, it will be okay, there will be an agreement with the Governors, I have talked to the Governors, I am not in the minority on this issue among them than there is among us. Most of them do not know where they are going to go, except to push people into the ranks of the uninsured. What that means is private insurers, employers, will continue to withdraw health care coverage from employees. About 3 percent a year do that. And the Medicaid rolls will grow by 3 or 3.5 percent.

I have to say again publicly, I know President Bush’s heart, I know Governor Leavitt, I know Dr. McClellan. These are good men. I know they do not mean ill to these people. But I have no assurance that ill will not occur to these people.

Some say we are just slowing the rate of growth. I agree. We will get the reform. But I would rather do this right than do this fast. I believe, given that we have not had a serious Medicaid commission since its creation in 1965, that we ought to have one so that the policy determination on the budget is done.

I do not know where the $14 billion came from. But I know what it is going to mean: Another 60,000 Oregonians maybe losing health care, pressuring private plans, overwhelming emergency rooms.

I would rather let the policy determine the budget. I pled with my leader, with my colleagues, to create this commission, but take this number out of reconciliation. Put in there a number that puts pressure on the commission to do its job before our next budget cycle so we in the Finance Committee can respond quickly to the idea that they agree and can get working on this, making reforms that everyone can agree with. But I can’t in good conscience vote yes and watch what happens, because I have seen what happens.

I plead with my colleagues, Republican and Democrat alike, to do this right and not just fast. We can do it right. We can help to mitigate this entitlement tsunami, and we can weed out the waste, the fraud, the abuse, the gaming of Medicaid. But we can do it in ways to those who it is designed to serve. They are the elderly in nursing homes; they are the children of the working uninsured; they are the chronically ill, those too poor to deal with cancer, HIV/AIDS. They are the disabled.

I think if we are going to say Medicaid is off the table—I didn’t do that. They said Medicaid is off the table; no touching it. That is fine. Social Security is all in the fight here. So let’s go to the only thing that is left, and that is the most vulnerable Americans. I am simply saying: Not so fast and not in a way that will do real human damage to people who cannot fend for themselves.

What do I do with this commission? The commission consists of the following: It will consist of 23 members: One member appointed by the President; two House Members, current or former, appointed by the Speaker and minority leader; two Senators, current or former, appointed by the majority leader and minority leader; two Governors designated by the NGA; two legislators designated by NCSL; two State Medicaid directors designated by NASMD; two local elected officials appointed by NAfO; two consumer advocates appointed by congressional leadership; four providers appointed by congressional leadership; two program experts appointed by the Comptroller General. They will have, hopefully in this budget cycle with other budgetary pressures that are already reeling on Medicaid, all the impetus in the world to fix this program. But to include these people.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed a list I have of over 130 organizations that support the Smith-Bingaman amendment that are scratching their heads about what this means in human terms if we do not do this right.

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


Senator GORDON SMITH, U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Senator JEFF BINGAMAN, U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS SMITH AND BINGAMAN: We, the undersigned organizations, strongly endorse the Smith-Bingaman amendment to the Senate fiscal year 2006 Budget Resolution, which includes all Medicaid cuts. The elimination of such cuts is essential for the health care of Medicaid enrollees, the providers who serve them, and state and local governments.

We understand that the Senators’ amendment will include the creation of a bipartisan commission in lieu of all cuts to consider future efficient and effective operation of the Medicaid program. Medicaid is the essential source of health access for 53 million of our nation’s most vulnerable citizens, and any changes to the program should be driven by policy and not by arbitrary cuts.

Sincerely,


Senator GORDON SMITH, U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Senator JEFF BINGAMAN, U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS SMITH AND BINGAMAN: We, the undersigned organizations, strongly endorse the Smith-Bingaman amendment to the Senate fiscal year 2006 Budget Resolution, which includes all Medicaid cuts. The elimination of such cuts is essential for the health care of Medicaid enrollees, the providers who serve them, and state and local governments.

We understand that the Senators’ amendment will include the creation of a bipartisan commission in lieu of all cuts to consider future efficient and effective operation of the Medicaid program. Medicaid is the essential source of health access for 53 million of our nation’s most vulnerable citizens, and any changes to the program should be driven by policy and not by arbitrary cuts.

Sincerely,
coverage for a monthly average of 464,000 low-income seniors, children, families, and people with disabilities. Families, children, and pregnant women make up the largest group, 69 percent, but only capped at 22 percent of expenditures. The majority of expenditures, more than 78 percent, are for people who are elderly or have a disability.

As I said, let us measure twice and cut once. What we are proposing is simply a process to carefully consider an action of this magnitude before we are committed to it. With the commission, we stand a much better chance of doing the right thing, in the right way, with broad support.

Let us sit down at the table with all the stakeholders and together decide how to make Medicaid better.

We pride ourselves on being the world’s greatest deliberative body. Yet today and the one before it, the process that will substantially change and provide funding limitations impacting, as my colleague from Oregon said, the most vulnerable of Americans, the most vulnerable among us, and we are doing it in the kind of rigorous examination that this body should demand, should cry out for.

This amendment simply provides that kind of rigorous, vigorous examination—a year’s worth—saying step back for 1 year, then put together a process that allows us to do the examination, deliberation, allow the commission to hold public hearings, conduct examination, issue its report and recommendations to the President and to the Congress and the public.

Let us do Medicaid reform. We need to do it. We need to get rid of the gaming. We need to get rid of those who are abusing the system. We need to cut the waste, without fear. We do it in a way which ensures that any changes to Medicaid provide sustainability, promote access to health care, and doesn’t hurt those who need the program the most.

Let us look before we leap. We need to look at Medicaid to be sure we are on solid ground.

I appreciate the tough challenges the Budget Committee is facing. I have deep respect for Chairman Gregg. He has a great heart. He wants the program to work. The chairman’s mark is substantially better from where we began with this proposal.

Again, let us do the kind of review that needs to be done.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment and establish a Medicaid commission to study this proposal before we act.

I urge my colleagues to support this thoughtful amendment.

I yield to my colleague who is a co-author of the amendment, Senator Bingaman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen- ator from New Mexico is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 204

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for yielding. I send the amendment to the desk.
about how to reform and improve the Medicaid program. We are imposing cuts on Medicaid at twice the level the President proposed, as scored by CBO, with little more guidance than rhetoric about cutting “waste and fraud in the system.”

According to the Budget Committee staff document, “at least 34 States are estimated to be receiving up to $6 billion a year in Federal Medicaid dollars inappropriately.”

What States? I think we all deserve to know who they are and what they are doing before going to cut funding to them. In the Senate Finance Committee, a bipartisan group of Senators asked the Secretary for that list and we still do not have it. However, anybody that asks is being assured not to worry because their State is not the problem. How can we cut $15 billion to the States without it seriously impacting any State or any of the $3 million people served by Medicaid? Including the byrns circus elephant, donkey cannot pull off such a feat.

To get scored savings, the Finance Committee will be forced to make major cuts in funding to the States. Let me emphasize, no State is protected. Also, while some of the proposals have so little detail that we have no idea about the impact on individual States, we do know the budget assumes saving $1.5 billion by dropping the matching rate for targeted case management in Medicaid from the current matching rate to 50 percent Federal and 50 percent State. Again, there is nothing about reform here. It is simply about cutting Federal funding to States. And, in this case, we do know which States, and they are the poorest States in this country.

It may come as somewhat of a shock to some in the Senate, but the cuts would fall disproportionately on the 28 States—Florida, Montana, Arkansas, West Virginia, New Mexico, Utah, Idaho, Louisiana, Alabama, South Carolina, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Arizona, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Iowa, North Carolina, Indiana, Maine, Missouri, Oregon, Texas, Georgia, Kansas, Ohio, Nebraska, and Florida—President Bush carried 26 of these States, and those States have 34 Republican Senators and 13 Democratic Senators.

Simple mathematics tells us that will not fly in the Senate. So, two of the largest proposals for savings truly have nothing to do with Medicaid reform and one does not have enough details to allow CBO to provide scored savings and the other has enough detail that we know it will never be enacted.

So, what we have here are proposed Medicaid budget cuts in search of a policy. It is with that in mind that Senator SMITH and I come to the floor today to actually attempt to reform and improve the Medicaid program in a systematic way. Our proposal is to strike the arbitrary cuts in the budget before we and replace them with the establishment of a bipartisan medicaid commission.

Why a Commission? Just like Social Security, just like the 9/11 Commission which examined the intelligence system, and just like Medicare, we believe that Medicaid deserves a comprehensive and thorough examination of what is working and what is not by all stakeholders—federal officials, state and local government officials, providers, consumer representatives, and experts.

Medicaid is a very complicated program. In fact, it is not one program. It is really four programs. First, it is a program that provides health insurance for 25 million low-income children. Second, it provides a safety net of coverage to 14 million adults, primarily poor and elderly, that play by the rules and work but do not have access to or cannot afford health insurance.

Third, 42 percent of Medicaid spending is actually for what are known as “dual eligibles,” which are over 7 million elderly and disabled citizens that have both Medicare and Medicaid coverage. Therefore, Medicaid fills the holes in both Medicare and private insurance by providing acute and long-term care services that neither Medicare or the private sector is able or willing to cover.

And fourth, Medicaid serves as a critical payment system for our Nation’s safety net, including payments to disproportionate share hospitals and Medicare physician payments in rather indiscriminate ways. As a result, the Congress has come back in 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2003 to make what are known as “provider give-backs.”

The cumulative pages of legislation to correct the Medicare and Medicaid changes from 1997 now far exceed the original legislation, the problems continue and, in some cases, even grow. In fact, we have a crisis with Medicare physician payments that everybody acknowledges will now cost billions and billions of dollars to correct.

Unfortunately, these “fixes” are not reflected in this budget, and we all know that the Congress will have to address the problem. I fear the budget, as currently proposed, will create more problems that need fixing rather than correcting the current problems.

Therefore, Senator SMITH and I call for a process by which we can enact reforms to Medicaid but do it correctly, rationally, and in a bipartisan fashion. For example, we should ensure that people have more access to home- and community-based care in Medicaid. Doing so would allow safety net providers, consumer representatives, and local government officials, providers, and others to better and efficiently manage the program.

And, in doing so, let us ensure that the Congress will have to address the problem. I fear the budget, as currently proposed, will create more problems that need fixing rather than correcting the current problems.

Therefore, Senator SMITH and I call for a process by which we can enact reforms to Medicaid but do it correctly, rationally, and in a bipartisan fashion. For example, we should ensure that people have more access to home- and community-based care in Medicaid. Doing so would allow safety net providers, consumer representatives, and local government officials, providers, and others to better and efficiently manage the program.

And, in doing so, let us ensure that the Congress will have to address the problem. I fear the budget, as currently proposed, will create more problems that need fixing rather than correcting the current problems.

Therefore, Senator SMITH and I call for a process by which we can enact reforms to Medicaid but do it correctly, rationally, and in a bipartisan fashion. For example, we should ensure that people have more access to home- and community-based care in Medicaid. Doing so would allow safety net providers, consumer representatives, and local government officials, providers, and others to better and efficiently manage the program.

And, in doing so, let us ensure that the Congress will have to address the problem. I fear the budget, as currently proposed, will create more problems that need fixing rather than correcting the current problems.
First, Medicaid is far from broken. The cost per person in Medicaid rose just 4.5 percent from 2000 to 2004. That compares to just over 7 percent in Medicare and 12.6 percent in monthly premiums for employer-sponsored insurance. The conclusion is Medicaid seems to be about the most efficient health care program around, even more so than Medicare. The overall cost of Medicaid is going up largely, not because the program is inefficient, but because more and more people find themselves depending on this safety net program for their health care during a recession. While nearly 5 million people lost employer coverage between 2000 and 2003, Medicaid costs rose in Medicaid precisely because it is working—and working well—as our Nation’s safety net health program.

Consequently, Medicaid now provides care to nearly 53 million low-income Americans, including nearly one-quarter of all New Mexicans.

On the other hand, it is also not true that Medicaid is not in need of improvement. Secretary Leavitt is rightly concerned about certain State efforts to “maximize Medicaid revenues” via “enhanced payments” to certain institutional providers. Secretary Leavitt, in a speech to the World Health Care Congress on February 4, 2005, referred to State efforts to maximize Federal funding as “the seven harmful habits of Highly Desperate States.” As a result, he called for “an uncomfortable, but necessary, conversation” with our funding partners, the States.

I would agree. However, Medicaid cuts driven by a budget reconciliation process is not a dialogue or a conversation. It is a one-way mechanism for the Federal Government to impose budget cuts on the States. The administration’s budget calls for $60 billion in cuts to Medicaid over 10 years, including $34-40 billion that would directly harm the States.

Where is the conversation in that? In fact, I believe the States would have quite a lot to say to the Federal Government in such a conversation. While I do not speak for the National Governors’ Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, or the National Association of Counties, some of their grievances are rather obvious and I share them.

For one thing, cuts are merely a cost-shift to State and local governments that simply force State Medicaid programs to enact cuts in coverage to our Nation’s most vulnerable populations or require tax increases to make up for the loss of Federal funding. It is pretty simple. If the Federal Government cuts $15 billion out of Medicaid, New Mexico will likely lose over $100 million in Federal funding for Medicaid. Either some of our State’s most vulnerable citizens will lose coverage or benefits, or taxpayers will be asked to pay more. Governor Richardson is a pretty impressive guy, but he cannot magically produce the $100 million that the Federal Government would cut to our State under this budget proposal.

Second, as figures from the Kaiser Family Foundation indicate, 42 percent of the costs in Medicaid are a result of services for people who are also beneficiaries. These dual eligibles are also a major driver of health costs in Medicare and this is a prime example of where the Federal Government pushes costs on to Medicaid. Instead, better coordination between Medicare and Medicaid could improve both programs and delivery of care to “dual eligibles.” States have been calling for better coordination for years to no avail.

Third, for all the rhetoric about being concerned about what States are doing in drawing down Federal funding, we should acknowledge that the Federal Government passes the buck on to States in other ways. For example, in the Medicare prescription drug bill that was passed by the Congress in 2003, the President imposed what is referred to as a “clawback” mechanism which forces the states to help pay for the federally-passed Medicare prescription drug benefit. Although States were expected to derive a financial benefit from the prescription drug bill, they are now finding that it will cost them millions of dollars more annually through what is referred to as the “clawback provision” than if the bill had never passed.

Furthermore, when States had $5.8 billion in added enrollment of dual eligibles in Medicaid due to what they refer to as a “woodworking” effect on dual eligibles trying to sign up for the low-income drug benefit discovering they are also eligible for Medicaid benefits. CBO further estimated that States had $3.1 billion in new administrative and other costs added by the prescription drug legislation.

States have no ability to “have a conversation” with the Federal Government about the imposition of such costs on them, but they should and will have that ability in our bipartisan commission on Medicaid.

Furthermore, due to a recent rebenchmarking done by the Department of Commerce’s Bureau of Economic Affairs with respect to the calculation of per capita income in the States and the application of that data by the Centers for Medicaid Services, or CMS, the Medicaid Federal Medical Assistance Percentage, or FMAP, many States, including New Mexico, will see a rather dramatic decline in their Federal Medicaid matching percentage. In fact, due to the rebenchmarking and other factors, 29 States will lose Medicaid funding in 2006 by an amount of in excess of $800 million. Again, this occurred with no dialogue or conversation.

I agree with Secretary Leavitt that there should be a conversation among all the stakeholders about the future of Medicaid and about what are the fair division of responsibilities between the Federal Government, States, local governments, providers, and the over 50 million people served by Medicaid. It is for this reason that the bipartisan commission on Medicaid includes all of those stakeholders at the table to have a full discussion and debate about the future of Medicaid.

It is our intent that the recommendations would not only be focused on spending inefficiencies but about improving health care delivery outcomes. While the commission’s most vulnerable citizens. However, they are not mutually exclusive. In fact, both can and should be done.

Before closing, I thank Senator Smith for his leadership on this issue and the over 100 organizations—State and local governments, providers, and consumer groups that have endorsed this amendment. We have the attention and support of all these groups to come to the table and talk. Like Medicaid, we are efficient and effective in the delivery of care to our Nation’s most vulnerable citizens. We should not pass up that opportunity.

The policy needs to drive the budget. As Senator Smith said, and as Senator Coleman said, we cannot just take a figure out of the air and say we are going to cut Medicaid because we need to make up some money in the budget in order to get to the number that we predetermined we ought to get to. That kind of arbitrary cut in Medicaid, when we are doing nothing to constrain the growth of Medicare, when we are doing nothing to constrain the growth of spending in a lot of other areas, would be irresponsible. Exactly as Senator Smith pointed out, it is important that we do this right, that we do this fast.

This first chart I wanted to point to shows the States in red which are going to suffer these cuts. There is $4 billion proposed for cuts in these States that are depicted in red on this map. It turns out that most of those are the States that supported the President’s reelection in large numbers.

We have a couple of other charts which I very briefly would like to point out. One is a chart that points out that Medicaid is not the great inefficient program that everyone is pointing to. Medicaid has grown 4.5 percent per year the last few years. Medicare has grown over 7 percent. The private sector health care expenses have grown over 12 percent. There is enormous growth in Medicare of other areas and more people are depending on Medicaid. That is the simple point.

This last chart points out that 42 percent of the cost of Medicaid is because of the “dual eligibles.” These are people who are covered by Medicare, but Medicaid is having to pick up a substantial portion. We need to understand these programs better before we begin cutting them. The Senator from Oregon has provided a real service to us in the Senate by focusing attention on this. I hope my colleagues will support this amendment.
I yield the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I yield time to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I appreciate the help that Senators SMITH and BINGAMAN are showing with regard to Medicaid.

I rise today to speak in support of the pending bipartisan amendment offered by Senators SMITH and BINGAMAN to eliminate the $15 billion in cuts to the Medicaid program mandated under this resolution. Instead of letting the budget process drive Medicaid reform, this amendment directs the creation of a bipartisan Medicaid commission to investigate and consider possible improvements to the Medicaid program.

In other words, this amendment would ensure that policy drives Medicaid reform, not the arbitrary and unjustified cuts in this resolution.

Lauren Smith, Wyden, Murray, Johnson and I offered a successful amendment during markup of this resolution. The sense of the Senate we offered, which was agreed to unanimously by the Budget Committee and is a part of this resolution, states that the Finance Committee shall not achieve any savings under reconciliation that would cap Federal Medicaid spending, shift Medicaid costs to the States or providers, or undermine the Federal guarantee of Medicaid health insurance.

It simply is not possible to cut $15 billion from the Medicaid program without violating this agreement. Cutting $15 billion from Medicaid means taking $15 billion directly from the States. It means that States will be left with the tough choices of decreasing reimbursements to providers, eliminating services like prescription drugs and specialized services for the mentally retarded for families and elderly, eliminating Medicaid for these services, or raising taxes to preserve these services.

These cuts come at a time in which States are already struggling with the escalating costs of the Medicaid program. In 1985, 6 percent of State budgets went to Medicaid. Today, on average, 22 percent of States' budgets are spent on Medicaid. In New Jersey, fourteen percent of the State budget is spent on Medicaid. States are having to make wrenching choices about whether to cut critical health services for their most vulnerable or reducing funding for education programs.

What this resolution says to States and the 53 million children, pregnant women, elderly, and disabled who would be uninsured without Medicaid coverage is that they are simply going to have tough decisions. We are in tough budget times so you are going to have to choose between cutting health care for the most vulnerable.

I would like to share with my colleagues a couple of charts that demonstrate the tough choices that Chairman GREGG and the President are asking us to make. This first chart compares the $15 billion in Medicaid cuts that the Chairman has assumed to balance the budget along with the $204 billion cost of making the President's tax cuts for millionaires permanent. These are the tough choices we are serving for the health care for millions of poor Americans or handing out hundreds of millions in taxes to the wealthiest in our country—which this budget poses.

Frankly, I don't think this is a tough choice. It is an easy one. We must preserve access to health care for our Nation's most vulnerable and we must maintain our Federal obligation to the States to pay our fair share for these services.

I would like to point out that States are also facing massive costs as they work to transition their Medicaid beneficiaries who are dually eligible for Medicare into the new Medicare prescription drug benefit. States like New Jersey that have State pharmacy assistance programs and Medicaid eligible seniors will also have to bear significant new costs to ensure that these programs coordinate with the new Medicare drug benefit.

Not only are States going to have to bear enormous costs transitioning these beneficiaries, but if they choose to provide more generous benefits than offered under the Medicare law they will have to finance those benefits with State dollars. My State of New Jersey, which plans to wraparound the Medicare benefit to ensure that those on Medicaid have access to the prescription drugs they need, has estimated that the State will spend an additional $92 million in 2005 and 2006 to pay for these costs.

Now, under this resolution, New Jersey would lose $90 million a year in Federal Medicaid funding. How much more money is the Federal Government going to demand from the States? It is an abdication of our Federal responsibility to force these costs on the States.

I asked my State to tell me what kind of impact that a $90 million loss in Federal funding would have on New Jersey's Medicaid program. The Medicaid director in my State gave me two options: the State will either have to eliminate health insurance for more than 20,000 low-income children and pregnant women or it will have to consider “optional” beneficiaries because they earn just above 133 percent of the poverty level, which is $20,000 for a family of four. Or the State could eliminate so-called “optional” services, including dental care, pediatric and optometric care, hearing aid services, optical appliances, psychological services, hospice care, and medical day care for individuals with Alzheimer's and dementia. And of course, there is a third option—increasing taxes to maintain these services.

We simply can't address the underlying problem of escalating health care costs, which are driving up the costs of the Medicaid program, by asking States to cough up more money or by forcing them to eliminate critical services. We need meaningful, long-term solutions that will control health care costs across the board for Medicaid, as well as for Medicare and private insurance.

We need to change the fact that nationally 42 percent of Medicaid expenditures are spent on Medicare beneficiaries. This is because Medicare does not provide long-term care. So when we talk about a Medicaid crisis, what we really should talk about is the crisis in long-term care in this country. We are an aging population. As my generation retires, we will demand more long-term care services. Yet we have no long-term care system in this country. As it currently stands, the Medicaid program is our long-term care program.

The Smith-Bingaman amendment directs the creation of a bipartisan Medicaid commission to investigate these issues and to develop recommendations on how to decrease costs in the Medicaid program without burdening States or cutting services. A commission comprised of members of congress, governors, State Medicaid directors, and beneficiary advocates is necessary to develop real policies to strengthen Medicaid. It simply does not make sense to pull a number out of thin air like this resolution does. Policy should drive the numbers—not the other way around.

I urge all of my colleagues to adopt the sensible approach proposed by Senators SMITH and BINGAMAN. Let's understand that we can have a process of Medicaid reform driven by budgets without thinking through where that is going to come from. We heard our other colleague talk about where the burden of those cuts will fall.

I specifically asked what would happen if the proportionate deduction of cuts in New Jersey were to occur, which would be by the Senate's version about $90 million to the State, and the gross-up would be $180 million.

We are talking about Alzheimer's daycare for seniors. We are talking about hospice care. We are talking about basic dental, chiropractic care, hearing aids, and optical for our seniors.

It is impossible to understand how we want to take this hard cut without knowing the direction we are going to take.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the opponents has expired.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to support the intelligent and responsible approach that Senators SMITH and BINGAMAN proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I will discuss for a few minutes this amendment and the Medicaid Program in our country.

I am glad I had a chance to hear the Senator from Oregon and the Senators
from Minnesota, New Jersey, and New Mexico. Their amendment would direct the Finance Committee to reduce the growth of Medicaid spending by $14 billion over the next 5 years.

Before I say anything else, let me point out two cut—no cut—of any kind. Medicaid spending over the next 5 years will go up 41 percent if left alone. The Budget Committee recommends it go up 39 percent instead of 41 percent. Where I come from—out in the nation—that is a 39 percent increase in the amount of money.

The amendment also has a very good idea, which is to enact a commission to take a broad look at the Medicaid Program and report back to Congress in 1 year with its recommendations, which means in another year we might get around to doing something about it.

The Senator from Oregon talked about the tsunami coming. He is exactly right. He is talking about the tsunami in mandatory spending we have all been talking about and how important it is to get spending under control. If I may respectfully say, I believe his position could be fairly characterized as saying we heard the tsunami is coming; let’s wait around a year or two and not do one single solitary thing about it except appoint a commission to talk about something every Governor in States worries about. We have committees in this Congress that have studied this for years. We know some things to do. We know how to take a few steps to higher ground.

Let me put a little perspective on this, if I may, for a moment. I ask to be told when I have 10 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 20 minutes 46 seconds.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Let me make another point with another chart. This has to do with State government. I have a State perspective. Someone said, ‘Let the States act on their own.’

Mr. ALEXANDER. What I struggled with as Governor was how to keep Medicaid growth under control, to create centers of excellence, and pay good teachers more for teaching well, and have low taxes.

It was a fight every year. The red is the State spending in Medicaid. People here go, ‘Medicare and Medicaid confused, but Medicaid is a program, as earlier said, that helps many of our low-income Americans. It is administered by the State government, but it is funded, about 60 percent or so, by the Federal Government and run by the State government. The eligibility requirements are basically set up in Washington, and then you go down if you are the Governor and you have to run it according to what some Congressman decides you need to do. And then as you are running it and you make some decisions, the Federal courts come in and limit what you do.

So you have eligibility requirements saying the caseload is going up 40 percent over 5 years. That is what the Governors are dealing with. And the CPI, the Consumer Price Index, for health care is three times that of the normal CPI and Governors are left sitting there with Federal eligibility requirements, rising health care costs, and courts not allowing them to make some decisions, so they are stuck. I know that because I was a stuck Governor all during that time.

Let me point out what we are trying to say to do today. This is the amount of money we are going to spend on Medicaid from the Federal Government in the next 5 years, $1.1 trillion. This is the reduction in the growth of spending we are suggesting, $13.9 billion. We are suggesting instead of going up 41 percent, go up 39 percent.

That can be done. There are a few steps we know to do today to move to higher ground so we can do that while we are doing a full-fledged study of Medicare. But we cannot do it by repeating a litany of waste, fraud, and abuse, and better efficiency and flexibility. That will not cut it. We are going to have to change some laws here so Governors have more flexibility and so they would be able to do much as much with the decisions that elected officials are supposed to make.

Let me make a few suggestions. I can suggest four or five steps we can take now and we can move to higher ground in the next year or two and not do one single solitary thing about it except appoint a commission to talk about something every Governor in States worries about. We have committees in this Congress that have studied this for years. We know some things to do. We know how to take a few steps to higher ground.

The Senator from Oregon talked about the tsunami coming. He is exactly right. He is talking about the tsunami in mandatory spending we have all been talking about and how important it is to get spending under control. If I may respectfully say, I believe his position could be fairly characterized as saying we heard the tsunami is coming; let’s wait around a year or two and not do one single solitary thing about it except appoint a commission to talk about something every Governor in States worries about. We have committees in this Congress that have studied this for years. We know some things to do. We know how to take a few steps to higher ground.

Let me put a little perspective on this, if I may, for a moment. I ask to be told when I have 10 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 20 minutes 46 seconds.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Let me make another point with another chart. This has to do with State government. I have a State perspective. Someone said, ‘Let the States act on their own.’

Mr. ALEXANDER. What I struggled with as Governor was how to keep Medicaid growth under control, to create centers of excellence, and pay good teachers more for teaching well, and have low taxes.

It was a fight every year. The red is the State spending in Medicaid. People here go, ‘Medicare and Medicaid confused, but Medicaid is a program, as earlier said, that helps many of our low-income Americans. It is administered by the State government, but it is funded, about 60 percent or so, by the Federal Government and run by the State government. The eligibility requirements are basically set up in Washington, and then you go down if you are the Governor and you have to run it according to what some Congressman decides you need to do. And then as you are running it and you make some decisions, the Federal courts come in and limit what you do.

So you have eligibility requirements saying the caseload is going up 40 percent over 5 years. That is what the Governors are dealing with. And the CPI, the Consumer Price Index, for health care is three times that of the normal CPI and Governors are left sitting there with Federal eligibility requirements, rising health care costs, and courts not allowing them to make some decisions, so they are stuck. I know that because I was a stuck Governor all during that time.

Let me point out what we are trying to say to do today. This is the amount of money we are going to spend on Medicaid from the Federal Government in the next 5 years, $1.1 trillion. This is the reduction in the growth of spending we are suggesting, $13.9 billion. We are suggesting instead of going up 41 percent, go up 39 percent.

That can be done. There are a few steps we know to do today to move to higher ground so we can do that while
Medicaid and harder for courts and plaintiffs’ lawyers to do it. We should put term limits on the outdated consent decrees that keep Governors like the Democratic Governor of Tennessee from doing what he was elected to do. He would like to restrain the growth of Medicaid spending.

When I left the Governor's office, health care spending was 16 cents out of every State tax dollar, and education spending was 51 cents out of every State tax dollar, because of the growth of Medicaid spending in Tennessee, education is 40 cents out of every tax dollar, and health care is 26 cents out of every tax dollar, and going up.

We will not have great colleges and universities if we do not start today to restrain the growth of Medicaid spending. So I would respectfully suggest that a commission could be of some help. A commission could be of some help if we are serious about it, which I know its proposers are, but we are not going to be able to just move around the fringes. We are going to have to have a completely different view of health care in America. Then we are going to have to transform Medicaid. And along the way, we are going to have to do what is a relatively easy thing to do compared to the other two, Social Security.

Together, those unfunded liabilities, that mandatory spending is going to grow. This red on the chart is going to grow to make this a noncompetitive United States of America and drown our States in debt.

I suggest that it is correct that the tsunami is coming. I suggest that this budget that Chairman GREGG has worked on makes only modest steps in fiscal discipline. Yes, it reduces our deficit a little, but that is not what we are serious about it, which I know its proposers are, but we are not going to be able to just move around the fringes. We are going to have to have a completely different view of health care in America. Then we are going to have to transform Medicaid. And along the way, we are going to have to do what is a relatively easy thing to do compared to the other two, Social Security.

Together, those unfunded liabilities, that mandatory spending is going to grow. This red on the chart is going to grow to make this a noncompetitive United States of America and drown our States in debt.

I suggest that it is correct that the tsunami is coming. I suggest that this budget that Chairman GREGG has worked on makes only modest steps in fiscal discipline. Yes, it reduces our deficit a little, but that is not what we are serious about it, which I know its proposers are, but we are not going to be able to just move around the fringes. We are going to have to have a completely different view of health care in America. Then we are going to have to transform Medicaid. And along the way, we are going to have to do what is a relatively easy thing to do compared to the other two, Social Security.

First, the Medicaid drug payment system is in significant need of reform. The average wholesale price system clearly overpays for drugs. Just as we took the average wholesale price out of Medicare in the Medicare bill 2 years ago, it seems to me we can and must clean up this payment system in Medicaid.

AWP, average wholesale price, is a flawed system, and we all know it. AWP is more known today as “Ain’t What’s Paid,” instead of what it really means to say, “Average Wholesale Price.”

Capturing savings by making this commonsense improvement is not inconsistent with a commission. While there is much that we can learn from a commission, we do not need a commission to tell us that the average wholesale price system of paying for drugs is flawed.

A recent General Accounting Office study showed that the best price system, a sale price system, also significantly flawed. If States are not getting the best price, it costs both the Federal Government and the State governments.

There is another Medicaid problem that we know about, and that is a proposal to crack down on the schemes that are currently legal whereby seniors divest themselves of their assets in order to qualify for Medicaid.

Mr. President, there is a virtual cottage industry that instructs seniors on how to give away their homes, properties, cars, and other assets in order for them to qualify for Medicaid. Surely, no one would agree this is in the best interest of the Medicaid Program, and surely you don’t need a commission to tell us this.

The President has rightly put on the table new regulations that will govern asset transfers that allow a senior to go on Medicaid for long-term care. This commonsense proposal, as well, is not one that we need a commission to make, but we could immediately save dollars so States can continue to spend the money on those who cannot afford care, as opposed to spending money on

Mr. GRASSLEY. Ten minutes, please.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eleven minutes 20 seconds.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I probably will not use the full 10 minutes.

Mr. President, I have the utmost respect for the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New Mexico. They are both members of the committee I chair. They are contributing members, very serious members of the Committee on Finance.

They are people who care deeply about providing health care coverage for our most vulnerable citizens.

I have listened with interest as my friend from Oregon talked with great passion about providing mental health services for these fragile individuals receiving public health services.

I share the commitment of the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New Mexico to providing the necessary care to individuals with disabilities, our senior citizens, and mothers and their children.

And yet, knowing all this, I also have a concern that if their amendment passes, we will fail to enact meaningful improvements to the Medicaid system. If we fail to do that, we could ultimately end up hurting the very same individuals for whom we show so much concern.

I understand that the key feature of the Smith-Bingaman amendment would create a bipartisan Medicaid commission. I have said for a while there needs to be a common language associated with Medicaid reform. Republicans and Democrats alike do not agree even on what the word “reform” means when it is applied to Medicaid. Some believe it means curtailing costs. Others believe it means expanding coverage. A Medicaid commission could help bring us together in developing common themes and ideas of needed reforms.

However, the need to make some critical changes to Medicaid that would capture savings over the next few years and the creation of this commission are not mutually exclusive. We could do both.

If we simply let the program function in the way that it has been over the next few years, States will continue to be squeezed and will have no choice but to begin curtailing services for the elderly and the disabled. To some extent that has been happening in some States.

Everyone needs to realize when a State makes a decision to not serve Medicaid people and to save State dollars, that saves money at the Federal level, too. The Federal Government should not be saving money because the States cannot do the things they need to do. What we need to do is give the States more leeway on serving their people in that particular State without assuming that we here in Washington have all the answers.

Quite frankly, we would be better off working together to do the difficult things that we need to do. The Federal Government should not be saving money because the States cannot do the things they need to do. What we need to do is give the States more leeway on serving their people in that particular State without assuming that we here in Washington have all the answers.

Quite frankly, we would be better off working together to do the difficult things that we need to do. The Federal Government should not be saving money because the States cannot do the things they need to do. What we need to do is give the States more leeway on serving their people in that particular State without assuming that we here in Washington have all the answers.

Quite frankly, we would be better off working together to do the difficult things that we need to do. The Federal Government should not be saving money because the States cannot do the things they need to do. What we need to do is give the States more leeway on serving their people in that particular State without assuming that we here in Washington have all the answers.
people who can afford care. This would be serving the elderly and the persons with disabilities who are very low income.

While the change the President is suggesting is simple, we must, in addition, also make improvements in the long-term care. The commission Senators SMITH and BINGAMAN are proposing would be very useful in that context. However, we should not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. There are things we can do this year that will provide improvements in the Medicaid Program, and we should do that.

We should eliminate wasteful practices and we should help States get the flexibility they need to better manage their programs, saving both Federal and State dollars.

We know Medicaid’s share of State budgets is growing at an unsustainable rate. Medicaid spending is growing so fast that it is beginning to rival education in cost to States.

If we take no action this year, we will continue to put States in the position of having to choose between supporting education and providing services to vulnerable populations.

I continue to work with Secretary Leavitt. He has been working with a bipartisan group of Governors to identify areas of agreement for making changes in Medicaid.

I will commit the Finance Committee to a bipartisan process, where we keep in mind principles that guide us in producing better Medicaid. The Finance Committee will look at proposals that produce shared savings for the Federal Government and our State funding partners. The Finance Committee will look at proposals that emphasize State flexibility through voluntary options for States. The Finance Committee will do this while making a commitment not to eliminate coverage for Medicaid eligibility they need to help people on the Medicaid Program and to restrain its growth and do it in a way that saves money for States and the Federal Government, that gives more flexibility, and then avoids cutting people off Medicaid.

I will sum up in this way. There is talk about fiscal discipline, about reducing the deficit. This is the only significant opportunity we have in this whole budget debate to reduce the growth of mandatory spending. What we would do is instead of letting it go up 41 percent, we let it go up 39 percent over 5 years. I suggest if we cannot do that, we cannot do anything this year, and we should not go home and say we are interested in fiscal discipline.

I don’t believe there is anybody in this Chamber who is more of a defender of States than I am, but I believe that between March and October, we can take a few relatively minor steps, make a minor adjustment in the growth of spending, and give States important new flexibility.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we amend the pending order of amendments being considered and add to the list Senator LIEBERMAN, from 9 to 9:30, on a homeland security amendment; Senator VITTER, from 9:30 to 9:45, on a port security amendment; and that at 9:45, Senator BROWNBACK be recognized for up to 15 minutes for debate purposes.

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

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I appreciate Senator CARPER being here, as his time is starting for a discussion on his amendment. The time on these amendments is going to run. If the Members don’t show up, the time is still going to run. That will be their opportunity to put their amendment down and make their point. After Senator CARPER, I will note that Senators SNOWE and WYDEN will come on at 7 o’clock and then Senator HARKIN at 7:30, Senator Ensign and Hutchison at 7:45, Senator LANDRIEU is at 8:05, Senator SANTORUM at 8:20, Senator VINOVIICH at 8:35, Senator DORGAN at 8:50. And we mentioned Senators LIEBERMAN and VITTER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be a divided period of debate, equally divided, until 7 p.m. on the Carper amendment.

The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 207

(Purpose: To provide for full consideration of tax cuts in the Senate under regular order)

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistance legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) proposes an amendment numbered 207:

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, the amendment I offer this evening is actually quite simple. It strikes the section of the budget resolution that gives reconciliation protection to some $70 billion in tax cuts. The amendment doesn’t prohibit those cuts. It simply says if we are going to cut our taxes by another $70 billion, we either need to come up with a way to pay for that or to sort of offset that with the Treasury or we need to be able to produce 60 votes here in the Senate.

At a time when deficits are already high, I, for one, believe we should not make it any easier to dig the hole deeper.

Sometimes I like to quote a former Chancellor of the Exchequer, a British fellow, who used to say this, talking about the theory of holes:

The theory of holes is that when you find yourself in a hole, stop digging.

The amendment we offer here tonight is based in part on that theory of holes made famous by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Faced with the kinds of deficits that we do face when we are cutting domestic programs, reconciliation should not be used for tax cuts that dig the deficit hole even deeper. Our Nation should be getting its fiscal house in order, not undermining the foundation of that house in order, not undermining the fiscal discipline we must apply the same principle to the tax side.

Our Nation should be getting its fiscal house in order, not undermining the foundation of that house in order, not undermining the fiscal discipline.
The reconciliation process is a fast-track procedure that was designed to facilitate the passage of deficit reduction legislation in the Congress. The process was intended to protect hard-to-pass deficit reduction legislation from a filibuster and to ensure that such legislation would pass with 51 votes rather than 60 votes in the Senate. In recent years, however, Congress has used these special procedural protections to make it easier to cut taxes, to increase deficits, and to increase our Nation’s debt.

Tax cuts enacted in reconciliation bills in 2001 and again in 2003 cost the Treasury nearly $2 trillion over 10 years. The current tax reconciliation instruction would make it easier to pass an additional $70 billion in tax cuts without requiring that they be offset or paid for. This is the very opposite of the way these fast-track procedures were intended to be used, and the consequences for our fiscal situation have been mounting deficits and mounting debt.

When President Bush took office some 4 years ago, the Congressional Budget Office projected surpluses of $5.6 trillion over the next decade and that any publicly held debt would be paid off by 2008. However, if we adopt the policies in this budget resolution, including these tax cuts, debt in 2008 will total $5.7 trillion based on CBO’s estimate of this budget proposal. In a span of 4 years, we have really moved from a CBO projection of surpluses of $5.6 trillion over the next decade that would have enabled us to have paid off publicly held debt by 2008 to where we see ourselves in a situation where CBO says, no, forget that; rather, our debt in 2008 will be in $5.7 trillion—not paid off. It will have grown to $5.7 trillion.

This is not about being against tax cuts but about making the decision that the precedents, the precedents that several budget deficits, if we are going to cut taxes further, those cuts ought to be offset.

Reconciliation evolved during the last period of large deficits to help Congress take the difficult steps necessary to balance the budget. It worked then and it can work again if we use these procedures to reduce deficits, not to make them larger.

My first tour of duty to Congress was at the beginning of 1983 as a Member of the House of Representatives. I had a lot to learn then. I still do. Among the things I needed to learn in 1983 was how the budget process worked because I did not understand it very well. I had been the treasurer of the State of Delaware for 6 years before that, and I was familiar with the budget process in my State, one that was similar to budget processes in many other States. In the State government in Delaware, the Governor proposes a budget sometime in the early part of a calendar year for a fiscal year that starts on July 1. There are hearings on the Governor’s proposal. The legislature debates the Governor’s proposal both for an operating budget and for a capital budget. Sometime before July 1, the legislature usually adopts an operating budget and a capital budget. We go out. We run the State. We use those budgets that have been adopted.

When I got here, I found out it was not that way at all. Sometime in the early part of the calendar year, the President proposes a budget that now kicks in around the beginning of the new fiscal year, around October 1. The Budget Committees in the House and the Senate on the President’s budget proposal.

The next step is for the Congress to adopt a budget resolution, which is not a real specific budget; it is sort of a skeleton or a framework for the budget—roughly, we are going to spend our money in these areas, we are going to raise our money from these areas, and in the end hopefully it will all balance.

After we have adopted a budget resolution, we come back and put the meat on the bones, the meat being the 13 appropriations bills we have traditionally enacted that provide the real detail of the budget resolution.

At the end of the budget process, usually sometime in September, ideally, we do some cleanup in order to make sure that we are going to hit our balanced budget target or deficit reduction target. At the end of the process, we pass a reconciliation.

When the Budget Act was adopted in the mid-1970s, the notion was that budget reconciliation would be used to help make sure we made the tough decisions to cut spending or to raise revenues in order to balance our budget or to get us closer to a balanced budget. So keep in mind the initial idea, the reason we had reconciliation, was to ensure that the Congress made the tough decisions to reduce budget deficits—in fact, to try to balance our budget.

One of the great ironies today is budget reconciliation has come to be used in an entirely different way. It is not used to help us make the tough decisions to reduce deficits, but, sadly, it is being used to make the deficits larger.

My point of view is this: Things are worth paying for whether they are veterans benefits, defense programs, education, or transportation. If they are worthy extensions that we ought to pay for them. If we are not willing to raise the taxes to pay for them, we simply should not have as many or any of those programs in this country.

At the very least, I believe if we are going to allow a Member of the Senate to stand up and say, I want to raise spending on my favorite program, and we know that doing so makes the deficit bigger, there ought to be an offset. If they cannot come up with the offset to pay for that spending increase, they ought to lose votes to do so. I believe the same should apply if this Senator or any other Senator wants to come in and cut taxes, however well intentioned that might be. If doing so simply raises the deficit, we ought to have the right to offer that proposal, but if it is going to raise the deficit, we ought to also have to muster 60 votes just like we would on the spending side. So that is my amendment.

Will the Chair inform me as to how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. CARPER. I reserve the remainder of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. President, some on the other side on several different occasions have trotted out several multiple arguments against the tax relief reconciliation instructions to the Finance Committee that I chair. Now, I am not going to get into any debate over whether budget reconciliation can, in fact, be used for tax legislation because there has been plenty of precedent established over the years in the Senate, whether the Senate has been controlled by Republicans or controlled by Democrats.

As an aside, though, I find it intriguing to consider the response on the other side feeling so strongly, as they have indicated, that partisan tax increases such as the 1993 tax hike legislation should enjoy expedited reconciliation process, and somehow our using that this year is wrong. They care not a whit about raising $1 trillion in taxes as was done in the 1993 tax bill on a party-line vote under the process that is called reconciliation, but talk about bipartisan tax relief in reconciliation and somehow get very irate. It seems to be a big double standard, so I come to the floor not to debate these points. Rather, I want to tell you why we should have a reconciled tax relief package.

Let’s look back just to the last Congress as a precedent. In that Congress, late in an election year, we passed a couple of tax relief proposals that were allegedly supported on both sides of the aisle. With an election facing them, many on the other side reluctantly supported extensions of tax relief proposals. Keep in mind that conference vehicle was opened a year earlier—a year earlier. You would think something that passed just before the election should have been considered over the course of a year, if it was not. You would think it would be simple, by how it finally passed, but there were obstacles put in the path of it all the time.

We were not as lucky when we took up the FSG/ETI legislation. That bill was a bipartisan way by Senator Baucus and this Senator. The bill came out of the Finance Committee with only two dissenting votes,
and those dissenting votes were Republican votes. Despite the bipartisan support, it actually took two cloture votes and the threat of a third cloture vote to break a Democrat filibuster on a tax relief bill Democrats claimed to support.

I have a chart behind me that represents goalposts on a football field. Tax relief bills have a way of becoming political footballs. We brought up the FSC/FTC on March 3rd, and did not complete it until May 11, more than 2 months later, the same year. That is over 2 months to do a tax relief bill that had unanimous support from Democrats on my committee. Members, sometimes for partisan reasons, sometimes for other reasons, decide to filibuster by amendment or other tactics.

Now referring to another bill, referring to the charitable tax relief bill that we call the CARE Act, let me point out that we were unable to go to conference because of Democratic leadership objections over the years 2003 and 2004. Also, do not forget that we were unable to get energy tax relief because of a stalled conference report.

So what happens? Reconciliation creates an opportunity for certainty. Reconciliation, obviously, is not my first choice. Reconciliation prevents must-do tax legislation from becoming political footballs, as you see the goalposts move from time to time. In this case, I had hoped that those who say they want to address issues such as alternative minimum tax hold harmless would not filibuster. If you say you care about expiring provisions that are going to expire this year, such as the college tuition deduction, you should care about reconciliation—if you want to get that done. It will be tough enough to address expiring tax relief provisions. There is demand for revenue of about $90 to $100 billion in this budget, and tax relief numbers of $70 billion. That means I have to find offsets about that amount. I think that offsets offset the revenue gains of $20 billion over 5 years, just to keep taxpayers where they are now. Not more tax relief—stopping existing tax policy from ending and having automatic increases in taxes. That will be tough enough without political football tactics of filibusters by amendment or otherwise, as we saw over the course of last year, that I am just using for an example.

But it is hard to be learned—to have a process in place where people who say they are for tax relief cannot say they are for tax relief and then stall the process forever and ever. Necessary, I have to have a reconciliation option. I have borrowed from the playbook. I appreciate the Budget Committee’s efforts of providing that option. I urge my colleagues to retain that option. Otherwise you are not being realistic when you tell the folks back home that you support extending these tax relief provisions.

In other words, I would like to have us avoid the environment where people can say they are for something but then stall for 2 months to finally get it done, moving the football goalposts down the field. What reconciliation does is it gives us an opportunity to get done what people say they want done.

There are a lot of tax provisions that have to be worked on this year that have almost unanimous support. People can say they are for them but put roadblocks in the way, or move the goalposts to keep them from happening. Reconciliation prevents us from that sort of activity. I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I would like to make a comment, and then I will yield time to Senator CONRAD.

For 8 years immediately before coming to the Senate I was privileged to serve as Governor of my State. During those 8 years we balanced the State budget. For 8 years out of 8, however, for 8 years in a row we also balanced our budget. Tonight, as we gather here, we face a budget deficit for the year probably in the range of $100 billion again. We just spent $30 billion last year of over $400 billion. Our Nation’s trade deficit this year is expected to exceed $600 billion.

I say to my friends, that kind of lifestyle is not sustainable. We are not going to enjoy the standard of living that we do today if we continue down this path of spending ever more money as a country than we raise, and forever buying more from abroad than people buy from us—not by just a little bit but by a lot.

Our trade deficit for the month of January was, as I recall, about $60 billion. We can go back only as recently as 1990, and I think our trade deficit for the whole year was about $30 billion. We are on a dangerous path. For us to continue willy-nilly along the same course is playing with fire. Again, the principle that is part of this, that really underlies this amendment, is if you have a big budget deficit and you want to cut taxes further, and it has the effect of raising the budget deficit, you can do that. But when you have a budget deficit of over $400 billion and as far ahead as we can see there is more red ink, we ought to make it a little more difficult to cut taxes and, frankly, we ought to make it more difficult to raise spending.

I yield to my friend from North Dakota, Senator CONRAD, for however much time he wishes to consume.

Mr. CONRAD. How much time is remaining on this side of deficit from last year?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just under 8 minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. Would the Chair advise me after I have consumed 5 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Certainly.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the more I listen to this debate about the budget, the more I feel as though I am in some time warp, or some sort of surreal out-of-body experience because the other side talks about the need for more tax cuts and more spending. They never talk about the fiscal condition of the country at this moment. They never talk about where it is all headed.

This is the circus that we have tonight as we meet. This looks back to 1980. The green line is the revenue line, and the red line is the expenditure line of the Federal Government. The last time our Republican friends were in control back in the 1980s, we can see the expenditure line is way above the revenue line as a result of the massive deficits.

Then a Democrat took office, and the spending line came down steadily. The revenue line went up, and the result was we balanced the budget, we stopped using Social Security money for other purposes.

Then we got another Republican administration, and the revenue line collapsed the spending line, and the deficits again opened up dramatically. That is a fact. That is undeniable. That is what happened.

Our Republican friends are plenty ready to spend the money, but they do not want to raise taxes to cover their spending, and they do not want to cut their spending to match their revenue. The result is deficits as far as the eye can see.

Here is what has happened since our Republican friends took over. The deficits have gone through the roof. It is not only the deficits, but the debt as well. The debt was $3.3 trillion—publicly held debt—and now it is headed for $4.4 trillion.

Our Republican friends come with a budget that they say is fiscally responsible, but their own numbers give lie to the rhetoric. If you look at their own budget document on page 5 where they estimate how much they are going to increase the debt over each of the next 5 years, we can see that the deficit for the first year of this budget, here is what it shows. They are going to increase the debt $669 billion this year, $636 billion next year, $624 billion the next year, $612 billion the next year, and $611 billion the fifth year. They say they are cutting the deficits in half, but the debt goes up every year by over $600 billion, according to their own estimates.

The Senator from Delaware comes with an amendment that says you shouldn’t have special protection to further reduce the revenue base. You shouldn’t have special protection that says we take the revenue base that has already collapsed and reduce it further with special protections from the traditional way of doing business in the Senate. Instead, if somebody wants to have more tax cuts, they should pay for them. There is an old-fashioned idea—pay for it. That is what the Senator from Delaware is saying. You can have more tax cuts, but pay for them, conclude the year the 1980s, we can see the expenditure line is way above the revenue line as a result of the massive deficits.

Then a Democrat took office, and the spending line came down steadily. The revenue line went up, and the result was we balanced the budget, we stopped using Social Security money for other purposes.

Then we got another Republican administration, and the revenue line collapsed the spending line, and the deficits again opened up dramatically. That is a fact. That is undeniable. That is what happened.

Our Republican friends are plenty ready to spend the money, but they do not want to raise taxes to cover their spending, and they do not want to cut their spending to match their revenue. The result is deficits as far as the eye can see.

Here is what has happened since our Republican friends took over. The deficits have gone through the roof. It is not only the deficits, but the debt as well. The debt was $3.3 trillion—publicly held debt—and now it is headed for $4.4 trillion.
Don’t shove this onto our kids. Don’t add this onto the already burgeoning Federal debt. It is a conservative idea. It says let us pay for what we do around here.

I thank the Senator for his comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I happen to think we need to take care of those taxes where they are expiring. If we don’t deal with them, the rates are going to go up. We have a number of tax provisions that are within the 5-year window of the budget resolution that is before us. Three of them are what we refer to as economic growth, taxes reduced, investment and job creation incentive, and taxes we reduced.

I think one of the most effective taxes in stimulating the economy is reduction of capital gains. It is set to expire within this 5-year window.

If you look as far back as the Kennedy administration, he reduced capital gains to create more income during his administration so he could spend on other programs. Because you cut taxes doesn’t mean it is going to reflect a decrease in revenue to the Federal Government. We have seen that happen from time to time. It happened during the Reagan administration. It helped pay for defense spending. We have seen it in my State of Colorado.

Right now, we happen to have in my State of Colorado a modified national tax where we build off of the Federal tax bottom line form. One time we didn’t, and we reduced capital gains in the State of Colorado and, lo and behold, revenues increased to the State of Colorado.

We have seen this happen now under the Bush administration with the tax incents that we put in place, which included a 15-percent tax rate on capital gains income, and included a 150-percent tax rate on dividend income, and increased 100 percent the deduction for small business expenses. Having done that, here is what we have seen happen. February’s nonfarm payroll growth exceeded analysts’ expectations and was broad-based. We saw nonfarm payroll increase 262,000 in February, above the 225,000 median analysts’ estimates, according to Bloomberg. It was the largest nonfarm payroll gain since October of 2004 and only the second gain of over 200,000 since last May. We saw 121 consecutive months of job gains, and have added more than 3 million new jobs to the payroll. The unemployment rate declined to 5.4 percent from 5.6 percent a year ago. Now it is below the 1980s peak of 10.8 percent, the 1990 peak of 7.8 percent, and the 2000 year peak of 6.3 percent, according to OECD, which is an international organization that tracks unemployment rate in the United States and compares it to other countries. According to its rating, the unemployment rate in the U.S. is low again in comparison to our major trading partners.

The United States has 5.5 percent, France’s unemployment rate is 9.6 percent, 4.1 percent higher than in this country. Germany is 9.8 percent, the Euro area average is 10.6 percent. We look at all these figures, and I don’t see how anybody can deny the fact that those taxes where we reduced them for the purpose of driving the economy didn’t work. It did work. It created more revenue for the Federal Government.

We can tax things to the point where you get very little revenue to the Government. I think we have been through an era where spending and taxing both have been on the higher side. When that happens, you decrease production, and the result is you have less revenue. Just raising taxes doesn’t mean you automatically are going to get more revenue to the Federal Government. On the other hand, because you cut taxes doesn’t mean you are going to get less revenue to the Federal Government. It depends on where your tax rate is.

We have seen time and time again where we took a tax such as capital gains. In the Kennedy era, we reduced it in the Reagan era, we reduced it in local States, and we have seen the effects by the adjustments within the States. We have seen it happen recently with the budget tax incentive for capital gains, revenues increased to the Federal Government.

That is why Members such as myself feel it is important that we keep in the reconciliation process the opportunity to begin to extend these taxes. Obviously, they are not going to be extended permanently. I prefer to extend them permanently. Obviously, that is not going to be possible around here. I am willing to go ahead and extend them again further on a temporary basis and then meet later.

If you are going to stimulate the economy, I think you have to turn to the small business sector. That is the real engine that drives this economy. It is the small business sector. That is where innovation occurs. That is where individuals can own their own business and be motivated to produce. We see that time and time again in this country. I have seen it in my State of Colorado.

I am a small businessman myself, having had a veterinary practice. I understand the vital role small business will play in economies of cities throughout this country. We had a 100 percent deduction for small business on expensing. That had a phenomenal impact on revenues to the Federal Government in a positive way. It is one of the taxes that increased revenue to the Federal Government. We saw such a dramatic drop in the unemployment rate.

It is important we not do away with the goose that laid the golden egg. We need to look at what has worked historically and we need to continue that policy. If we do that, we will continue to see our economy grow.

The President is on the right track. This budget is on the right track to, at the very least, extend out those taxes. There are some Members that would have liked to have more in the reconciliation bill. The $70.2 billion that is in here that they are talking about is a bare minimum as far as I am concerned. I wish we had a lot more. I think we could bank more to further stimulate the economy.

It is not the government that creates new jobs, it is the small business people out here that are working. They are the ones who really create jobs. It is the free enterprise system in this country that creates jobs. When you create jobs, you can hold down government expenses and you can generate more revenue to the Federal Government.

There are other expiring tax provisions that the Finance Committee can look at. They are not what I would classify necessarily as economic growth. They do not stimulate economic growth when you reduce them necessarily, but they help to contribute to the environment that helps our economy grow. I look at some of these that will expire within this window and I hate to turn my back on them, because they are popular, many of them, among the American people.

Relief from individual alternative minimum tax; the research and experimentation tax credit; the deduction for teachers’ classroom expenses; deduction for qualified education expenses; deduction of State and local sales taxes; cutting the welfare-to-work tax credit, work opportunity tax credit, credit for electricity produced from wind, biomass, and landfill gasses, tax credit for hybrid fuel cell vehicles; the first-time home buyer credit; and expensing of brownfields for mediation. Just a few of those taxes that will be expiring within the 5-year window that is provided for in this budget.

My view is if these are worthy programs, we are much better off to reduce taxes in a way that stimulates those programs to grow than to say we will spend Federal dollars and promote these programs and subsidize these businesses. That is the wrong way. We are better off to keep a competitive environment by reducing taxes on some of these programs that are vitally important.

I firmly believe the President is on the right track. I firmly believe the tax cuts we have put in place since the President was first elected to office are working, and it would be very disappointing to me and I think it would be a wrong track to somehow or other tax back some of the aggressive initiatives that have proved to do so much for improving the economy in this country and improving revenue not only to the Federal Government but the State governments. The figures are looking better among State and local governments.

I for one am going to stand and say, look, we need to have those provisions
We cannot sustain this forever. As a nation, we cannot continue going around the world and borrowing ever larger sums of money to fund our national debt. We certainly cannot continue to buy so much more from other places around the world. This month alone $60 billion more we will buy from the rest of the world than we will sell. It is not sustainable. We need to instill a bit of old-fashioned common sense and fiscal discipline.

I started earlier talking about the Chancellor of the Exchequer theory of holes; my friends, we need to stop digging.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, could we be updated on the time situation.

Mr. CONRAD. So the next amendment up would be Senator Wyden; is that correct?

Mr. CONRAD. From 7 to 7:30 is the Snowe-Wyden amendment. We will put in a quorum call so they can prepare to offer their amendment.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DeMINT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, we will recognize Senator Snowe, and we will recognize her on the Democrats' time.

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

The Senator from Maine.

AMENDMENT NO. 214

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Ms. Snowe], for herself, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Feingold, Mr. McCain, and Mrs. Feinstein, proposes an amendment numbered 214.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that any savings associated with legislation that provides the Secretary of Health and Human Services with the authority to participate in the negotiation of contracts with manufacturers of covered part D drugs to achieve the best possible prices for such drugs under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, that requires the Secretary to negotiate contracts with manufacturers of such drugs for each fallback prescription drug plan, and that requires the Secretary to participate in the negotiation for a contract for any such drug upon the request of a prescription drug plan or an MA-PD plan, is reserved for reducing expenditures under such part.)
drug prices that is two and three times the rate of inflation.

My good friend, Senator Wyden, and I received a report from the Government Accountability Office, and the news was not good, as this chart illustrates. The trend of drug prices going up two and three times the rate of inflation, especially so that this rate increased during the time of consideration of the Medicare Modernization Act. So you can see the major difference in the price changes that is two or three times over the rate of inflation.

It is actually even worse than what this graph would indicate. Those with fixed incomes, for example, have seen the long-term effects of the price increases that seniors are experiencing all across America, certainly in my State of Maine. A senior with $250 in monthly drug costs, in 1999, would need to spend $238 to purchase those same prescription drugs in 2003—never, not better drugs, but the same products.

But this is the trend. This trend indicates that purchasing power is eroding, and beneficiaries are not going to realize the full value, the full benefit, and the full promise of the act that passed that included things like Part D benefits.

Now, Senator Wyden and I have introduced legislation repeatedly on the very question as to how we can maximize the value of this prescription drug benefit. It is in the interest of seniors. It is in the interest of taxpayers. It is certainly in the interest of good public policy.

One of the best tools that we can give the Secretary of Health and Human Services is the ability to negotiate prescription drug prices. There was a prohibition in the Medicare Modernization Act, regrettably. There should not have been a prohibition. We should have been able to give the Secretary of Health and Human Services the same authority that the Veterans Administration, that is utilized by the Department of Defense, very effectively, very successfully.

So why is it that the Secretary of Health and Human Services cannot have that same prerogative and the ability to control prices on prescription drugs, something that is utilized all across America, most certainly by seniors? It can make the difference between life and death, the progression of a disease that ultimately could result in more costly illnesses.

So that is what this is all about: whether we are prepared to give the Secretary of Health and Human Services the authority to negotiate prescription drug prices.

That is what our amendment does. It allows the Secretary to have that authority. It is permissive authority, but on the other hand, there will be two instances the interested would be required to think it would be in the interest of all of us to understand that this will be an improvement on the legislation that passed that provided the prescription drug benefit. One, as you know, there is a fallback provision in the legislation that passed. In areas of the country where there may not be competitive plans, we want to make sure those seniors, regardless of where they live in America—urban, rural areas—are able to control prices on prescription drugs, something that is utilized.

It is in the interest of taxpayers. It is in the interest of good public policy to ensure that the Government is negotiating the very best prices that it is going to be the taxpayers. It will drive up the cost of the prescription drug plan that went from $400 billion up to $341 billion, and we don’t have any idea how high it is going to go. CBO is not even prepared to estimate it at this time.

I cannot imagine why there would not be a willingness on the part of the Senate to embrace this approach and give the negotiating power to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. In fact, it had a chance to be the taxpayers. It will drive up the cost of the prescription drug plan.

That is a very powerful statement coming from the former Secretary. He well understood that the vital ingredient for controlling the cost of prescription drugs was to have this negotiating prerogative to ensure that we could maximize this legislation, this benefit on behalf of seniors, most certainly, and also on behalf of taxpayers. We have seen the annual increased projections of about 8.5 percent and the cost of the Part D benefit. I don’t think any of us are under any illusion that if the Federal Government, don’t have this ability to use and exercise this prerogative at key moments in time, we will lose and devalue this benefit for seniors because their purchasing power will erode quickly over time.

With that, I would like to yield to my colleague, Senator Wyden of Oregon. I appreciate his leadership on this issue and working to make sure we have the very best initiative that would, hopefully, draw a majority of support in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. Wyden. Parliamentary inquiry: Mr. President, the amendment by the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Oregon about the noninterference clause will not result in savings, and it is going to undermine a drug benefit that is not even up and running yet. I don’t know how you can possibly change the drug benefit that effectively doesn’t start until January 1, 2006. How do you know things are not going to work until you have had some experience with it?

I have urged everybody to hold off on changing anything in the prescription drug bill until you actually see it functioning. It seems to me to be very difficult to work on a piece of legislation like this and try to change it before it has been operational.

First and foremost, let me be clear about something again. The Medication Modernization Act does not prohibit negotiations with drug companies. That could not be further from the truth. In fact, it requires the Medicare plans to negotiate with drugmakers for better prices. These negotiations are at the heart of the new Medicare drug benefit plan.

The absurd claim that the Government will not be negotiating with drugmakers comes from a noninterference clause in the Medicare law. This noninterference clause does not prohibit Medicare from negotiating with drugmakers. It prohibits otherwise the CMS from interfering with those negotiations that are provided for.

Let me be clear, the noninterference clause is at the heart of the bill’s structure for delivering prescription drug coverage. This clause ensures that negotiations will result from market competition, rather than through price fixing by the Center for Medicaid Services bureaucracy.
Here is what is so funny about what we are discussing today. The same non-interference clause language that we have in the law right now was in the Daschle-Kennedy-Rockefeller bill and the Gephardt-Dingell-Stark bill in 2000. The Daschle bill in 2002, the Gephardt was in the year 2000.

I want to read for you what this says:

In administering the prescription drug benefit program established under this part, the Secretary may not (1) require a particular formulation or institute a price structure for benefits; (2) interfere in any way with the negotiations between private entities and drug manufacturers or otherwise interfere with the competitive nature of providing a prescription drug benefit through private entities.

Now, where did that language come from? It comes from the bill introduced by Senator Daschle and cosponsored by 33 Democrats, including Senator KERRY. They all thought their approach, which was incorporated in our legislation passed in 2003, and has now been amended on a number of fronts of it, including the sponsors of this amendment, as “preventing Medicare from negotiating,” was a fine approach when it was suggested from the other side of the aisle.

In fact, at the time, this is what Senator Daschle had to say.

Our plan gives seniors the bargaining power that comes with numbers. . . . Our plan mirrors the best practices used in the private sector. For beneficiaries in traditional Medicare, prescription drug coverage would be delivered by private entities that negotiate prices with drug manufacturers. This is the same mechanism used by private insurers.

Just for the record, opponents now also have claimed that Republicans insisted on including the so-called ban in the Medicare Modernization Act that somehow we “pushed through.” I remind these people—and they are here right now—that the whole concept was developed by Democrats.

The Congressional Budget Office has concluded that the market approach in the Medicare law will result in better, higher prescription drug cost management for Medicare than any other approach considered by Congress. That is the green eye-shaded people in the Congressional Budget Office. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is at 6 minutes.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I believe we have two speakers on this side who want 4 minutes apiece. I ask unanimous consent that we have 8 minutes on this side extended out and that we give Senator GRASSLEY another 4 minutes to wrap up his speech, and then another 4 minutes on the time of Senator HATCH, if we might. There have been some cancellations, and we can take that one later on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Okay, I yield the floor to the Congressional Budget Office. Here is what the Congressional Budget Office said about eliminating the noninterference clause in a letter just last year:

The Secretary would not be able to negotiate prices that further reduce Federal spending to a significant degree.

The letter went on to say:

CBO estimates that substantial savings will be obtained by the private plans.

That is the way we wrote this bill and what the Senator is trying to change.

Now, we also have an analysis from the Chief Actuary for the Medicare Program. The Chief Actuary is required by law to provide independent actuarial analysis on issues.

The Chief Actuary’s report states the view that the Medicare prescription drug plans will achieve average cost reductions of 15 percent initially, and that those cost reductions will rise to 25 percent over 5 years.

The Chief Actuary has concluded that he does not “believe that the current administration or future ones would be willing and able to impose price concessions that significantly exceed those that can be achieved in a competitive market.”

In fact, more astonishing, the Chief Actuary points out that if Medicare establishes drug price levels, it will reduce competition, not increase it. Their report states:

Establishment of drug price levels for Medicare by the Federal Government would eliminate the largest factor that prescription drug plans could otherwise use to compete against one another.

Further, their report points out that the past experience in the Medicare Program does not give one much, if any, confidence that Medicare will do a good job in setting prices. Far from it. As confirmed by the Actuary’s report, prior to the enactment of the prescription drug bill, drugs in Part B “were reimbursed at rates that, in many instances, were substantially greater than prevailing price levels.”

So Medicare does not have a very good track record when it comes to price negotiations.

So let me be clear: Direct Government negotiation is not the answer. The Government does not negotiate drug prices. The Government sets prices, and it does not do a very good job at that.

The bill’s entire approach is to give seniors the best deal through vigorous market competition, not price controls. Again, a quote from Senator Daschle when he outlined the principles of his Medicare prescription drug benefit:

Fifth, we should take a lesson from the best private insurance companies: Cost-savings should be achieved through competition, not regulation or price controls.

Even The Washington Post editorial page wrote on February 17, 2004:

Governments are notoriously bad at setting prices, and the U.S. Government is notoriously bad at setting prices in the medical realm.

The Congressional Budget Office said that such a proposal “could generate no savings or even increase Federal costs.”

So we did not rely on Government price-fixing but instead created a new drug benefit that relies on strong market competition, an approach relied upon by the MEND Act as introduced by Senator Daschle and cosponsored by 33 Democrats.

The new Medicare drug benefit creates consumer choices among competing, at-risk private plans. The Medicare plans will leverage the buying power of millions of beneficiaries to lower drug prices. I urge my colleagues to oppose efforts to repeal the non-interference clause and oppose efforts to get the Government involved in setting drug prices. It is a prescription for higher costs and undermining the competitive market in the Medicare bill that will result in lower drug costs. Let us not interfere with that with some sort of attempt to strike the so-called non-interference clause.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, every time one turns around, the costs of the prescription drug program go up and up. The bipartisan Snowe-Wyden proposal is the only proposal that is being considered that takes steps to protect taxpayers and seniors. This does not undermine anything. Nothing is going to change other than the Snowe-Wyden legislation provides an additional tool in order to hold down drug costs and protect taxpayers.

Without this proposal, Medicare is going to be like a fellow standing in line at the Price Club buying toilet paper one roll at a time. Nobody in America shops that way. If one is buying a car or buying anything at a store, they try to get the best value. That is what this legislation is all about. In fact, the only areas where anything is required is when the private sector says an additional boost in bargaining power is necessary. The cause of what are called the fallback plans which are so important in the rural areas where there are no restraints at all in terms of what can be charged.

Given the mounting concern about the cost of this program, where it has gone up almost every couple of months since it was signed, I would think that the other side, the opponents of the Snowe-Wyden legislation, would say: All right, we are going to oppose Snowe-Wyden, and this is our proposal. The fact is, the other side seems to say the status quo is just fine. The status quo with the costs going into the stratosphere is something that apparently they are not too upset about. Senator Snowe and I see it differently. We believe it is important to provide an additional tool, the kind of tool that is used in the private sector, and we think it will be meaningful.

Ultimately, this vote is a vote about what the Senate and our colleagues vote for this bipartisan legislation, they stand with taxpayers and seniors who would like this additional tool so that marketplace forces can be
used to hold down costs. If my colleagues vote against this, in effect they are voting for the status quo because, I would just emphasize, there is no other proposal being offered by the opponents. They seem to say everything is fine.

We do not. We think there is a bipartisan approach that makes sense. It is the approach that is used every single day in the private sector of this country. It uses marketplace forces to get the best possible deal, and ultimately what it results in is the best value, the better deal you get. That is why, when he left, did he say he wished he had the opportunity to negotiate? In fact, the Veterans Administration—there are very skilled negotiators at the VA, people who have been developed and gone through various iterations. They seem to say everything is nuts.

I hope my colleagues will support it. Several additional colleagues—Senators LEAHY, CANTWELL, and KOHL—would like to serve as cosponsors. I particularly want to thank Senator CONRAD for his patience as this has been developed and gone through various iterations. I note my friend Senator HATCH, who has great expertise in this area as well, wants to speak. I wrap up by thanking Senator SNOWE. We have been at this for 4 years. Both of us support this legislation. This is an important effort to try to get it right. When we started, nobody expected that the costs would escalate the way they have. This is likely to be the only vote the Senate gets to cast this year on prescription drug cost containment. I hope my colleagues will not pass up the opportunity to take a bipartisan step in the right direction. In the direction of making this program work at a critical time when seniors are going to start signing up for the benefit that starts next year.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time?

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleagues allowing additional time for me to speak. I thank my friend SNOWE and WYDEN, for their ongoing leadership. I very much appreciate their leadership and eloquence in talking about this issue.

I find it interesting in this debate that Senator Daschle is used in quotes from the other side, from the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee. The reality is that was a different approach, that was a Medicare prescription drug benefit very different than what we ended up passing.

What is most important is that the former Secretary of Health and Human Services, Tommy Thompson, said as he left office that he would have liked to have had the opportunity to negotiate lower prices. If that was in the bill, why, when he left, did he say he wished he had the ability to negotiate lower prices? I am sure it is because the former Secretary knows what every smart consumer knows: that a proposal is all keyplace, the more you buy of anything, the better deal you get. That is what we are talking about.

Right now, today, the only entity in the country that cannot negotiate for lower group prices is Medicare. What sense does that make when we are talking about precious dollars going to seniors and the disabled to buy medicine in this country. What sense does that make? In 50 companies, large pharmacy chains, the Veterans Administration—they can all use bargaining clout to obtain lower drug prices for the patients they represent. In fact, the Veterans Administration has had significant success in negotiating lower prices; in some cases, as much as 65 percent.

I am told, and I have seen studies that show, if we gave the same bargaining authority to Medicare that the VA has, you could actually close the gap in the prescription drug benefit. There is enough savings that you could close the gap so that everyone would be receiving prescription drugs without what has been commonly called the donut hole.

These are huge savings. As a member of the Budget Committee, I have watched the numbers go up for the Medicare bill. We thought it was $400 billion. Now CBO says $593 billion and counting. We have to do something, provide the tools for Health and Human Services to be able to negotiate, to be able to lower those prices. Right now we have a situation where that is not allowed. It makes absolutely no sense. When I talk to people at home and they ask me, Why in the world Medicare is prohibited from using their full force to be able to negotiate, I say it is crazy. This makes absolutely no sense, unless you are one of those folks who does not want them negotiating, in terms of the prices.

So I urge the adoption of this amendment and thank my colleagues again for doing an outstanding job in putting together this important amendment giving the Secretary of Health and Human Services the authority to negotiate drug prices on behalf of seniors and the people of our country with disabilities be agreed to. It would be wonderful to see a very strong bipartisan vote in favor of this very important amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 9 minutes and 43 seconds.

Mr. HATCH. For a minute there I was so out of it tonight when you were talking I thought it was about the Snowe-Wyden amendment instead of the Snowe-Wyden. It took me a little while to catch on here. I just couldn't resist that.

I have to say, I sat through all these meetings and I never once heard Secretary Thompson say that he wanted this authority. In any event, let me just speak about the Snowe-Wyden amendment, which they are trying to make into the “Snow-White” amendment, it seems to me.

In my opinion, this amendment guts one of the most important provisions of the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003.

Supporters of this amendment imply, wrongly in my opinion, that the price charged to beneficiaries is not subject to negotiation. That could not be further from the truth. The truth is, drug prescription drug plans will be negotiating with drug makers. These negotiations are the very heart of the new Medicare drug benefit. We do not want to open the door to Government price controls for prescription drugs.

The non-interference clause in the Medicare Modernization Act does not prohibit Medicare from negotiating with drug makers. It prohibits CMS from interfering in those negotiations. That is a far cry from some of the earlier statements that have been made on this floor regarding this provision.

I happen to care a great deal for the two sponsors of this amendment. I have voted very closely with them throughout their tenure and my tenure in the Senate. But they are simply wrong on this amendment.

Let me be clear, the non-interference clause is at the heart of the law’s structure for delivering prescription drug benefits. This clause ensures those savings will result from market competition, rather than through price fixing by the CMS bureaucracy. That is what was behind this. Let’s not distort these provisions.

What is ironic about what the other side is saying is that the same non-interference clause was in the Daschle-Kennedy-Rockefeller bill and the Gephardt-Dingell-Stark bills in the year 2000, as has been explained by our distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee.

In administering the prescription drug benefit program established under this Act, the Secretary—No. 1, require a particular formulary or institute a price structure for benefits; No. 2, interfere in any way with negotiations between private entities and drug manufacturers, or wholesalers; or No. 3, otherwise interfere with the competitive nature of providing a prescription drug benefit through private entities.

What is the source of that language? It is from S. 2541, The Medicare Modernization Act, introduced in 2000. Think about it, some of the very people who are criticizing this provision in the Medicare Modernization Act tonight supported this provision in 2000.

I must remind my colleagues that former Senator Daschle once said:

Our plan gives seniors the bargaining power that comes with numbers. Our plan gives seniors the bargaining power that comes with numbers. ... Our power that comes with numbers .... Our plan gives seniors the bargaining power that comes with numbers. ...
Think about that. I think those who advance these arguments that you cannot have competitive work with regard to drug pricing are wrong and ought to quit playing politics with a bill that is so important for senior citizens all over the country.

Those who suggest this non-interference language will drive up the cost of implementing the law simply do not have the facts or the legislation on their side.

This is what the CBO said about eliminating the non-interference clause in a letter last year:

[The Secretary would not be able to negotiate prices that further reduce federal spending to a significant degree.]

I do not ever recall, and I sat through all of the meetings, day after day, hour after hour—I do never recall Secretary Thompson asking for that authority.

The CBO in that letter went on to say:

CBO estimates that substantial savings will be obtained by the private plans.

Now, let us be clear: Direct Government negotiation is not the answer. The Government does not negotiate drug prices. That would be price control, and it would inevitably cause prices to rise as companies would not be able to do business in this country as they have in the past.

The Medicare Modernization Act’s entire approach is to get Medicare beneficiaries the best deal through vigorous market competition, not price controls.

Let me conclude by saying that this amendment is not something that is in the best interest of our Medicare beneficiaries. Medicare beneficiaries do not want or need the Government to determine the cost of their drugs. Price fixing will lead to higher costs and does not have the facts or the legislation on their side.

This is what the CBO said about eliminating the non-interference clause in a letter last year:

[The Secretary would not be able to negotiate prices that further reduce federal spending to a significant degree.]

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Snowe-Wyden amendment.

Frankly, let me just make that point one more time: The Medicare Modernization Act does not prohibit Medicare beneficiaries from negotiating with drugmakers.

It prohibits CMS from interfering in those negotiations. That is a fact.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Snowe-Wyden amendment.

Mrs. SNOWE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I want to make some closing comments on behalf of myself and Senator WYDEN because it is important to reiterate several facts about this approach.

First of all, the point is the Medicare Modernization Act included a direct prohibition against the Secretary’s authority to negotiate, an authority that is already utilized by the Veterans Administration and the Department of Defense.

The second fact is those soaring costs with respect to the Part D program as we know it. Within a month after the enactment, we had a restatement from the administration of $534 billion.

The CBO isn’t even prepared to give a net cost of that legislation. We only expect that the price is going to go up, up. As Senator WYDEN indicated, the only tool we have to negotiate prices to keep those prices low, particularly in situations, for example, where the Congressional Budget Office indicated to us in a report that with sole-source drugs, where there are drugs that have no competition, we will realize savings.

That is our responsibility we have to seniors and to the taxpayers with respect to this program.

Finally, it is indicated that Secretary Thompson made this comment. He said, “I would like to have the opportunity to negotiate.”

He was asked a question in his final press conference as Secretary of Health and Human Services. The question was, “You listed the drug benefit as one of your proudest achievements. Was there anything you really pushed for in that bill that didn’t get in or that you would like to see Medicare tackle in the future?”

Note the fact that the question didn’t even suggest negotiations. But his answer was, “I would have had the opportunity to negotiate.”

And for good reason, because the Secretary understood that the price of this program and the price of the benefit was only going to go in one direction, and that is up.

It defies logic that we would not allow the Secretary to have the ability to negotiate the very best prices in certain instances and in other instances which the Secretary deems worthwhile.

A final point: In a recent poll, 90 percent of the American people believe the Secretary should have the ability to negotiate on their behalf.

In the final analysis, this is the amendment that is going to save money—save money in the drug program, save money to the taxpayer, save money to the seniors.

It is hard for me to believe anyone would vote against that.

I again thank Senator WYDEN for all of his support and leadership over the last few years to make this happen.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to lend my strong support for the amendment by Senators SNOWE and WYDEN.

Less than 2 years ago, Congress passed a massive expansion of our Nation’s entitlement system, the Medicare Modernization Act, MMA, which added costly prescription drug coverage to the Medicare Program. At that time, we were told that the new benefit would cost an estimated $800 billion over 10 years—a figure many of us believed to be far lower than the actual cost. Today, the same package is estimated to cost between $534 billion to $1.2 trillion over the next 10 years. Those costs can only be expected to grow further.

To add insult to injury, language was added to MMA which explicitly prohibited the Secretary of Health and Human Services from engaging in negotiations directly with drug companies. This language was included deliberately, even though other departments and agencies, including the Federal Government and State governors, under the Medicaid Program, have similar authorities.

Prohibiting the Secretary of Health and Human Services from engaging in such negotiations is an offense against the American taxpayer.

Earlier this year, I joined Senators SNOWE and WYDEN in introducing legislation which would amend the MMA and allow the Secretary to negotiate lower drug prices. The amendment we are debating now calls for those savings to be used for debt reduction a worthy goal given the massive burden we added to future generations through the passage of MMA.

I voted against the passage of MMA because I believe we can no longer afford to flagrantly spend taxpayer dollars and saddle future generations with the enormous burden of these programs, the cost of which is spiraling out of control. With the passage of that package, we missed a great opportunity to enact reforms that would have helped to ensure the Medicare program’s financial solvency. Congress has an obligation to remedy that mistake and the Snowe/Wyden amendment is a good first step.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we give time a first consideration for 2 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

AMENDMENT NO. 172

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], for himself, and Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LIVIN, Mr.
Kohl, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Durbin, and Mrs. Murray, proposes an amendment numbered 172.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To restore the Perkins Vocational Education program and provide for deficit reduction paid for through the elimination of the phase out of the personal exemption limitation and itemized deduction limitation for high income taxpayers now scheduled to start in 2006)

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $1,300,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $2,800,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $4,600,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $6,500,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $8,500,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $2,800,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $4,600,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $8,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $1,380,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $1,380,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $1,630,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $1,490,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $1,550,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, increase the amount by $1,610,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $40,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $1,040,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $1,350,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $1,480,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $1,540,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $1,360,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by $1,760,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by $3,250,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by $5,020,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by $6,360,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,360,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $3,120,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $6,370,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $11,390,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $18,350,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,360,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by $3,120,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $6,370,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $11,390,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by $18,350,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by $1,380,000,000.

On page 7, line 17, increase the amount by $40,000,000.

On page 7, line 20, increase the amount by $1,490,000,000.

On page 7, line 21, increase the amount by $1,040,000,000.

On page 7, line 24, increase the amount by $1,490,000,000.

On page 7, line 25, increase the amount by $1,350,000,000.

On page 8, line 3, increase the amount by $1,350,000,000.

On page 8, line 4, increase the amount by $1,480,000,000.

On page 8, line 7, increase the amount by $1,610,000,000.

On page 8, line 8, increase the amount by $1,540,000,000.

On page 10, line 16, decrease the amount by $23,800,000,000.

On page 10, line 17, decrease the amount by $23,800,000,000.

On page 10, line 6, increase the amount by $1,380,000,000.

On page 10, line 7, increase the amount by $46,000,000.

On page 10, line 9, increase the amount by $3,200,000,000.

On page 10, line 12, increase the amount by $1,490,000,000.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I understand I have 7½ minutes. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The budget resolution for 2006, which we are now considering, essentially calls for the elimination of funding for an enormously effective and popular education program called the Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act, which we all know as Voc Ed vocational education. This amendment restores the funding to Perkins vocational education and also reduces the deficit by billions of dollars in the future.

The costs of these needed steps, restoring vocational education and reducing the deficit, are offset by rescinding two new tax cuts for the wealthy, tax cuts which have not even gone into effect yet, the so-called PEP and Pease phase-out provisions.

The budget currently calls, under the President’s proposal, for eliminating funding for vocational education while allowing these two new tax cuts, which will cost $23 billion in the coming 5 years and $146 billion in 10 years that follow, with 97 percent of the benefits going to those earning at least $200,000 a year.

That is what this chart shows. The distribution of tax benefits under the phase-out of PEP and Pease, 54 percent go to people making over $1 million when it is fully phased in. Another 43 percent go to those making $200,000 to $1 million a year—97 percent of all the benefits of these tax provisions which hasn’t even gone into effect yet. It goes into effect next year unless we do something about it. Ninety-seven percent goes to people making over $200,000 a year.

We have choices. To govern is to choose. We have a choice. We recently restored the Vocational Education Act, the Perkins Act, on a bipartisan vote of 99–0.

We know that vocational education makes possible a broad range of technical education programs and vocational programs for millions of young people and adults. Vocational education combines classroom instruction, hands-on lab work, on-the-job training, and it is a true lifeline for students at risk of dropping out of school.

In Iowa alone elimination of the Perkins Vocational Education Program would directly impact 93,000 high school students and more than 337,000 community college students. The impact nationwide would be a disaster for millions of students.

The only way that we can be assured of saving vocational education, the Perkins Program, is by adding more overall funding to the education budget for that purpose. That is it. That is the only way it can be assured. And that is what my amendment accomplishes.

But, moreover, my amendment reduces the deficit as well. By rescinding these two tax cuts which haven’t taken effect yet—they take effect next year—and after they would fully be in effect, we then begin to save $146 billion over the next 10 years.

When the phase out of PEP and Pease, as they are called, were passed in 2001, the phase-out—I guess the case could be made that they are affordable. Thanks to the budget surpluses that President Bush inherited from President Clinton, we were looking at a cumulative surplus of over $5 trillion over the coming decade, enough to eliminate the national debt and then some. That was then and this is now.

Now we are looking at projected deficits in excess of $200 billion a year for as far as the eye can see—annual deficits in excess of $500 billion a year, a decade from now, if we keep on this way.

It makes good sense to eliminate these two proposed tax cuts. We are not rescinding anything that has gone into effect. They start next year. There is no reason they should start next year.

Let us have some common sense here. This amendment says we will fully restore vocational education and we will reduce the deficit. And the people who are making over $200,000 a year I don’t think really need this tax cut. People making over $1 million a year don’t need it. But I will tell you who does need it—kids who need vocational education in the United States. And, the American people need to avoid an added $146 billion deficit explosion that will occur in the decade after these tax provisions take effect in 2010. That is who needs this.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Iowa have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has 1 minute 54 seconds and the Senator from New Hampshire has 7½ minutes.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, this amendment is like a lot of other amendments that are being brought...
forth. It is well-intentioned. I don’t deny that. But its practical implication is that it significantly raises spending and significantly raises taxes and it does not necessarily accomplish the goals which the Senator from Iowa wishes to accomplish.

The Senator from Iowa states he wishes to allocate more money to vocational education. The budget does not do that. The budget has virtually no impact on that other than to set a topline number. In this case is $843 billion, which is divided between the Defense Department and the non-discretionary defense spending of the Federal Government. The nondefense discretionary number is approximately $444 billion. Within that are a lot of accounts, one of which is vocational education. How that money flows is not controlled by the budget. The budget has no legislative, statutory effect on those accounts other than to set a topline number and then allow the committee of jurisdiction to make the decision as to how that money will be spent.

In fact, the history has been that although the Budget Committee makes suggestions as to how money should be spent, it only has a number of different functions, those functions do not correspond to the various appropriating committees of the Senate and the Appropriations Committee, and the authorizing committees tend to generally follow suggestions of the Budget Committee relative to specific programs. If they did not ignore us, I would be much more specific, but I have learned it is a pointless exercise to try to tell appropriators or authorizers what to do relative to specific programs.

We give the Appropriations Committee a topline number and we say to the authorizing committees they have to reconcile or you have this much money available under the mandatory accounts. But beyond that, we do not have a whole lot of impact on how they spend that money other than to say this is how much you have.

So it is the Appropriations Committee that makes that decision. The Senator from Iowa actually has a unique role relative to education because he has been both the chairman and he is now the ranking member of the subcommittee on Appropriations. I am surprised the position in making sure his ranking member has, because he has already offered an amendment that has been adopted, that there is not enough education money that is going to be allocated to his subcommittee for him to do everything he wants to do or for the subcommittee to do everything they want to do. I serve on that subcommittee. But that is our role around here. The priorities should be set by us, the different chairmen of the different appropriating committees and the ranking members, and we should move forward from there.

We should not, however, in my opinion, do a general raising of spending and a general raising of taxes which is what this does. Rather, we should live within the proposed levels of spending.

In the area of education, it should be pointed out this administration has sent up their ideas and, yes, in their proposals. And that federal education should be adjusted in the way it is funding. But this administration has a unique position over education. They have dramatically increased funding for education over the last 4 years. They increased it over the Clinton years by something like 40 percent. They have chosen as an administration, and I think it is probably the right choice, to pick certain elements of Federal responsibility and fund those elements aggressively and recognize the Federal Government cannot be all things to all people, but it does have responsibility in specific areas and it should pursue those responsibilities aggressively. That is what they have done. They have increased funding for special education by somewhere around 60 percent; increased funding for title I by 45 percent. They have increased funding for No Child Left Behind by 46 percent. They increased funding for the Pell grants, and I don’t remember the exact figure, but it is a double-digit increase. Those are the accounts they have decided to focus on.

This bill assumes they will continue that effort, but that is not necessarily what will happen. The Appropriations subcommittee of which the Senator from Iowa is ranking member will have the opportunity to do what they wish. They can put the extra money into special education, they can put the extra money into title I, they can put the extra money into education or title I. The only way to do that means we have to take out special education, bilingual, impact aid, those accounts other than to set a topline number and then allow the committees of jurisdiction to make the decision about specific programs.

This bill itself has significantly focused on education. We set a reserve for higher education with $35.5 billion made available to the Education Committee to allow them to put in a new and more aggressive higher education bill.

We have proposed in this bill an additional almost half a billion over what the President requested as the top line—in other words, instead of having a top line of $843 billion, we have a top line of $843.5 billion and the reason is because we expect that extra $500 million to be put into the Pell grants for next year and raise those grants from $4,050 to $4,115.

In addition, we suggested in this bill a proposal to the Education Committee—I hope they will follow it; they don’t have to—which would allow them to increase Pell grants by $500 million, a massive increase in Pell grants for students who go to school over 4 years either to a community college and vocational college and then move on to traditional college. Huge commitments which we have suggested can be accomplished under this budget.

The budget is aggressive in the context of a fiscally restrained effort in the area of education. This administration’s record on education has been strong and vibrant over the last 4 years, uniquely so compared to the Clinton administration before and the budget itself, and I have to reinforce this because people look at line items. So when you offer a bill, an amendment like this, all you are doing is spending more and taxing more. You are not necessarily in any way adjusting the budget. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I respectfully answer my friend from New Hampshire, first talking about priorities. This is priorities, all right. You want a tax provision that goes into effect, starts phasing in next year that 97 percent of the benefits go to people making over $200,000 a year; or do you want to fund vocational exercise? It is not as simple as that. Who gets the tax breaks? When fully phased in, those with over $1 million income, you get $20,000 a year, and if you are under $75,000, you get a big fat zero.

And then what about priorities. My friend from New Hampshire is talking about raising taxes. All we are saying is a tax that has been in effect for 15 years will continue and will not be phased out. We are not raising anyone’s taxes at all.

Third, I point out this is the first budget in 10 years that has a reduction in education. My friend from New Hampshire says, well, we can make the decision in Appropriations about what we want to do. Is it like this. This is what my friend from New Hampshire has presented. It is like a puzzle as this chart shows. We have Pell grants, we have afterschool, we have title I, special education, bilingual, impact aid, all in this box. We have the money for those 7 items, well, if you want to put voc in, put it in, but if you put it in, take a piece out.

Would the Senator from New Hampshire tell us which of these to cut? Ed tech or TRIO are all left out, but this is the box we are in.

The Senator from New Hampshire says, well, you can put it back in. But that means we have to take out special education or title I. The only way to do it, I say, is to enlarge the box. And that is what we do with this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next 20 minutes is devoted to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

The Senator from Texas is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 218

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON], for herself, Mr. ENSON, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. Kyl, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN, proposes an amendment numbered 218.
Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To fully fund the level of Border Patrol authorized by National Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 and as recommended by the 9/11 Commission)

On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by $352,400,000.

On page 23, line 17, increase the amount by $317,000,000.

On page 23, line 21, increase the amount by $35,400,000.

On page 9, line 15, decrease the amount by $352,400,000.

On page 9, line 16, decrease the amount by $317,000,000.

On page 9, line 20, decrease the amount by $35,400,000.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, this is an amendment cosponsored by myself and Senator Ensign. Senator Ensign has done so much work in this area on the intelligence reform bill, assuring there would be 2,000 authorized Border Patrol agents. We also have as cosponsors Senators DOMENICI, CORNYN, MCCAIN, KYL, and FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would like to be notified if this amendment is ever included in fundraising activities on behalf of Hezbollah.

The two groups of Arab males were discovered by patrol guards from Willcox, AZ. One field agent said, "The suspects did not speak Spanish, and they were speaking to each other in Arabic. It's ridiculous that we don't take this more seriously. We're told not to say a thing to the media.

This is a field agent for the Border Patrol.

Last July, in Burlington, VT, police raided an international syndicate that forced Asian women to work as sex slaves. The women told investigators they had been smuggled from Asia to Mexico, entering the United States through Arizona, Texas, and other States. They ended up in Vermont.

Take the example of the capture of terrorist suspect Padilla. The Justice Department says Padilla and an accomplice planned to enter the United States through Mexico to blow up apartment buildings in major cities such as New York.

Mr. President, 97 percent of illegal intruders are filtering through the Southwest border. But they do not stay in the South. They go throughout our country.

The Border Patrol does an amazing job. We applaud their work. But we need to give them more help. Recent stories and intelligence reports show that terrorists are planning to use our border, and it should be a wakeup call.

Since 2001, 1,300 agents have been added to the force. But we have 6,900 miles of border with Canada and Mexico. My State of Texas alone has over 1,200 miles of border with Mexico. In most places there are no fences. In Texas, the Rio Grande River can sometimes be waded across or is completely dry.

We are seeing an increase of 137 percent in immigrants who are from countries other than Mexico. These immigrants, which are called OTMs, "other than Mexicans," are coming into our country in the largest numbers we have ever seen. But due to a lack of resources, they are often caught and released, or they are not caught at all.

Recognizing our serious border vulnerability, and the intelligence reform bill last year and authorized an increase of 10,000 Border Patrol agents over 5 years. It included provisions to add 8,000 detention beds and 800 additional interior investiga tors. Unfortunately, the budget before us only allocated enough to cover 210 agents, 143 investigators, and 1,920 beds for detention.

The Commission of U.S. Customs and Border Protection recently said: We do not have enough agents; we don't have enough technology to give us the security we need.

Let me give you some examples of recent happenings.

In Detroit, Mahmoud Youssef Kourani was indicted in the Eastern District of Michigan on one count of conspiracy to provide material support to Hezbollah. Kourani was already in custody for entering the country illegally through Mexico and was involved in fundraising activities on behalf of Hezbollah.

The indictment says Abdallah and his associates would direct people seeking to reach the United States to travel to one of several Latin American countries, and from there to Guatemala. They would then be transported to America through Mexico in return for payments of thousands of dollars in smuggling fees.

The amendment we are offering tonight will add $315 million to the President's request for the Border Patrol. This will provide for the training and equipping of 2,000 agents. This would be the full amount authorized and will have a dramatic impact on the security-related problems we have on the border.

In order to maintain a fiscally responsible bill, and not increase the top cap of discretionary spending, we are offsetting this increase with an equal reduction in the international affairs section of the budget because protecting our borders from foreign threats is an international affair.

Today, with my colleagues Senators ENSIGN, DOMENICI, CORNYN, MCCAIN, KYL, and FEINSTEIN, I am calling on Congress to do more than add 210 Border Patrol agents that are in the underwriting budget. We ask for the full contingent authorized of 2,000. This is still not enough. And I hope we will be able to come back next year and get up to the full 2,000 again.

But the warning flag has gone up. We must heed the warnings we have been given. Every incident I mentioned is a call to the United States to make sure that our borders with Mexico are secure. We need more Border Patrol agents and more detention facilities to make our borders safe.

The people of our country deserve this security, and our amendment will take one step in the right direction. I hope my colleagues will work with me to put this in the bill, then later in the Appropriations bill. We must do everything to heed the warning call we have gotten.

Mr. President, I yield the rest of our time to the Senator from Nevada, who has worked very hard on this amendment. I appreciate very much his cosponsoring this amendment with me today.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Texas for all the work she has done to strengthen our borders. Living in a border state, she understands the dual threat of terrorism and protecting our borders. Since 9/11, protecting our borders has taken on a completely different meaning and has only increased the importance of what our amendment is attempting to do.

Mr. President, I rise to call for the Senate to stand by its commitment to increase border security by adding 2,000 new Border Patrol agents.

In the decade before 9/11, al-Qaida studied how to exploit gaps and weaknesses in the border entry systems of the United States and other countries.

This week, intelligence officials confirmed that the terrorist, Zarqawi, plans to infiltrate America through our porous borders and carry out attacks on soft targets—whether it is while we are trying to get to a movie theater, our friends to a restaurant, or our kids to school. Additionally, a yearlong investigation recently concluded after authorities captured 18 people in an alleged plot to smuggle grenade launchers, armor-piercing missiles, and other Russian military weapons into this country.

Let’s face it, the dual threat of the illegal border crossing of people who wish to kill us and the weapons they need to do it on a large scale is very real.

We are not dealing with rational actors. We are not dealing with people who respect life or freedom. We must continue to be diligent in our fight to defeat terror and to protect our homeland.

The amendment we are offering ties directly to one of the important 9/11 Commission Report recommendations prohibiting terrorist travel to our country.

Pre-9/11, INS had only 9,800 Border Patrol agents. With the priorities of the agency concentrated on immigration and narcotics, no major counter-terrorism effort was underway.

More than 3 years after the devastating terrorist attacks, the men and women who serve at the border’s front line of defense are overwhelmed.

Statistics show that with current personnel levels, our agents only catch about one-third of the estimated 3 million people who cross the border illegally each year. It only took 19 to 210 agents. This amendment allows Congress to fulfill its commitment by providing the additional $352.4 million needed to fully fund 2,000 Border Patrol agents, and it does it without raising taxes. It does it with an offset to what is called “function 150,” or the international relations function.

Doubling the number of Border Patrol agents from pre-9/11 levels will allow increased protection on both our southern and our often neglected northern border, helping to thwart al-Qaida and prevent these terrorists from circumventing our security.

The Commission found that many of the 9/11 hijackers, including known terrorists, could have been watched-listed and were vulnerable to detection by border authorities. However, without adequate staff and coordinated efforts, the evildoers were allowed unhampered entry.

The world has changed dramatically since 9/11, when terrorists used our open and trusting society against us. We cannot allow a repeat of that tragedy. This amendment will help give those who guard our frontiers the tools they need to protect the safety of the citizens of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of our time.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 4½ minutes.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CRAIG be listed as a cosponsor of our amendment.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada. This is a team effort. I appreciate so much his working with me on this. Our border Senators have been trying to increase border patrol for years.

When I first came to Congress, we doubled our Border Patrol agents from 3,000 to 6,000. We were a country that was not porous, both on the borders of Canada and Mexico. But, clearly, we have had more and more influx of illegal aliens that have become a burden in many parts of our country, and now we have a security threat from people who do not live on our borders but are using our borders as a conduit to come into our country. The examples that Senator ENSIGN and I have just mentioned, where we are finding Muslim prayer rugs and instructions in Arabic on how to carry out attacks in the Rio Grande Valley, are just wake-up calls that we cannot avoid. So we are, hopefully, going to have the support of Congress to add a full 2,000 Border Patrol agents.

But as important as it is to catch these people, we also need to be able to detain them. Today, many times, because we have no detention facilities, we will say to the people: You must promise to come back in 60 days for your hearing on illegally entering this country.

Well, guess how many come back. Ten percent come back for their hearing. What happened to the other 90 percent? We are finding them in places such as Vermont, New York, and Detroit. MI. That is what happened to them.

Mr. President, it would be irresponsible not to take this threat seriously. We need these Border Patrol agents. We need to keep these people incarcerated to find out why they are trying to enter our country illegally. Every country has the right as a sovereign nation to protect their borders. It is our responsibility to do so.

I hope my colleagues will help us pass this amendment and do the right thing for homeland security. This is a priority, and it must be a priority accepted in this budget.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 219

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment is the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mrs. LANDRIEU] proposes an amendment numbered 219.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a reserve fund in the event that legislation is passed to provide a 50 percent tax credit to employers that continue to pay the salaries of Guard and Reserve employees who have been called to active duty)

On page 49, after line 8 insert the following:

SEC. 9. DEFICIT NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PATRIOTIC EMPLOYERS OF NATIONAL GUARDSMEN AND RESERVISTS.

In the Senate, if a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment is offered thereto, or if a conference report is submitted thereon, that provides a 50 percent tax credit to employers for compensation paid to employees who are on active duty status as members of the Guard or Reserve in order to make up the difference between the employee's civilian pay and military pay and/or for compensation paid to a worker hired to replace an active duty Guard or Reserve employee, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall adjust the revenue aggregates and other appropriate aggregates, levels, and limits of this resolution to reflect such legislation, to the extent that such legislation would not increase the deficit for fiscal year 2006 and for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I come to the floor to lay down an amendment to provide a place in this budget for the men and women who are placing their lives on the line for us.

A couple of months ago, before we went on our break in December and January, I had the great privilege, actually, of holding this body in a filibuster for 3 days. It was not something...
that was planned, but it was something that evolved after I found out that the last huge FSC-ETI bill that we passed in the Senate managed to find tax relief, tax cuts, special tax considerations for seemingly everyone in America except for the men and women in uniform fighting for us.

I know people listening tonight will really not believe what I am saying is true. But they can go to Web sites on this budget to look at the record, or talk to their Guard and National Reserve to see what I am saying is actually true.

We have passed trillions of dollars in tax cuts since 2001. It would be one thing if we were taking money out of the budget to do that, but we are actually borrowing money to give tax cuts. We are not just taking money that is just sitting there sort of waiting for us to decide how to use it and then giving it to tax cuts based on some reason about who would need it the most. We are borrowing money to charging it to our children and our grandchildren, and then giving tax cuts to people who arguably do not need it.

Many Democrats have come to the Senate floor and tried to make that case again, and I hope that some of this is getting through.

But whether they are a Democrat, Republican, or Independent, or whether they were for the war in Iraq; whether they think the troops should stay there or come home; or whether they believe there were weapons of mass destruction and we went in for the right reasons or there were not and we went in for the wrong reasons, I think universally in America people believe, no matter what their political persuasion, that if we are going to continue to give tax cuts the first people who should get them are the people who are fighting to protect us.

But in this budget, on page 21, proposed by the President of the United States, in small print, which I am sorry cannot be picked up by the camera, it says:

The Committee-reported resolution assumes on-budget revenues are reduced by $70.2 billion over five years.

The resolution instructs the Senate Finance Committee to basically give out $70 billion in taxes. So if this budget passes the way it is, $70 billion is going to have to be given out in taxes, in addition to the $2 trillion we have already given away—these numbers are just mind-boggling; it is impossible for me to describe how much money that is. But this President is intent basically on emptying the Treasury for tax cuts.

I believe we should balance the budget. I was one of 50 Senators who voted on the only amendment that actually would have gotten us there, which was the pay-go amendment. We lost by one vote. So I am not going to make that argument tonight again.

I believe that if we are going to give $70 billion in tax cuts, which is what this budget instructs us to do, please, Mr. President, could we please give a tax cut to the men and women in uniform? They are the ones who have left their homes in Louisiana, North Dakota, Tennessee, all over the country, and gone to the front lines to fight for us.

The sad thing about this is that 40 percent of those men and women who go from the Guard and Reserve take a pay cut to fight for us. It is inconceivable to me that this administration, or anybody in the Senate, would stand here tonight and argue for a budget that gives $70 billion in additional tax cuts to people who may or may not need them and yet at the same time not put us on the front line and take a pay cut.

When we come to the floor and go to the Finance Committee and beg and plead on their behalf, could they give them a few pennies, could they give them a break? We are told over and over again, I am sorry, we cannot afford it.

The last “military tax relief” the Congress passed was a $1.2 billion bill. I wish I could show how tiny that is. I mean, $1.2 billion is a lot of money, but relative to what we are giving out to everybody else in tax cuts, it is so small. When we did that bill, I went to them and said: Look, can we do better? Our men and women need this tax break. Their employers are trying to keep their paychecks whole. If we give a tax cut to their employers who are voluntarily continuing to pay their active duty Guard and Reserve employees’ salaries, perhaps they could at least keep their paycheck. We are not talking about extra money; we are just talking about letting them get their paycheck that they got when they were firemen, policemen, an architect, a doctor, or a lawyer. Let them keep that paycheck.

This is not even really for the soldiers, because these guys and gals are making the sacrifice. This is to keep their families, and their children in their homes, in their automobiles, getting them to the doctor.

For some reason—I do not know why—this Senate, particularly the Republican leadership, refuses to give a tax credit to the Guard and Reserve. So the last time a bill came through, I asked: Could you please attach this amendment to it?

Sorry, Senator LANDRIEU, we cannot afford to give the Guard and Reserve a tax cut. Do you not understand, we do not have any money.

I do not know what they are talking about, because this budget is going to give another $70 billion in tax cuts. So please do not even argue with me on the point. I am not going to listen. There is $70 billion given away in this budget again, and I am going to ask for the $1.2 billion out of $70 billion—pennies, pennies—for the Guard and Reserve.

Let me tell you how this affects Guard and Reserve families. This is a letter from Kansas, the State of Senators BROWNBACK and ROBERTS:

After 9/11 [my husband] was activated . . . His pay was significantly decreased, his health care was in jeopardy, and I was pregnant. There was no money to help him with the many sacrifices for our country and our country wasn’t taking care of us at all. How could this be happening?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has consumed her time.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask for 2 additional minutes.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. Going again:

Luckily, our country may not have been taking care of us under the circumstances, but [my husband’s company] was. They sent us a check to make up the difference in pay for my husband’s entire activation. They deserve to be recognized as a great supporter of our military by receiving this tax credit.

This tax credit would go to businesses that are doing the patriotic thing, helping the Guard and Reserve on the front line, keeping them and their families out of bankruptcy, not having to mortgage their house, not having to give up the car while they are fighting for us. This tax credit is the least we can do. It is not a tax cut for everybody in America and leaving out the men and women in uniform.

What is worse about it is every picture we are in is taken with men and women in uniform, with that flag flying, but when it comes to putting them in the budget—we can put them in our campaign pictures, all right, but we cannot put them in the budget.

That is what my amendment does. We are going to vote on it tomorrow. It will add 60 minutes to the Finance Committee, go ahead and give away $70 billion again, but the first $1.2 billion is going to be given to the men and women in uniform. They deserve it. Shame on us if we do not put them in.

So we are not going to vote on this tonight, but for the Guard and Reserve in my State, for the Guard and Reserve in New Hampshire, for the Guard and Reserve in South Carolina, North Dakota, and South Dakota, I hope we will get 100 percent of the Senators to vote on this. If anybody wants to debate it, I will stay here all night and debate it as long as anybody wants, but I think my time has been limited.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request to get an order for some more proposed amendments. Tomorrow morning, we are going to convene at 9. Beginning at 9, we have four Members of the Senate who are going to be recognized. We are going to return to the Smith Medicaid amendment for 60 minutes, then we
will go to the Sarbanes CDBG amendment for 15 minutes, then to the Coleman CDBG amendment for 15 minutes, then Senator Coburn will be recognized for 10 minutes. After that, there are a series of individuals whose amendment time we are confirming but not necessarily the order in which those amendments will come. Those individuals are Senator Kennedy on education for 15 minutes; Senators Baucus and Conrad, agriculture, for 30 minutes; Senator Biden, COPs Program, for 15 minutes; Senator Byrd, the Highway Program, for 15 minutes; Senator Snowe, the SBA domestic program, for 15 minutes; Senator Clinton, Prevention First Program, for 15 minutes; Senator Lautenberg, the debt limit amendment, for 10 minutes; Senator Conrad and I will reserve 15 minutes each, for a total of 30 minutes between us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Gregg. Mr. President, I now yield back the remainder of my time on this resolution, after the expiration of tonight's debate and after the expiration of the agreement which was just reached.

Mr. Conrad. Mr. President, I will retain all of my time.

That was a joke. It would be a real interesting day tomorrow, wouldn't it? I just should. We should make clear that at the end of this evening we will be yielding back on both sides all of our time with the exception of the time we have laid out in this agreement. Is that correct?

Mr. Gregg. Can we do it right now?

Mr. Conrad. Yes.

Mr. Gregg. We both yield back all of our time, as proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So ordered.

Mr. Conrad. If I could briefly describe to my colleagues the negotiation we have had this evening? I know there will be colleagues who will come tomorrow who will be disappointed. Senator Gregg and I apologize to them in advance. Here is the circumstance that we confront. We have over 70 amendments still pending, not counting the 20-some amendments we have in the queue. If we just do the math, that is 90 amendments. We can do three amendments an hour. That would be yielding back on both sides all of our time, as proposed. If we start at 1 o'clock tomorrow and we have to go 30 hours, do the math.

What Senator Gregg and I have tried to do is to at least begin the process at 1 o'clock tomorrow afternoon or thereabouts. Again, for colleagues who are disappointed, I apologize. I know Senator Gregg feels the same way. We would like to have every colleague get all of the time they desire. It is just not possible and reach conclusion.

One thing to say to my colleagues, for those who think, couldn't we just go over into Friday morning? We have a number of colleagues who, because of funerals, because of health conditions, cannot be here Friday morning. That means if we do not finish tomorrow night, we are going to be here Friday night. I do not think anybody who has been through this process doesn't understand if we are here Friday night we are going to be here Saturday.

To colleagues who are disappointed, I am sorry, but we have done our level best to give people some amount of time to offer their amendments. I think we have done it in as fair and as equitable a way as is possible.

Mr. Gregg. Mr. President, I do not wish to take time off of Senator Salazar's time, but I want to affirm what the Senator from North Dakota has said. I also want to thank the ranking member of the Senate committee and the Democratic leader and, of course, the Republican leader for working very hard to bring about this understanding as to how we are going to proceed on the budget. I think it is the fairest way to proceed, and it does allow the Members to get many of the core issues up and debated. That has been the key here, to make sure the high-visibility issues and the issues that we get up and get debated, in the context of the fact that we know these vote-athons take a huge amount of time.

Right now, if we start voting on the present number of amendments we have pending, we will have to vote for 30 straight hours. Obviously, we hope that will not happen, but that is a distinct possibility, that a large percentage of that time will have to be consumed in votes. So we need to get started fairly early tomorrow. That is the purpose of this agreement, so that we can get out of here very late, probably, or very early Friday morning.

I yield the floor.

Mr. Salazar. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 215, which I filed earlier this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerks will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: 'The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Salazar] proposes an amendment numbered 215. Mr. Salazar. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide additional funding for rural education, rural health access, and rural health outreach programs)

On page 9, line 15, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.

On page 9, line 16, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.

On page 9, line 20, decrease the amount by $36,000,000.

On page 9, line 24, decrease the amount by $12,000,000.

On page 10, line 3, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 17, line 16, increase the amount by $29,000,000.'
access to technology, computers, and the Internet than their urban counterparts and, thus, are at risk of being left behind in our global economy.

Rural school districts tend to have higher dropout rates than their urban counterparts. Rural schoolteachers teach more subjects than their urban counterparts, and rural school districts face significant problems with teacher retention. Two serious problems in meeting the Federal Government’s definition of “highly qualified” under the No Child Left Behind Act.

Those of us who have traveled throughout this country, who have been in many of these rural school districts, know that educational opportunity being brought about for the students in rural schools is very different from that in urban schools. We know that in rural schools they do not have the things that many kinds of facilities, the computer technology, the swimming pools, the other parts of the physical facilities—that you find in the wealthier urban settings. So this amendment is a simple statement about the investment needed to help us have the kind of educational opportunity for the children of America who live in the rural parts of our country that have become the forgotten America.

My amendment also addresses the issue of rural health care, restoring funding for the Rural Health Outreach Program, and increases funding for the State Offices of Rural Health Program. These are two programs that are helping us address the health care issues that are faced in rural America. These programs enable the communities to partner with universities, with private practitioners, with hospitals and medical providers to make sure we address rural health care in the way that it is lacking in other communities.

Let me say a word about the circumstance relating to rural health care. In Colorado, in many of my counties, there is only one nurse practitioner for the entire county. On the western part of our State, in Grand Junction, CO, veterans wait up to 5 months in order to see a doctor.

In Colorado, 756,000 of our citizens are uninsured, and a great majority of them live in rural areas. When they get sick, they cannot afford to see a doctor or there is a shortage of physicians for them to see. Rural Coloradans tend to have more health care problems so that the lack of health care is life threatening.

We know health care access in our rural communities is in crisis. A few facts bear this out. Forty-five million Americans have no health insurance at all, but 10.2 million of those 45 million Americans live in rural America; 10.2 million of those 45 million Americans live in rural America.

Americans living in rural communities face some of the greatest challenges in obtaining and keeping health insurance. There are many communities across my State—and I am sure across America—where families in rural communities simply cannot get health insurance, and when they get health insurance they have to pay anywhere from $1,000 to $2,000 a month just to keep that health insurance.

Rural residents are more likely to be covered by Medicaid than their urban counterparts. Problems in rural communities have less access to medical services because there is such a critical shortage of doctors in rural communities across our country.

My amendment will restore some of that funding so that our communities in forgotten America can continue to develop innovative programs to increase access to healthcare. Let me conclude by saying this is a simple step to help us put the spotlight on the problems that are faced by rural America today. This is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. This is an issue where Democrats and Republicans should stand up and say that we value education in our rural communities and in our rural schools, that we understand the major problems of healthcare that are faced in our rural communities, and that we will stand up to make sure that we are addressing those issues of healthcare in rural America.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator Conrad be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, can you advise us of the time remaining on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 37 seconds in favor of the amendment. 7½ in opposition.

Mr. CONRAD. I ask my colleague if I could have 1 minute of his time on this amendment.

Mr. SALAZAR. You can have all of it.

Mr. CONRAD. That is very kind. I will take just a minute.

I thank Senator Salazar for offering this amendment. This amendment is important to rural States such as mine. This amendment makes a real difference in States such as North Dakota and Colorado in rural education and in funding for rural healthcare outreach.

Senator Salazar has proposed an offset to take some of the very significant increase in international affairs and re-direct it to rural America. Rural America is hurting in many parts of this Nation.

Right at the heart of the need for revitalization is education and healthcare. Those are two of the areas that have been targeted by Senator Salazar’s amendment.

This is a very modest amount of money, but it sends a big signal. I hope my colleagues can find it possible to support this amendment.

I thank Senator Salazar for his leadership.
On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $1,100,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $2,500,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $3,200,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,100,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $2,500,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by $3,200,000,000.
On page 30, line 16, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 38, line 17, decrease the amount by $3,200,000,000.

Mr. CONRAD. We now have that amendment in the queue and that is what we wanted to accomplish. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 25

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, on behalf of the entire Senate of Connecticut, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and myself, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS], for Mr. LIEBERMAN, for himself and Ms. COLLINS, proposes the following amendment: 

Ms. COLLINS. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To protect the American people from terrorist attacks by restoring $565 million in cuts to the first responder programs in the Department of Homeland Security, including the State Homeland Security Grant program, by providing $150 million for port security grants and by providing $140 million to hire 1,000 additional Border Patrol agents)

On page 16 line 15, increase the amount by $715,000,000.
On page 16 line 16, increase the amount by $1,020,000,000.
On page 16 line 20, increase the amount by $254,000,000.
On page 16 line 24, increase the amount by $220,000,000.
On page 17 line 3, increase the amount by $339,000,000.
On page 23 line 16, increase the amount by $150,000,000.
On page 23 line 17, increase the amount by $112,000,000.
On page 23 line 21, increase the amount by $14,000,000.
On page 26 line 14, decrease the amount by $585,000,000.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my friend and colleague from Connecticut in offering an amendment to restore funding for the Department of Homeland Security’s first responder programs to increase security at our country’s borders and to better secure our Nation’s seaports.

The amendment would provide a modest, but important, increase in funding to help protect our first responders, those who are on the front lines in the war on terrorism.

Our amendment provides funding by adding a total of $855 million for Homeland Security funding. This includes $565 million for State Homeland Security programs that support our first responders; $150 million for port security grants; and $140 million to hire 1,000 additional Border Patrol agents.

Our amendment does not provide excessive funding. In fact, it is modest in scope. It would simply restore funding to last year’s levels for Homeland Security.

The amendment will ensure at least the same amount of funding for our Nation’s ports, and it takes a modest first step toward increasing the number of border patrol agents as authorized by the Collins-Lieberman Intelligence Reform Act. I note that bill authorized the hiring of 2,000 additional Border Patrol agents.

Our amendment authorizes the hiring of only 1,000 additional agents. I note that other Senators this evening, including the soon to be President, have also expressed the support for increasing the number of Border Patrol agents.

This amendment is also offset by reductions in the allowances account, so it will not increase the deficit.

It is a responsible amendment. As we set priorities through this budget resolution, we are faced with many worthy and competing needs and programs. But surely along with national defense, improving the security of our homeland must be a priority, and that means providing adequate assistance to those who are on the front lines: Our firefighters, police officers, emergency medical personnel, State and local law enforcement, and emergency managers.

Former Secretary of Homeland Security Tom Ridge perhaps put it best when he said that Homeland Security starts with hometown security. Improving our preparedness is an investment that must make it possible for our ability to prevent, detect, and respond if required to terrorist attacks. After all, if the worst happens and we are subject to another attack from terrorists, our citizens are not going to dial 9-1-1.

We should always remember who is first on the scene when disaster strikes. We have an obligation to help our first responders be prepared—as well prepared as we can be—because that strengthens the preparedness of our Nation.

Again, this is a modest amendment. There have been other proposals to increase Homeland Security grant funding by billions of dollars.

I recognize we have to strike a balance, that we are operating in an environment of severe budget constraints. That is why Senator LIEBERMAN and I have joined forces to propose what truly is a modest amendment, to simply restore funding to last year’s levels.

I think it is the least we can do. I do expect the Senator from Connecticut to be here shortly. I reserve the remainder of our time.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CONRAD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I am honored to rise to speak on behalf of the amendment my distinguished colleague and friend Senator COLLINS of Maine has offered to this budget resolution. This amendment will make sure adequate funding is provided for key programs at the Department of Homeland Security.

I am very grateful to Senator COLLINS, who is the chair of the newly named Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. I am privileged to serve as the ranking Democrat on that committee. I am very glad to join with Senator COLLINS in offering this amendment because it continues the statement that when it comes to security, whether in the world through the Armed Services Committee or here at home through the Homeland Security Committee, we ought to act in a bipartisan, non-partisan fashion.

This is genuinely a bipartisan amendment. This amendment and the increases it provides would be paid for by reducing administrative expenses and would not increase the deficit. It would
provide an additional $855 million that we believe is vitally needed to prepare our first responders, to secure our ports, and to strengthen our borders.

Our intelligence and security experts tell us the threat of terrorist attack here at home is as significant as it is within the United States with weapons of mass destruction. And now, the Intelligence Community informs us that the Jordanian terrorist Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, now affiliated with Osama bin Laden, leading a group of terrorists in Iraq, may have conferred with bin Laden about attacks within the United States at nonobvious targets spread throughout this country of ours.

The fact is, we remain vulnerable. We are safer, as the 9/11 Commission said in its report, because we are in a war and not yet safe.

In a recent letter to the Senate Budget Committee, looking at what I took to be the needs of our country with regard to homeland security, I recommended an additional $3.4 billion in homeland security spending for the Department-wide, with $4.2 billion going to first responders.

In the current context, that is a large number, but I truly believe every dollar would have been well spent and would have improved and increased our sense of security from terrorism here at home.

The fact is, we have the best military in the world, in the history of the world, as we have seen in Afghanistan and Iraq in recent years. One of the reasons we do, in addition to the extraordinary commitment, skill, and bravery of our personnel, is we have been willing to invest money to provide that first-rate defense. The money is not here. We will not become secure on the cheap. I understand that the $8.4 billion I proposed in my letter to the Budget Committee is not going to find majority support here on the Senate floor. But surely we can agree not to go backwards.

Although the administration has recommended increases, some of them targeted to homeland security programs, in its fiscal year 2006 budget, those increases are very modest and not yet formal.

It has been said before, but it cannot be said often enough, that our first responders from different States and localities across our country are using a lot of their own money and taking a lot of initiative on their own to prepare to defend against terrorist attack. But they cannot do it alone, nor should they have to. Therefore, Senator Collins and I are proposing this evening would provide $565 million to restore the administration’s proposed cuts to Homeland Security Department first responder programs, to get us back to where we have been.

That would include State homeland security grants, firefighter grants, and emergency management planning grants. Maintaining these programs at their current levels is the least we can do given the importance of those first responders from different States. That is as it says. How can we make sure that in a moment of crisis those first responders from different agencies and different jurisdictions can, in fact, communicate with one another? Only a few States have achieved that interoperability because it is so expensive.

Just last week, New York’s Center for Catastrophe Preparedness and Response reported that emergency medical services personnel generally lack not only proper equipment but also proper training.

Without more support, our first responders simply will not be able to provide the help we need if terrorist strikes. Second, in our amendment, Senator Collins and I also provide for $150 million in dedicated funding for port security. The budget resolution provides none—no funds—in this area. It is hard to imagine any part of our ports to our economy and transportation network. Ninety-five percent of all our trade flows through our ports, and a potential terrorist attack at one of them would cause economic havoc for our country. In fact, the U.S. Coast Guard has estimated it will cost more than $7 billion to effectively secure America’s ports.

Unfortunately, this budget does not guarantee any spending for port security. Rather, it combines a large array of homeland security needs—including port security—into a catch-all fund for infrastructure protection. This fund is too small to cover all infrastructure protection needs. Therefore, the amendment that Senator Collins and I introduce tonight would guarantee that port security gets at least the fiscal year 2005 level of $150 million.

Finally, border security. The 9/11 Commission bill passed by Congress and signed by the President at the end of last year authorized 2,000 new Border Patrol agents for this year. The President’s budget funds only 210 new agents. These new hires, as I see them, would basically replace agents who were moved from the southern border to beef up staffing at the northern border.

Our amendment would provide $140 million for border security. That would allow the Department of Homeland Security to hire 1,000 new agents in the coming fiscal year, which I am confident—and Senator Collins is, too—will be enough to make a noticeable difference in our border defenses.

Mr. President, bottom line: This is a modest proposal. In large part, it is a status quo proposal, keeping us at least where we have been and not moving backward. The experts have told us that we need to invest billions more than we are. We are still learning of new vulnerabilities all the time. We cannot afford to retreat in our efforts, when we know there is still a great distance to go before our first responders are well prepared and other gaps at our borders and ports are closed.

That is the intention of this bipartisan amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it. I thank the Chair and I thank Senator Collins for her leadership once again in proposing this amendment. I am proud to stand with her on this, as I have on so many other matters.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, what is the time situation on this amendment? The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time agreement on this amendment.

Mr. GREGG. I thought we had a half hour from 9 o’clock to 9:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was not formally locked in.

Mr. GREGG. Assuming we had a half hour, how much time would be remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There would be 12 minutes left.

Mr. GREGG. So I would have 12 minutes, theoretically?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, 12 minutes is left in the total half hour. The Senator would control that entire 12 minutes.

Mr. GREGG. I notice that the Senator from Louisiana has an amendment. I think the Senators offering the amendment have completed their statements.

Ms. COLLINS. We are ready to rebut anything that might be said in opposition. But if there were no one speaking in opposition, I would be happy to conclude my remarks.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Senator. I will give the Senator an opportunity to rebut briefly. I will speak briefly in opposition, so that we can move to the Senator from Louisiana.
Mr. President, this amendment is well-intentioned. Obviously, first responders and the homeland security issues are major issues for us as a nation. We have done a significant amount in this area and, of course, there is a supplemental funding amount around that that has a significant amount of increase for a number of homeland security initiatives.

Earlier this evening, we did an amendment offered by the Senator in the chair and the Senator from Texas, which was $2,000 additional border agents. This adds 1,000 border agents. I am not sure when we stop adding border agents tonight. I am thinking maybe there should be a budget point of order that you can only add up to, say, 10,000 or 20,000 border agents in any one given evening.

But as a practical matter, it seems to me that we are getting a little carried away with the border agent additions—even in the context of making political statements.

The amendment itself takes the money out of the 920 fund. I think it is important that people understand that the 920 fund—when you authorize funds out of the 920 fund, you are saying essentially there will be an across-the-board cut in all other accounts of the Federal Government.

This amendment, which has approximately $800 million in it—or something like that—would mean that since it is a discretionary number, half of that would be assessed against the Department of Defense, which would mean you would be cutting DOD by $100 million, education by around $20 million, health care by about $140 million, $150 million. You would be cutting environmental protection by probably $100 million—and so on and so on because it is an across-the-board cut. It has to come from these other accounts on the discretionary side of the ledger. In fact, the education cut would be bigger, much bigger.

Obviously, we have to make choices, and this amendment has decided that homeland security and adding another 1,000 agents on top of the 2,000 already proposed is a priority. But I think it is important that people understand that this is not a situation where the money grows on trees. It comes from taxpayers, and we are trying to limit the amount of money that taxpayers have to spend. Therefore, choices have to be made.

This amendment essentially requires that other accounts of the Federal Government, which have some priority also, such as defense, education, health care, and environmental protection, will be reduced were this amendment to actually be carried to its natural fruition, which I hope it will not be. That being the case, I will reserve my time and, hopefully, we can move on to the Senator from Louisiana.

Does the Senator from Maine wish to comment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, if I could just make a couple of comments in response to the Senator from New Hampshire. I will be very quick because I know the Senator from Louisiana has been waiting.

It will be up to the Appropriations Committee to decide how to allocate the cuts that we are proposing in the allowances account. It would not necessarily cut across the board equally. In fact, almost certainly it would not, because the Appropriations Committee will set priorities.

The second point that I want to make has to do with the number of border agents proposed in our amendment. I think that it demonstrates how modest the amendment is that the Senator from Connecticut and I have offered. After all, even though our legislation, the intelligence reform bill, authorized 2,000 additional Border Patrol agents, because we recognized the constraints of the budget we have proposed only going halfway toward that goal, and that is why we chose to authorize just 1,000 additional border agents. It is in recognition of the budget constraints under which we are operating.

So I think the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee actually helps make the point of how reasonable our approach is, that we chose to go for a more modest number than the previous amendment that was debated this evening.

Furthermore, I point out that that amendment, to the best of my knowledge, was not accepted this evening. It is still a pending amendment.

So this is about setting priorities, and surely we can provide funding just equal to last year’s—we are not even proposing an inflation increase—to ensure that we continue to strengthen the preparedness of this Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to file an amendment numbered 223 which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk who report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Vitter] proposes an amendment numbered 223.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that Congress should provide dedicated funding for port security enhancements)

On page 63, strike line 24, after the second period insert the following: “In dealing with homeland security assistance grants that relate to port security, Congress should (1) allocate port security grants under a separate, dedicated program intended specifically for port security; (2) ensure that these grants are part of a combined program for many different infrastructure programs that could lead to reduced funding for port security; (2) devise a methodology to enable the Secretary of Homeland Security to both distribute port security grants to the Nation’s port facilities more quickly and efficiently and give ports the financial resources needed to comply with congressional mandates, and (3) allocate sufficient funding for port security to ensure that port authorities receive mandated security improvements, ensure the protection of our Nation’s maritime transportation, commerce system, and cruise passenger traffic to achieve funds consistent with the needs estimated by the United States Coast Guard, and recognize the unique threats for which port authorities must prepare.”

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, this amendment addresses the very important issue of port security which was spoken about a few minutes ago by another Senator. I am very concerned that the President’s budget submission does not fully advance port security because it would merge the present support security grant program with other homeland security infrastructure programs. This amendment would address this.

Ports are vital to our Nation and our economy. There are 361 public ports in the U.S. handling over 95 percent of our overseas trade. That accounts for 2 billion tons, $900 billion in domestic and international freight annually. Ports and their maritime industry partners currently make up 27 percent of the GDP, and within the next 15 years many predict the amount of cargo that U.S. ports will handle will double. At that rate, our port facilities would account for as much as one-third of our GDP.

Of course, ports do not only handle imports and exports but also 7 million cruise ship passengers and 50 million passengers on ferries every year. Ports play a vitally important role in the war on terror. Many of our ports are vital to the deployment of our troops, and all of our ports are needed for sustained cargo. The ports themselves supply 4 million jobs.

In my home State of Louisiana they are particularly important. They are a vital part of our way of life and our economy. We have 5 of the 15 busiest single ports in the Nation. As a Nation, 50 percent of our agricultural products go through our ports.

For all of these reasons, ports are an enormous target for the bad guys, for the terrorists. Therefore, we have been focusing, with good reason, on port security.

The problem is, the President’s current budget submission would merge a current and very important port security program into other infrastructure programs. I think that would lose tremendous focus in the effort to beef up our port security and get the job done at our Nation’s ports. My amendment would address that by doing several things.

First and most importantly, it would state the sense of the Senate that port security grants should not be combined with those other infrastructure programs. Again, we would lose focus by focusing on port security with all of those other programs.

Secondly, my amendment would say that Congress should determine a
method to enable the Department of Homeland Security to more efficiently and more quickly deliver port security grants to our Nation’s ports. Third, the amendment states that Congress should state funding levels that would strive to get the full job done, estimated by the experts, the U.S. Coast Guard. The Coast Guard says that at least $7 billion is needed to make enhancements to our ports, although some experts say that might be as high as $16 billion.

I encourage all Senators to support this amendment and help ensure that this important port security grant program is not merged and subsumed into a more general program. I reserve any remaining time which I have, which I would like to use to talk about another amendment in a minute. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes remaining.

AMENDMENT NO. 224

Mr. VITTER. At this point I call up amendment No. 224, at the desk. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report. The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) proposes an amendment numbered 224.

Mr. VITTER. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To restore funding for Corps of Engineers environmental programs to fiscal year 2005 levels, and to offset that increase through reductions in general Government spending)

On page 12, line 15, increase the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 12, line 16, increase the amount by $91,000,000.

On page 12, line 19, increase the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 12, line 20, increase the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 12, line 23, increase the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 12, line 24, increase the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 13, line 2, increase the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 13, line 3, increase the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 13, line 6, increase the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 13, line 7, increase the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 14, line 16, decrease the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 14, line 17, decrease the amount by $97,500,000.

On page 14, line 20, decrease the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 14, line 21, decrease the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 14, line 24, decrease the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 14, line 25, decrease the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 15, line 3, decrease the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 15, line 4, decrease the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 15, line 7, decrease the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 15, line 8, decrease the amount by $130,000,000.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, this separate amendment numbered 224 is another vitally important part of the budget, which is the budget for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This amendment would increase funding of the Corps of Engineers by nearly last year’s level. Specifically, the President has proposed a significant, $130 billion cut from last year’s levels. This would simply stay steady from last year’s levels, using full offsets so that it would not change the overall top-line numbers.

The Corps of Engineers’ mission is vitally important to the country in two areas in particular—first, for a lot of environmental purposes. This certainly affects Louisiana. In Louisiana, this Corps funding is critically important as we literally fight for our life in the fight against coastal erosion.

As noted by the President himself, over the past 75 years more than 1 million acres of Louisiana coastal plain have been lost off of Louisiana. Another third of a million could be lost by 2050.

This is such a crisis that we lose a football field of land, which is a fair amount of land, every 38 minutes. That clock does not stop. It is 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year.

This, of course, is just related to Louisiana. There are other vitally important environmental projects that the Corps is focused on outside of Louisiana, such as the Florida Everglades, upper Mississippi, and many other important projects.

The second area for which the Corps is vitally important is water projects that build and maintain waterways around the country. That goes directly to the maritime sector of our economy and our national economy and economic growth. The Corps builds and maintains and operates 8,000 water projects across the country. Every year it dredges 900 harbors, operates 275 locks and dams, 75 hydropower facilities, and it manages 4,300 recreation areas. All of this is very important to our country, our way of life and our economy. An enormous part of the economy is maintained by that important work of the Corps.

That is why I believe cutting the Corps’ budget in real dollar amounts, by $130 million, is not the way to go. It would hurt our economy. It would hurt economic growth. So my amendment would simply propose to restore the Corps of Engineers’ funding to last year’s level—no more, what was actually appropriated last year.

It is important to note that my amendment contains a full offset that would be a decrease in funding from the General Government account. This would be a 0.7 percent reduction in that account, an account which has been increased 8 percent, double the rate of inflation from last year.

I think this is the right thing to do. I urge all my fellow Senators to support this amendment. I yield back my time.
the better part of the last three decades, dropping from 90 percent of market share in 1940 to just over 45 percent last year. In fact, last year was the first time the United States was not first in sales of commercial aircraft.

Despite this decline in market share, U.S. commercial aviation is one of the few areas of U.S. manufacturing where we actually have a positive balance of trade. The administration’s proposal is shortsighted, and the kind of “penny wise, pound foolish” idea that will hinder the United States’s economic growth and eliminate any chance that our commercial aviation industry will be able to regain market share against our global competitors.

Make no mistake, the European Airbus consortium has a specific, targeted, and funded effort to achieve overwhelming dominance of the commercial aviation market by the year 2020. My amendment sends a message. The message is that as this year’s budget process plays out, this Senator and my colleagues and colleagues from many parts of our country are going to fight the proposed unwise, harmful cuts to aeronautics research and development. I do not think Americans like losing in aeronautics. Our goal is not only to stop these cuts but also to build a national consensus toward investing even more in aeronautics at NASA.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have additional information printed in the Record on why aeronautics research is important to our Nation.

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

THE IMPORTANCE OF AERONAUTICS

1. Aeronautics is important to the safety of the nation and the flying public because:

Air traffic will nearly double in the next decade and will triple in 20 years. If you calculate out today’s accident rate to the day when we will have 20 years from now, we will have a major accident once per week, an unacceptable rate.

Our interstate highway and railroad systems, which are already less safe than flying, are also already exceeding capacity and require a huge investment in infrastructure to meet anticipated demand.

2. Aeronautics is important to our national defense because:

Every military aircraft design the U.S. military currently flies incorporates advanced technologies that were developed at NASA Research Centers. NASA engineers have developed military innovations such as stealth, multi-mode targeting exhaust nozzle systems integrated with aircraft flight-control systems; fly-by-wire flight control technologies; high-strength and high-stiffness fiber composite structures; and tilt-wing rotorcraft technology.

Losing experienced NASA aeronautics engineers and discouraging young engineers from entering this field only harms our national expertise in cutting edge aviation systems.

3. Aeronautics is important to our economy because:

The U.S. aerospace and aviation industry employed 2 million workers in 2001. These workers earn incomes that are 35% higher than the average income in the U.S. The U.S. is losing serious market share in aviation to Europe; U.S. market share has dropped from 70 to 30 percent in just a decade. The Europeans’ “Aeronautics Vision for 2020” plans include them gaining irreversible dominance in civil aviation manufacturing.

Many aerospace and aviation industry segments have lost jobs since 1996, and the manufacturing sector of this industry has lost 67,000 jobs since 1998 alone.

The aviation industry has the largest positive balance of trade of all U.S. industries ($33 billion in 1999). The National Institute of Aeronautics is expected to release a report finding the need for increased aeronautics investment and specifically on greater focus on NASA’s vehicle systems programs.

The amendment I will be offering would meet these recommendations over the next 5 years. As I stated, the increases are relatively modest. For fiscal 2006, the amendment calls for an additional $207 million for the Vehicle Systems Program. This additional funding would be offset by reduction in funding for administrative services across all accounts.

I urge my colleagues to consider the importance of aeronautics research, not only for the jobs and the commercial importance for our country but also for our continued national security. Aeronautics is important, because if you look at the R&D and the advancements that will be coming in aeronautics compared to what is going on with our European competitors, our aeronautics engineers are generally older. If we are going to have the next generation of young people involved in aeronautics engineering, we need to have this commitment to R&D.

Moreover, it is essential that our men and women in the Armed Forces have the best aircraft. We currently have air superiority. The reason that we have it is because of the R&D over the past 5 decades. For this country to continue to protect the freedom that we enjoy here on the floor of the Senate and in this Congress we must be able to project our power into areas where precision, stealth, and speed are required. To continue being able to do that, aeronautics R&D is absolutely essential.

I request that my colleagues to support this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 197, AS MODIFIED

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk with a modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ALLEN], for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. DeWINE, proposes an amendment numbered 197, as modified.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase, with an offset, by $1,582,700,000 over fiscal years 2006 through 2010 funding for Transportation (budget function 160) with the amount of the increase intended to be allocated to the Vehicle Systems account of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for subsonic and hypersonic aeronautics research)

On page 15, line 15, increase the amount by $207,700,000.
On page 15, line 16, increase the amount by $207,700,000.
On page 15, line 19, increase the amount by $313,200,000.
On page 15, line 20, increase the amount by $313,200,000.
On page 15, line 23, increase the amount by $321,900,000.
On page 15, line 24, increase the amount by $321,900,000.
On page 16, line 2, increase the amount by $355,100,000.
On page 16, line 3, increase the amount by $355,100,000.
On page 16, line 6, increase the amount by $384,800,000.
On page 16, line 7, increase the amount by $384,800,000.
On page 16, line 14, decrease the amount by $207,700,000.
On page 16, line 15, decrease the amount by $207,700,000.
On page 16, line 17, decrease the amount by $313,200,000.
On page 16, line 20, decrease the amount by $313,200,000.
On page 16, line 18, decrease the amount by $313,200,000.
On page 16, line 21, decrease the amount by $313,200,000.
On page 16, line 23, decrease the amount by $313,200,000.
On page 26, line 24, decrease the amount by $355,100,000.
On page 21, line 1, decrease the amount by $384,800,000.
On page 21, line 2, decrease the amount by $384,800,000.

Mr. ALLEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield the floor.

AGRICULTURE MANDATORY SPENDING

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the budget resolution and its impact on Agriculture Committee mandatory spending programs. Would the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee engage in a colloquy with me on this subject? Mr. GREGG. I would be pleased to enter into such a colloquy.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. As I understand it, the budget resolution before us today assumes a total reduction in Agriculture Committee mandatory spending programs of $5.4 billion over the
five-year period covering fiscal years 2006 through 2010. I further understand that $2.8 billion of this total is to be achieved by the Agriculture Committee by changing laws governing mandatory spending programs within its jurisdiction through the budget reconciliation process. Assuming the Agriculture Committee complies with its reconciliation instruction, this leaves an additional $2.6 billion in assumed, but un-reconciled, mandatory spending reductions in Agriculture Committee programs. My understanding is that the additional $2.6 billion in assumed reductions will not impact such programs if the Agriculture Committee chooses not to achieve them. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, your understanding is correct. If the Agriculture Committee complies with its reconciliation instruction, the budget resolution contains no budget enforcement mechanism to achieve the additional $2.6 billion in assumed mandatory spending reductions.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I would like to explore this a little further because it is an important point. It is possible that, subsequent to the completion of the budget reconciliation process, the Agriculture Committee may wish to move legislation that affects programs within its jurisdiction. My understanding is that no budget points of order will lie against such an Agriculture Committee bill as long as it is spending neutral. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, you are correct.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. This clarification is helpful. Unfortunately, there is a lot of confusion on this point. Yesterday, all Senators were sent a letter that among other things suggested that the budget resolution’s assumed additional, but un-reconciled, reductions in Agriculture Committee mandatory spending would generally allow a budget point of order to be raised against Agriculture Committee bills subsequent to the completion of the budget reconciliation process. Have you had an opportunity to read this letter?

Mr. GREGG. I have and the letter is very definitely incorrect on this point.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. While I would prefer to not alter any programs under the Agriculture Committee’s jurisdiction this year to achieve mandatory spending reductions, our committee has been willing to contribute its fair share to help restrain mandatory spending in previous efforts to reduce the budget deficit. I believe our committee will be willing to do that again this year. In my view, a $2.8 billion reduction over five years in Agriculture Committee mandatory programs is a reasonable contribution given the President’s proposal to reduce overall mandatory spending by $81.6 billion. Unfortunately, the House budget resolution instructs the House Agriculture Committee to achieve $5.3 billion in mandatory spending reductions. I strongly request that you keep the Agriculture Committee’s reconciliation instruction in the final budget resolution conference report from rising above the Senate’s $2.8 billion figure during conference with the House.

I thank the Chairman.

Mr. GREGG. For no other reason than to make my best to maintain the Senate position in conference with the House.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, the Senate is once again working late hours to enact a budget resolution to take more steps in setting major policy guidelines through the reconciliation process. So begins our annual budget process.

From now until September 30, Congress will conduct dozens of hearings and hold countless meetings, while Members of both Houses deliver innumerable speeches and spend long hours of debate over every subtle nuance of the Federal budget process.

Over the next 8 months, Congress will consider a budget resolution, a budget reconciliation package, and as many as 13 separate appropriations bills—the latter only if we do not combine those appropriations bills into one massive spending bill, which has been the practice in recent years.

By the time Congress adjourns—hopefully in early October but more likely in mid-November—a majority of votes taken in the Senate will relate to the budget process.

Indeed, as my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, has pointed out, 73 percent of the Senate’s votes in 1996 were budget-related, 65 percent in 1997, and 51 percent in 1998. It is no wonder each year it is quite common for the same subject to be voted upon three or four times during the course of the entire budget process. It is a heck of a way to run a railroad, but what is really unbelievable is that this whole process is repeated each year.

I say enough is enough. It is time to bring rationality to our Nation’s budget process.

It is a fact that Congress spends too large a portion of its time debating and voting on items related to the Federal budget. Meanwhile, most other congressional functions are not given proper attention. CBO reports that last year Congress appropriated over $170 billion for 167 programs whose authorizations had expired. This is not the fault of the appropriators. No one expects them to not fund veterans health care or other critical programs due to the way budgeting is done. It is the explicit fault of a process that simply does not leave us enough time to adequately review and authorize important Government programs.

We need to reestablish our priorities so we may effectively do the work of the people, make sure that the Federal Government is running at peak efficiency and deliver value, which is quality service for the least amount of money.

I believe we have an excellent opportunity to do that this year.

One of the first bills I cosponsored when I became a Senator was a measure introduced by Senator PETE DOMENICI that would establish a 2-year budget—just like we have in about 20 States, including the State of Ohio. I believe enactment of this bill would have provided an important tool in the efficient use of Federal dollars while strengthening Congress’s proper oversight role. Unfortunately, we were unable to pass that legislation and the issue has lain idle over the past several years. Now is the time to take it up again.

Because Congress produces annual budgets, Congress does not spend nearly as much time as it should on oversight of the various Federal departments and agencies due to the time and energy consumed by the budget resolution, budget reconciliation, and appropriations process.

Not only is this a problem for Congress, but each executive branch agency and department must spend a significant amount of its time on each annual budget cycle.

Again, as my colleague, Senator DOMENICI pointed out in 2000, the executive branch spends 1 year putting together a Federal budget, 1 year explaining that Federal budget before Congress, and 1 year implementing the budget eventually passed by Congress.

Even the most diligent Cabinet Secretary cannot keep track of all the oversight he or she is supposed to accomplish if they are trapped in this endless budget cycle.

A biennial budget will help Congress and the executive branch avoid this lengthy process. Since each particular Congress lasts only 2 years, a biennial budget would allow us to consider a 2-year funding proposal during 1 year, while reserving the second year for Government oversight.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management and Restructuring in the Governmental Affairs Committee, I have noted that even though the General Accounting Office produces numerous reports documenting Government inefficiencies that need to be corrected, most GAO reports sit on the shelf because there is no time to conduct detailed hearings.

When oversight hearings are held, nearly everyone in the executive branch knows—from career bureaucrats to Senate Secretaries—that they need only weather the immediate storm when they are asked to come to that particular hearing.

That is because once they answer the criticisms that have been leveled in these GAO reports, and explain how they are going to improve the situation, it is over; the worst has passed. Rarely do they have to worry about followup hearings to make sure they have implemented the proper remedies because they know Congress just will not have the time to conduct future hearings.

A 2-year budget cycle gives Congress time to do that legislative oversight and makes it harder for agencies to avoid giving answers.
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Two-year budgeting also gives Congress and agencies time to plan for the future instead of always reacting to the past. Federal agencies are required to have 5-year strategic plans but they need longer term budgets to match their funding to their planning.

For some, we are all tired of the seemingly endless budget and appropriations cycles and are frustrated at the inability to devote enough time to the oversight duties of their committees. I urge them to join in cosponsoring this resolution. I also urge my House colleagues to review the merits of the biennial budget process and act upon legislation as expeditiously as possible for the good of America.

The point I am making is this. It is time for this Congress to adopt a 2-year budget cycle instead of the one we have had for too many years. It will help us do a better job in terms of budgeting; it will allow Congress and the agencies time to plan more effectively and certainly get us to do the oversight that is so badly needed by this Congress.

I sincerely wish we were about to vote on a biennial budgeting bill instead of merely a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. Nevertheless, we can at least send a message to our colleagues telling them the Senate does not intend to let this issue simply fade away.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this resolution. I ask that the text of my amendment No. 175 be printed in the RECORD.

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

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that Congress should enact a biennial budget for the Federal Government.)

On page 65, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 1. SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING BIENNIAL BUDGETING.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should enact a biennial budget for the Federal Government.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, the process of developing a budget each year provides an opportunity to take stock of our priorities as a nation.

The President outlines his priorities through his budget, but it is the Congress, with its control of the purse strings, that is ultimately charged with the responsibility of fashioning and enacting legislation.

Regrettably, the priorities reflected in this budget resolution—which mirror those in the administration’s budget proposal—are wrong for America and certainly wrong for the people of New Jersey.

In New Jersey, we are particularly sensitive to the choices made by this administration and its allies in Congress, since we provide the greatest contribution of taxes paid relative to what we get back from the Federal Government. One result is that the Federal dollar has fallen from 70 cents to a measer 57 cents under the Bush administration. This budget will only further increase the strain on New Jersey’s citizens, especially our most vulnerable: our children, our disabled, and our seniors.

According to the resolution before us, this administration and this Congress’s priorities include underfunding No Child Left Behind by an astounding $12 billion next year, which means that 53,152 students in New Jersey will not be served by the title I program and 32,822 fewer kids in New Jersey will have a safe place to go after school. I supported that this body on Monday rejected an opportunity to restore some of this funding.

According to this resolution, Republican leadership’s priorities include cutting $15 billion from the Medicaid Program over the next 5 years. If these cuts take effect, New Jersey would lose $90 million a year in Federal Medicaid funding.

I asked my State to tell me what they would do if they lost this funding. I told them there are two options: The State will either have to eliminate health insurance for more than 20,000 low-income children and pregnant women who are considered “optional” beneficiaries because they earn just above the poverty level, which is $20,000 for a family of four; or, the State could eliminate “optional” services, including dental care, hearing aid services, psychological services, and medical daycare for individuals with Alzheimer’s and dementia.

The Republican leadership’s priorities include cutting Amtrak’s entire operating subsidy. I doubt the 82,000 commuters who ride New Jersey Transit trains every day would agree with this policy choice, since their trains operate along Amtrak’s Northeast corridor rail. Neither, I know, would the literally millions who rely on Amtrak to travel interstate.

Let’s not forget cuts for our veterans and first-responders. Weakened investment in community development. The list goes on and on.

All in all, under President Bush’s budget, my home State of New Jersey stands to lose nearly $300 million next year, adjusted for inflation, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities and that is before you even estimate his implied cuts to Medicaid. If Congress fails to act, cuts under our budget could be of a similar magnitude.

These cuts do not come as part of some shared sacrifice driven by tough fiscal times, as some would have us believe. Most of these program cuts are only a drop in the bucket compared to the cost of President Bush’s tax cuts for the most fortunate.

In all, the Bush administration has reduced Federal revenues to their lowest level as a share of the economy since the 1950s. As a consequence, we no longer have the resources to deal with our Nation’s priorities — that is why they want to cut funding for veterans and education and health care and community development.

Next year, people with incomes greater than $1 million will receive $32 billion from President Bush’s tax breaks. Compare this $32 billion cost to the $220 million that the President has proposed cutting from the Low Income Heating Assistance Program, which helps low-income seniors pay their heating and cooling bills. We would literally be throwing people out in the cold—405,000 of them, to be precise, or more than 7,000 in New Jersey—to pay for less than 1 percent of President Bush’s tax breaks.

This choice simply does not reflect our Nation’s fundamental values. I don’t think it reflects the values of even those benefiting most from it. Nor does it address the real needs of working families in New Jersey and across America.

That reality includes rising health care costs that are driving families into bankruptcy like never before and preventing businesses from creating jobs that includes growing wage disparity and a labor market that’s stayed weaker for longer coming out of a recession than any other time on record.

According to the Tax Policy Center of the Urban Institute and the Brookings Institution, more than 70 percent of the benefits of the President’s tax breaks enacted in 2001 and 2003 go to the 20 percent of taxpayers with the highest incomes. More than 25 percent of those tax cut benefits go to the top 1 percent.

I believe that America stays strong by investing in its people and its communities, not by abandoning them.

Let’s remember the context. Since President Bush took office, the Federal budget deficit has deteriorated every year. This year, we are expected to be $427 billion in the hole.

In light of this record, President Bush and his Congressional allies’ repeated claims of fiscal responsibility simply are not credible. This budget makes those claims even less credible by achieving much of its purported “cost savings” by passing the buck to States and local governments.

Lowering the numbers here in Washington is not the same thing as fiscal discipline if this is simply an exercise in shifting cost burdens to states and communities. That is hardly a plus for the American people and certainly not for New Jersey.

Our States are already stretched too thin. In New Jersey, we have a budget shortfall of $4–$5 billion and annual property tax increases of 7 percent. Much of the reality for States in budget and tax policy has been the result of cost burdens and unfunded mandates passed down from this administration and its allies in Congress.

We have heard claims from the other side that their tax cuts for the most fortunate are somehow responsible for providing a boost to our economy. But as any serious minded economist not on the Republican payroll will tell you, the real story of our modest growth has
been the longest sustained monetary expansion on record by the Federal Reserve.

Claims that the tax cuts are responsible for significant economic growth are reminiscent of a rooster taking credit for the Sun coming up.

The more noticeable result of the tax cuts has been an explosion in our Nation’s debt, starting with the $1.8 trillion cost over 10 years of making the cuts permanent. If we continue along the present Government’s spending path, by 2015, each family’s share of the national debt will be $73,563. This is simply unacceptable.

As we develop this year’s budget, I hope we take a long, hard look at the priorities our Nation has followed under this President. Because, in my view, those priorities need major changes.

As I said earlier, it is the job of the President to reflect his priorities, but it is the role of Congress to reflect the priorities of America, of our families, and of our workers. I hope we will not fail them.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, as I listen to the arguments coming from the other side of the Hill, I think it is important that we clear up a few misconceptions. A couple of common themes are being emphasized with which I fundamentally disagree.

First of all, it is being alleged that the budget is “cutting” spending. In fact, we are not “cutting” anything. Defense spending under this budget would rise by 4.3 percent over last year. Other discretionary spending would also rise.

Mandatory spending will similarly increase—in some cases substantially. Medicare, for example, is slated to rise by 12.7 percent. So to say we are “decreasing” funding is just not true. The savings to which we refer result from slowing projected increases in spending. We should not assume that just because we go from one year to the next we should automatically be increasing all of our current obligations.

Secondly, it is alleged that we are “cutting” programs. In fact, what we are talking about here are overall budget numbers. Nothing about this resolution allocates specific dollars to specific programs. While it is true that the President’s budget has made recommendations to cease Federal funding of certain programs, allocation of the final budget number is the job of the appropriators. In addition, the majority of the programs about which I have heard complaint are areas properly left to State authority and are not within the powers enumerated to the Federal Government. For example, of course education is a priority. But specifics of education and available programs are not within the purview of the Federal Government. They are properly left to the States. That said, under the President and this Congress, overall investment in elementary and secondary education exceeds $500 billion annually, surpassing spending on national defense and exceeding per-pupil education spending of every other country except Switzerland.

Finally, we are hearing a lot of rhetoric about “tax cuts for the rich.” I would first point out that many of those who are trying to make capital investments and meet payroll. Secondly, we must all remember that money belongs first to those who earn it, and taxes are the share an individual’s earnings that is paid to the Federal Government. The money isn’t ours first. It is theirs. Limiting Government to its essential purposes and allowing people to keep more of their own money is something we all should strive to accomplish. The burden of government has grown entirely too large and away beyond what our Founders intended.

These same people who rail about deficit increases “resulting from tax cuts for the rich” are not advocating fiscal restraint on the spending side. To the contrary, they consistently argue for bigger and bigger increases in Federal spending and more and more entitlement programs funded by the Federal Government. During last year’s budget debate, many of these same Senators voted for $400 billion in additional spending.

If we are to be serious about reducing the deficit, we cannot continue to spend at the current pace. Our largest entitlement programs—Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security—are already in deep financial trouble going forward into the near future. At some point, we have to hold the line.

Mr. ENZI. I want to begin by complimenting Chairman GREGG, Senator CONRAD, and our leadership for bringing the budget resolution to the floor. Last week the Budget Committee reported out the resolution on a party line vote, after a full day of debating and voting on amendments. I am enthusiastic about the budget numbers by which we are moving forward. It was only 5 weeks ago that President Bush sent his proposal to the Hill for Congress to review.

Last year we passed a budget out of the committee and on the Senate floor but were unable to reach an agreement on a Conference Report. That was unfortunate for a lot of reasons. The Budget Resolution sets a blueprint that Congress is supposed to follow for the budget, the House and the Senate. Chairman GREGG and Senator CONRAD have worked tirelessly to get us where we are today. I commend them for that, and hope that this pace will continue so we can have a budget resolution conference report voted on quickly.

The budget process forces Congress to contemplate our legislative and spending priorities each year. However, I’d like to remind everybody we’re not debating appropriations today. My colleagues from the other side of the aisle will try to make this budget debate about proposed cuts to individual programs and pet projects, but we’re not cutting any individual programs today. Let me say that again, we’re not cutting any individual programs today. We are not making the decisions this week as to which individual programs will be funded. We are setting overall funding levels that will hold our colleagues’ spending in check down the road.

However, despite this fact, we are going to hear amendment after amendment that proposes to increase funding for one program or another by increasing taxes.

For example, an amendment that proposes to increase funding under function 750 for COPS grants by eliminating tax relief for working Americans does not guarantee that funding will actually find its way into those grant accounts. That decision will be resolved by the appropriate Senate committee during the debate on appropriations. That means much of the rhetoric we will hear throughout the debate is political, not practical. Right now, we can only decide the amount of money, not where it will end up.

Setting the overall funding level for fiscal year 2006 is especially challenging, because I think most of us agree that deficit reduction must be a top priority. When I read the Administration’s budget request they presented in February, I saw that President Bush proposed the first budget since Ronald Reagan that cut non-security discretionary spending.

I have a long track record in support of deficit reduction, and I am committed to helping President Bush and Chairman GREGG achieve this goal. As we know from marking up the resolution last week, the committee-reported resolution contained instructions that would require authorizing committees to reduce mandatory spending. Many of these cuts will come from programs that I oversee in my role as chairman of the HELP Committee.

I am committed to reviewing and strengthening programs under HELP’s jurisdiction to ensure they are cost effective, not duplicative, and that accountability is required. Because Federal dollars are limited, we need to focus our resources on opportunities where programs will make a difference, and where results can be measured.

One main priority for the committee this year is reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. The committee-reported resolution and the President’s budget both propose spending cuts, while also making room for new initiatives. Critics of the President may claim that we are unreasonably cutting education spending. In addition to required savings, the resolution also contains a $5 billion reserve fund for new initiatives. My colleagues who have worked on education policy understand that there are reforms to work toward that shouldn’t be contentious. I want to work with all of my colleagues, particularly those on the other side of
able, to draft a bipartisan reauthorization bill that enhances access to higher education for poor and middle class families. Higher ed reauthorization should be a bipartisan bill, like it has been historically.

The resolution also proposes deficit reduction from savings associated with changes to the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation. Right now the PBGC has a deficit of $23 billion. The Committee-reported Resolution incorporates a $5.3 billion reduction of that deficit over 5 years. Only a small part of this can be accomplished through reconciliation. The HELP Committee will collaborate with the Finance Committee to reach this goal in the context of comprehensive pension reform. Chairman Grassley and I are committed to restoring the financial stability of the defined benefit system.

The solvency of the PBGC is a critical component of these reforms.

I again want to thank Chairman Gregg and his staff for their hard work on this resolution. They have all worked tirelessly, through many weekends, to get us here today. I yield the floor.

Mr. Gregg. Mr. President, we are now at the end of the day. It has been a long day, especially for staff. We appreciate their effort and their courtesy. I note that there are now pending approximately 25 amendments to this resolution. Of that, approximately 70 or so amendments that we have been told may be offered. Tomorrow, when we begin voting, which will occur, it appears, around 1:20, we have to vote those 25 amendments, and that in and of itself is going to take 3 hours. If any percentage of the ones that are still pending have to be voted, you can assume a significant additional amount of time. So we could be here quite late tomorrow night, and our colleagues should be aware of that as they move into tomorrow.

It also should be noted that almost all the amendments that have been offered today—there have been one or two exceptions, or maybe three or four exceptions—have essentially attempted to increase spending. Some have offset that spending increase with reductions in accounts which actually exist. A couple of the amendments, such as one of the amendments on Border Patrol, takes the money that it spends on Border Patrol and moves it over from other accounts in international affairs. Most of the amendments spend additional funds by raising taxes or by doing what is known as the 920 account, which amounts to an across-the-board cut, for all intents and purposes, of other accounts within the Government.

It is going to be interesting to see when we have completed this budget process whether there really is a willingness to fiscal discipline within the Congress, especially within the Senate which is controlled by a party that alleges itself to be fiscally disciplined. We are going through some very late tomorrow night or early Friday morning. But clearly the issue is in question.

MORNING BUSINESS

TRIBUTE TO THE REVEREND DENVIS RUSH

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a lifelong Kentuckian who dedicated his life to serving others, the Reverend Denvis Rush. In his own words, he was a “Preacher.” The Reverend Rush was a Kentucky icon who passed away earlier this year at the age of 85 from complications of liver cancer.

The Reverend Rush began preaching at the age of 18. His 66-year career spanned eight different churches in Eastern Kentucky and allowed him to embark on mission trips to Indonesia, Africa, South America, and Korea. He touched thousands of lives by officiating at numerous baptisms, weddings, and funerals. Despite his illness, he continued to preach and stood before his congregation for a final time the Sunday before he passed away.

In addition to his ministerial duties, the Reverend Rush was a longtime chairman of the Oneida Baptist Institute’s school board and served on the executive board of the Kentucky Baptist Convention. He was also active in other community organizations where he would donate their time and energy to help improve the quality of life of those around them. The Reverend Rush is survived by his wife; a daughter, Joyce Rush Woods; four sisters; a brother; four grandchildren and seven great-grandchildren.

The Reverend Rush was a very modest man who, when asked to reflect on his lifetime of achievement, said, “I haven’t done it. The Lord’s done it, through a little old nobody.” But the thousands of people he touched all certainly thought he was somebody, somebody special. Mr. President, today I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our sympathy to the family and friends of the late Rev. Denvis Rush by honoring and recognizing all of the contributions he made to communities in Kentucky and around the world. He will be missed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record an article from The Lexington Herald-Leader, “Denvis Rush, minister, dies,” about the Reverend Rush’s life.

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

[DENVIS RUSH, MINISTER, DIES; HAD CONDUCTED REVIVALS ON 4 CONTINENTS]

(By Jennifer Hewlett)

The Rev. Denvis Rush held revivals on four continents. He officiated at thousands of funerals and weddings in Laurel and Clay counties and other Eastern Kentucky counties. For decades he preached several times a week at Kentucky churches.

When he found out that he had liver cancer in November, he declined to undergo chemotherapy because he knew it would sap his energy. He wanted to use every bit he had left to preach the word of his times said.

The Rev. Rush, a Baptist minister for more than 66 years, died Monday at Marymount Hospital in London. He was 85 and lived in London. In addition to his family, he leaves behind thousands of friends whose lives he deeply touched.

“Taxes times in his life when he had more influence on the people of Clay County than any elected official would have, and that’s a saying a whole lot,” said the Rev. Theron Taylor, pastor emeritus of Liberty Baptist Church in London and a longtime friend.

“He did so many things for the people in Clay County and Jackson and Perry and Leslie, his influence is extremely wide,” Taylor said.

PREACHING AT 18

The Rev. Rush, a Laurel County native, began preaching at age 18 and pastored his first church, Laurel River Baptist Church in London, soon afterward. He was pastor of Providence Baptist Church near London at his death.

Before moving to Providence about 14 years ago, he pastored Horse Creek Baptist Church in Clay County for 37 years. During
several of those years, the Rev. Rush pastored Lily Grove Baptist Church, an African-American church in Clay County, at the same time.

"There was no color barrier with him. He was color blind," Taylor said. "He helped them build a new church. He did a lot of the work himself with his two hands. . . . They loved him and he loved them." At one time, the Rev. Rush was a member of the executive board of the Kentucky Baptist Convention.

"Whatever decisions were to be made within our association, one of the questions always asked was 'What does Brother Rush think about it?" said Roy Faulkner, director of missions for the Laurel River Baptist Association.

"He's an icon in Kentucky among Baptists.

For decades, Rev. Rush was Oneida Baptist Institute's biggest cheerleader, said Kay Underwood, administrative coordinator at the school and wife of the school's president, W.F. Underwood.

For several years, the Rev. Rush, who had been a longtime chairman of the school's board, hauled donated food by an area wholesale grocer to the Clay County school for the students, faculty and staff members. He bought a truck just for that purpose.

"He was a wonderful ambassador for Oneida," Kay Underwood said. "One of our buildings is named after him and his wife, Juanita."

The minister, Underwood said, wasn't a wealthy man who could give a lot of money to the school, which has more than 300 students in grades six through 12, but he was a major influence on others who could.

"One of the tender things to me . . . he had a heart for children. He loved anything a child did. . . . This was a man who was preaching and who was busy, busy, busy, but he was never too busy for a little child. I think that's why he had such a heart for Oneida," she said.

For the past five years, the Rev. Rush was the mission's teacher and coordinator at Laurel Lake Baptist Camp outside Corbin.

When he was at the camp, "it was sort of like the Pied Piper, with kids following him for miles over the campus," Faulkner said.

CLEAR CREEK SCHOLARSHIPS

There is a scholarship at Clear Creek Bible College named for the Rev. Rush, who studied there. Money for the scholarship was contributed by people whose children he touched.

The Rev. Rush influenced many young preachers, Taylor said.

WORLDWIDE REVIVALIST

Over the years, the Rev. Rush held revivals not only in North America, but in Africa, Asia and South America.

Taylor recalls an overseas mission trip to Brazil that the Rev. Rush took. While there, he gave witness to an elderly man on his front porch. Inside the house was the Rev. Rush through an interpreter that she needed his help when he finished with the old man.

"She said, 'I'm 18 years old and I've got AIDS and I'm dying.' He taught her how to become a Christian," Taylor said.

"He had more understanding. He knew how to talk to people," Taylor said.

"His heart was in missions. . . . He told me just a week or so ago that if he had one thing he could do again was he'd like to go back and preach in Kenya one more time," Faulkner said.

The Rev. Rush preached for the last time Sunday. He preached twice that day. He was to have been funeral today, but being agreed to do so less than a couple of hours before he died. After he found out he didn't have long to live, he held a revival and officiated at several funerals and weddings.

The Rev. Rush is survived by his wife, Juanita Rush; a daughter, Joyce Rush; a son, Woodrow Rush; four sisters; a brother; four grandchildren and seven great grandchildren.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

PRIVATE FIRST CLASS LANDON GILES

Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life of Landon S. Giles. Private First Class Giles was a passionate and free-spirited young man who lived his life with an admirable sense of adventure and courage. He was also a brave soldier who proudly and honorably served his Nation in uniform.

In doing so, he gave his life while improving the lives of those he saw as less fortunate while helping to bring freedom and hope to a land that has known only oppression and fear. The way he lived his life is a testament to the kind of person he was. The State of Arkansas and our Nation will mourn his loss but will remain forever grateful of the service he rendered on behalf of all.

PFC Giles was born and raised in the southwestern Arkansas town of Arkadelphia. From an early age, his sense of adventure and his athleticism would contribute to the way he spent his childhood. If he wasn't playing golf, football or baseball, he was most likely hiking or on a hunting trip with friends and family. Above all, PFC Giles loved to travel, where he could experience foreign cultures, see new places and meet new people. His father's job required an extensive amount of travel overseas and it allowed him the opportunity to do just that.

Through travels with his father, PFC Giles had the opportunity to see much of the world. By just the age of 12, he became a certified scuba diver while diving at Sipadan, an island off the coast of Malaysia. Additionally, he would go on to experience memorable journeys such as climbing volcanoes in the South Pacific, deep-sea fishing off the coast of Australia, surfing in Hawaii, and riding an elephant through parts of Thailand. It was a rare privilege of which he took full advantage.

It was an adventure that required courage and imagination and he loved every minute of the hours he had.

Wherever that life took him, his friendly personality and outgoing nature provided him with a natural gift for making friends quickly and easily. At the same time, his work ethic, dedication and discipline earned him the respect of his teachers and coaches.

Throughout his time at Arkadelphia High School, PFC Giles would call upon these traits when he spoke of entering the military. Shortly before his graduation, he joined the United States Army National Guard. He proudly served in Iraq for only a few weeks, he was killed when an improvised explosive device detonated near his patrol on February 26.

Back in the community he called home, countless friends and neighbors, as well as strangers who simply wanted to pay their respects, lined the procession to his burial service. Many held American flags in their hands, others simply held their hands over their heart. The community's outpouring of grief was tempered only by its outpouring of appreciation. Their fallen hero had returned home and it was readily apparent that his sacrifice would not soon be forgotten.

Landon Giles was an inspiration, not only because of the way he lived his life, but because of who he was. He was a loving son, brother, and friend, and a passionate and free-spirited young man who lived his life with an admirable sense of adventure and courage.

I want him to be remembered as a strong, bold, compassionate young man who put his life on the line to defend our country and help those less fortunate than us.

My thoughts and prayers go out to all those who knew and loved this special young man.

CO-SPONSORSHIP CHANGE S. 379

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today I rise to ask for a clarification in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from yesterday, dated March 15, 2004. The RECORD mistakenly reported that I was to be added as a cosponsor of S. 379, the Firearm Manufacturers Protection Act. Appended to my name in the RECORD instead of that of Senator MITCH McCONNELL who had requested to be added as a cosponsor of that bill. I wanted the RECORD to reflect that I was never requested to be added to the bill.

As I hope my record reflects, I have been a strong opponent of the gun immunity bill because it puts one industry's bottomline ahead of the families
and victims of gun violence. I opposed this bill and will continue to oppose it because it slams closed the courthouse door to those seeking justice for victims of gun violence, such as the victims of the horrific sniper who terrorized the citizens of DC, Maryland, and Virginia just a short time ago.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would like the RECORD to reflect that I was necessarily absent for the vote on the Byrd amendment offered to S. Con. Res. 118 on Wednesday, March 16, 2005. Had I been present for this vote, I would have voted in favor of the amendment.

COLONEL PETE BUNCE, USAF

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, today I would like to pay tribute to Colonel Pete Bunce of the United States Air Force. Over the past few years, he has earned my personal thanks many times over for a job well done.

Many of us in the Senate know Colonel Bunce, who for the last 3 years has served as liaison to the both the Budget and Appropriations Committees. He has been a strong advocate for the Air Force and has worked tirelessly to improve communications between the Air Force and the Senate.

Colonel Bunce has been a good friend to the State of North Dakota and to this Senator. He has provided important assistance to me in organizing many meetings with the top leadership of the Air Force and the Department of Defense. Community leaders from the three North Dakota communities with the closest ties to the Air Force—Fargo, Grand Forks, and Minot—have all been able to join me for high-level Pentagon visits thanks to his help. He and his staff have also always been tremendously helpful in the Budget Committee’s deliberations on national defense spending.

His professional advice helped me better understand the costs and sacrifices made by our military personnel during this war. I know many of my colleagues feel the same way. His personal testimony as the parent of a troop in harm’s way was even more valuable. Pete’s son, Justin, came home wounded from Iraq. Just as he was recovering from that injury, he was in a serious car accident. I want Pete to know that he, Justin, and the entire Bunce family are in my thoughts and prayers.

While I have relied on Colonel Bunce’s military advice, I have valued his friendship even more. Pete, as you enter into your well-deserved retirement, please know that you go with the best wishes of this Senator and all of us in the Senate.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crime legislation. Each Congress, Senator KENNEDY and I introduce hate crime 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 express horror at a separate hate crime that has occurred in our country.

Last February, a 37-year-old gay man was brutally murdered because of his sexual orientation. The attacker allegedly poured gasoline over the victim and set him on fire while he slept. The police are investigating the incident as a hate crime.

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.

CELEBRATING IDAHO HEROES

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise to recognize Mr. and Mrs. Greg Cannell of American Falls, ID, for their heroic actions in saving the life of a rural mail carrier who skidded off a winding mountain road and into a nearby river in Idaho.

On December 1, 2006, Ron Meadville, a rural mail carrier, was returning from his 110-mile route along the remote North Fork road northwest of Salmon, ID. Friends Tina Taysom and Greg Cannell were traveling ahead of Meadville on the same road. They pulled over to look at some deer, and Meadville passed them. When they pulled back on the road and rounded a bend, they couldn’t see the mail truck but saw a set of skid marks that veered off the road, toward the near-frozen river. Meadville had hit a patch of ice that sent his truck hurtling over the 25-foot embankment to land upside down in the Salmon River, in more than 5 feet of 33-degree water.

Greg Cannell and Tina Taysom acted immediately. They stopped their truck, jumped out, slid down the steep embankment, and plunged into the river. After several strenuous attempts, they were able to pull open the truck door, grab Meadville’s hand, and pull him through the window between the seat and the doorjamb. By this time, Meadville was experiencing hypothermia. Taysom and Cannell pulled Meadville up the embankment to their vehicle. Meadville managed to tell them he lived about a mile away, and they took him to his home, where they helped Meadville’s wife care for him. They refused any care for themselves until they knew Meadville was safe.

Greg Cannell and Tina Taysom put themselves in harm’s way to save a stranger. They’re not so-called heroes, but they are truly heroes to Ron Meadville and his family. Without their courageous actions, Ron Meadville would not be alive today. Their actions truly were heroic, and it is a pleasure for me to honor them and share their story.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE KENTUCKY NEW ERA/ROTARY REGIONAL MIDDLE SCHOOL ACADEMIC ALL-STAR TEAM PROGRAM

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize nominees for the Regional Middle School Academic All-Star Team from the Pennyroyal region in western Kentucky.

The regional Academic All-Star program’s purpose is to recognize top academic scholars and performers. Students from Caldwell, Christian, Trigg and Todd Counties of Kentucky were nominated based on their academic performance in seven disciplines: English, foreign language, journalism, mathematics, science, social studies, and the creative and performing arts. The students are judged on their core academic scores, the total of the student, their grade point average, academic honors earned, unique accomplishments and achievements, extra-curricular activities, employment history, and an autobiographical essay.

Education is the foundation upon which we reach our human potential. Students in Kentucky are developing their talents, furthering their education, and pursuing their aspirations in life through programs like the Academic All-Star program. Encouragement and recognition develop confidence and achievement among young Americans—the future leaders of our country.

The following students have been nominated for their academic excellence: Alicia Lynn Morris, North Drive Middle School; Ashley Chewning, University Heights Academy; Brittany S. Hurt, Hopkinsville Middle School; Chelsea Barnett, Christian Co. Middle School; Corrinna M. Kinnard, Sts. Peter & Paul Catholic School; Janelle Nichol Gilmer, Todd Co. Middle School; Megan Gray, Mahaffey Middle School; Sam Mitchell, Caldwell Co. Middle School; Sherry Cheatham, Heritage Christian Academy; Wesley Croom, Co. Middle School; Jaqueen Hokuinali Goodwin, North Drive Middle School; Elizabeth Settle, University Heights Academy; Emily Beatty, Todd Co. Middle School; Kate Milani, Mahaffey Middle School; Laura Beth Baggett, Heritage Christian Academy; Morgan C. Murray, Sts. Peter & Paul Catholic School; Sarah C. Hazelmyer, Trigg Co. Middle School; Shelley L. Traylor, Caldwell Co. Middle School; Taylor Queen, Christian Co. Middle School; Wendy A. Johnson, Hopkinsville Middle School; Corrinna M. Kinnard, Caldwell Co. Middle School; Jacob Kyle Langston, North Drive Middle School; Jonathan A. Chavez, Sts. Peter & Paul Catholic School; Chelsea Barnett, Christian Co. Middle School; and David C. Murray, Sts. Peter & Paul Catholic School.

Students in Kentucky are developing their talents, furthering their education, and pursuing their aspirations in life through programs like the Academic All-Star program. Encouragement and recognition develop confidence and achievement among young Americans—the future leaders of our country.
Catholic School; Megan Jones, Mahaffey Middle School; Melissa Starks, Trigg Co. Middle School; Molly Ware Stuart, Todd Co. Middle School; Nadeem Ramzi Haroun, Hopkinsville Middle School; Rachel Brown, Heritage Christian Academy; Renee Elaine Hartell, Christian Co. Middle School; Sarah Elizabeth Fields, University Heights Academy; Chelsea Rae Prince, North Drive Middle School; Chris Kirkman, Christian Academy; Sarah Marie Holscher, Simon Kenton Christian School; Helen G. Crenshaw, Hopkinsville Middle School; Hunter Carroll, Todd Co. Middle School; John Paul Boitnott, Caldwell Co. Middle School; Kelsey Fish, Mahaffey Middle School; Lindsay Elizabeth Gray, Christian Co. Middle School.

These students embody the spirit, commitment, and sacrifice that we all should strive for in our daily lives. The citizens of Kentucky should be proud to have these young men and women in their community. Their example of dedication and hard work should be an inspiration to the entire Commonwealth. I extend my thanks to these students for their efforts, and I am proud to bring their accomplishments to the attention of the Senate.

**BONEAL INCORPORATED**

- **Mr. BUNNING.** Mr. President, I pay tribute and congratulate Boneal Incorporated of Means, KY. This company has been named Regional Prime Contractor of the Year for Region IV by the Small Business Administration in Washington, DC.

Boneal has been chosen for this award among companies from Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia and Florida. Boneal is now eligible for Small Business Administration’s National Prime Contractor of the Year Award, which will be given out during Small Business Week from April 25 to 28.

This is not the first time Boneal has been recognized for its success. In both 2000 and 2001, Boneal received the Quality Supplier Award from the United States Postal Service. In 2002, the company was named “Kentucky Industry of the Year” by Associated Industries of Kentucky and received the 2002 Small Business Administration Award for Excellence.”

The citizens of Kentucky should be proud of this small company. Their success serves as an example of how Kentucky’s economy can take off and adjust to the 21st Century. Boneal Incorporated’s know-how and hard work can be an inspiration to the business community of the Commonwealth. I wish them continued success in the future.

**HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES OF NORTHERN DELAWARE**

- **Mr. CARPER.** Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Fair Housing Month and the efforts of Housing Opportunities of Northern Delaware, HOND. On April 25, 2005, HOND will hold their 22nd Annual Proclamation Signing Ceremony. Their theme this year will be “Diversifying our neighborhoods with quality by building relationships through culture and lifestyles.” In April 2005, the nation will observe the 37th anniversary of the passage of the Fair Housing Act, the groundbreaking legislation that affirmed in this country the right of every citizen to obtain the housing of their choice without being limited by race, color, religion, national origin, sex, disability or familial status.

Housing Opportunities of Northern Delaware, Inc. is a non-profit organization promoting fair and equal housing opportunities in the sale and rental of housing in Delaware. HOND provides counseling to individuals who believe they are victims of housing discrimination through education, advocacy, and enforcement of local and national laws, and to promote fair and equal access to housing in rental, sales, homeowner insurance, and mortgages wherever one may choose to live. It is well known that fair housing opens doors of opportunity. To communicate this belief, HOND focuses its activities around six functions. The first is education. HOND provides current information about housing discrimination in the market through workshops, seminars and literature. A variety of workshops, seminars and literature are developed for consumers, community groups, housing professionals and private business persons.

The second is compliance. HOND works with and encourages realtors, bankers, apartment managers, landlords and others to comply with fair housing regulations. HOND also works closely with local, state, and national government agencies including FDC, HUD, State Human Relations Office and Commission, the City of Wilmington and New Castle County. Direct assistance is the third function. HOND provides assistance and counseling to individuals who believe they are victims of unfair housing practices. HOND works with community groups and counseling agencies that are interested in fair housing. The fourth function is advocacy. HOND monitors legislation of local, State, and national levels and serves as an advocate for fair housing.

Research is the fifth function. HOND develops and conducts research projects to eliminate inequitable housing practices. Consumers, community groups, and public and private housing organizations participate in these research projects.

Finally, there are special projects. HOND works with community groups, agencies, and others who have projects in mind to promote fair housing. I rise today to recognize Housing Opportunities of Northern Delaware, Inc. for all that they do in Delaware to better the lives of our residents. Their focus on serving our community is laudable, and I look forward watching their continued success and the impact it has on the people of Delaware.

**THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS NATIONAL HOME FOR CHILDREN**

- **Mr. LEVIN.** Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the services of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, VFW, National Home for Children. Located in Eaton Rapids, MI, the VFW Home for Children has spent the past 80 years caring for the children and families of our Nation’s veterans. The National Home’s uniquely designed facility provides housing, food, health care, education training, and counseling for the orphaned children and single-parent families in their care. With 70 buildings, 36 individual family homes, a community center, a guest lodge, and a chapel, the National Home is well-equipped to serve VFW-connected children from around the country.

The VFW National Home for Children provides two distinct programs for its residents: the Residential Program and the Single Parent Family Program. Children without a parent or guardian are placed in the Residential Program and live with professional childcare workers until they graduate from high school or are reunited with a family member. Single parent families are placed in a 3-year program that helps the parent or guardian develop the skills necessary to become self-sufficient. Both programs strive to ensure that the children maintain as normal a living arrangement as possible. Therefore, the community is structured as a typical American neighborhood and is fully integrated into the surrounding community. Children attend public school or live in private homes instead of dormitories, and are encouraged to participate in community-wide events. Most importantly, both of these programs provide the children involved with what they need the most—a normal childhood.

The VFW National Home for Children is the only organization of its kind in the United States. Their innumerable services have touched the lives of thousands of children and families. Whether the orphaned child was raised at the National Home since infancy, or a struggling family that needs help getting on their feet, virtually everyone...
leaves the National Home stronger and in a better position than when they arrived.

I know my Senate colleagues join me in offering our congratulations and sincere appreciation to the VFW National Home for Children. We applaud and admire the hard work of the dedicated donors, staff, and volunteers. We commend the VFW National Home for Children as they continue to improve the lives of these families.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:13 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following resolution:

H. Res. 147. Resolution electing members to the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

At 3:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1268. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, to establish and rapidly implement regulations for State driver’s license and identification document security standards, to prevent terrorists from abusing the asylum laws of the United States, to unify terrorism-related grounds for inadmissibility and removal, to ensure expeditious construction of the San Diego border fence, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1268. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, to establish and rapidly implement regulations for State driver’s license and identification document security standards, to prevent terrorists from abusing the asylum laws of the United States, to unify terrorism-related grounds for inadmissibility and removal, to ensure expeditious construction of the San Diego border fence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1294. A communication from the Acting Chair, Federal Subsistence Board, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, Subpart C and Subpart D—2005-2006 Subsistence Taking of Fish and Shellfish Regulations” (RIN0181-AT94) received on March 16, 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1295. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Investment Management, Office of Regulatory Policy, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Redemption Fees for Redeemable Securities” (RIN0235-AJ17) received on March 16, 2005; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1296. A communication from the Principal Deputy for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the authorization to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1297. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation and Management, Competitive Sourcing Official, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department’s 2004 Inventory of Incentive Governmental Activities and 2004 Inventory of Commercial Activities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1298. A communication from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the monthly report on the status of licensing and regulatory duties; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1299. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Alabama: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Plan Revisions” (FRL No. 7884-4) received on March 16, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1300. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Maintenance Plan Revisions; Ohio” (FRL No. 7886-7) received on March 16, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1301. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans: Oregon Visibility Protection Plan” (FRL No. 7881-4) received on March 16, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1302. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans: Maine; Control of Total Reduced Sulfur From Kraft Pulp Mills: Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule; and Correction” (FRL No. 7884-7) received on March 16, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1303. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Finding of Failure to Submit Section 110 State Implementation Plans; for Interstate Transport for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for 8-hour Ozone and PM2.5” (FRL No. 7885-7) received on March 16, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1304. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Delegation of Authority of Texas” (FRL No. 7888-4) received on March 16, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1305. A communication from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Frivolous Arguments Regarding Waiver of Social Security Benefits Used to Avoid Tax” (Rev. Rul. 2005-18) received on March 16, 2005; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1306. A communication from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Frivolous Arguments Regarding Opposition to Government Policies and Programs Used to Avoid Tax” (Rev. Rul. 2005-20) received on March 16, 2005; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1308. A communication from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Frivolous Constitutional Arguments Used to Avoid Tax” (Rev. Rul. 2005-19) received on March 16, 2005; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1309. A communication from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Frivolous ’Straw Man’ Claim Used to Avoid Tax” (Rev. Rul. 2005-21) received on March 16, 2005; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1310. A communication from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Charitable Remainder Trusts: Application of Ordering Rule” (Rev. Rul. 2005-22) received on March 16, 2005; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DOMENICI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 161. A bill to provide for a land exchange in the State of Arizona between the Secretary of Agriculture and Yavapai Ranch Limited Partnership (Rept. No. 119-40).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DOMENICI for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

*Patricia Lynn Scarlett, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

*Jeffrey Clay Soil, of Texas, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to a hearing.

A copy of the nomination is on file in the office of the Secretary and is subject to request to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.
INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LUGAR:
S. 647. A bill to authorize the extension of unconditional and permanent nondiscriminatory treatment (permanent normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Ukraine and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON:
S. 633. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the compensation due to the estates of veterans who became disabled for life while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBLISS:
S. 634. A bill to amend the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 to clarify allowable support for the exports of agricultural commodities and products to Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SANTORUM (for himself, Mr. CONRAD, and Mrs. MURRAY):
S. 635. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the benefits under the medicare program for beneficiaries with kidney disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:
S. 636. A bill to direct the Inspector General of the Department of Justice to submit semi-annual reports regarding settlements related to Social Security fraud and fraud against the Federal Government; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. PRYOR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):
S. 637. A bill to establish a national health program administered by the Office of Personnel Management to offer health benefits plans to individuals who are not Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURPHY (for herself, Mrs. COLLINS, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. CORZINE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. Spyropoulus):
S. 638. A bill to extend the authorization for the ferry boat discretionary program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CORZINE (for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REID, Mr. KERRY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, and Mr. DAYTON):
S. 639. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reduce the age for receipt of military retired pay for nonregular service from 60 years of age to 55 years of age; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself and Mr. NELSON of Nebraska):
S. 640. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a unit command center command for military intelligence, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. CORNYN):
S. 641. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Michael Ellis DeBakey, M.D.; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. AXELANDER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ENNIS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. Bunning, Mr. SMITH, Mr. VITTER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, and Mr. NELSON of Florida):
S. 642. A bill to support certain national youth organizations, including the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):
S. 643. A bill to amend the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 to authorize State agricultural credit programs; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. DODD):
S. 644. A bill to establish new special immigrant categories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SARENNES, Mr. REED, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DODD, and Mrs. CLINTON):
S. 645. A bill to restate the Public Safety and Recreational Firearms Use Protection Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELBY:
S.J. Res. 10. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which requires (except during time of war and subject to suspension by Congress) that the total amount of money expended by the United States during any fiscal year not exceed the amount of certain revenue received by the United States during such fiscal year and not exceed 20 per centum of the gross national product of the United States during the previous calendar year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:
S.J. Res. 11. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college and to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SANTORUM (for himself, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. LUGAR):
S. Res. 83. A resolution commemorating the 65th Anniversary of the Black Press of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 185

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 185, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for the reduction of certain Survivor Benefit Plan annuities by the amount of dependency and indemnity compensation and to modify the effective date for paid-up coverage under the Survivor Benefit Plan.

S. 296

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program, and for other purposes.

S. 339

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 339, a bill to reaffirm the authority of States to regulate certain hunting and fishing activities.

S. 378

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 378, a bill to make it a criminal act to willfully use a weapon with the intent to cause death or serious bodily injury to any person while on board a passenger vessel, and for other purposes.

S. 394

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 394, a bill to promote accessibility, accountability, and openness in Government by strengthening section 552 of the United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes.

S. 397

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the names of the Senators from Arkansas (Mr. JOYCE) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 397, a bill to prohibit civil liability actions from being brought or continued against manufacturers, distributors, dealers, or importers of firearms or ammunition for damages, injunctive or other relief resulting from the misuse of their products by others.

S. 468

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 468, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to enhance literacy in finance and economics, and for other purposes.

S. 484

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senators from Montana (Mr. BURNS) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 484, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal civilian and military retirees to pay health insurance premiums on a pretax basis and to allow a deduction for TRICARE supplemental premiums.

S. 495

At the request of Mr. DAYTON, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 495, a bill to impose sanctions against perpetrators of crimes against humanity in Darfur, Sudan, and for other purposes.

S. 533

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor
of S. 513, a bill to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions.

At the request of Mr. Martinez, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Sensenbrenner) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DeMint) were added as cosponsors of S. 539, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide the protections of habeas corpus for certain incapacitated individuals whose life is in jeopardy, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Reid, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Akaka) was added as a cosponsor of S. 558, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain additional retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special compensation and to eliminate the phase-in period under current law with respect to such concurrent receipt.

At the request of Mr. Bond, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. Landrieu) was added as a cosponsor of S. 566, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the proper tax treatment of certain disability mitigation payments.

At the request of Mr. Cornyn, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Grassley) was added as a cosponsor of S. 589, a bill to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays.

At the request of Ms. Collins, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Voinovich) was added as a cosponsor of S. 593, a bill to amend title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that the provisions relating to countervailing duties apply to nonmarket economy countries.

At the request of Mr. Coleman, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Lugar) was added as a cosponsor of S. 596, a resolution expressing the sense that the week of August 7, 2005, be designated as "National Health Center Week" in order to raise awareness of health services provided by community, migrant, public housing, and homeless health centers, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Frist, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 82, a resolution urging the European Union to add Hezbollah to the European Union’s wide-ranging list of terrorist organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 146

At the request of Mrs. Dole, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 146 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 18, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010.

AMENDMENT NO. 172

At the request of Mr. Harkin, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Landrieu), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Kohl), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Dodd) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Kerry) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 172 proposed to S. Con. Res. 18, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. Lugar.

A newly named Central Election Commission and a new set of election laws led to a much improved process. After tremendous international pressure and mediation, Ukraine repeated the runoff election on December 26, 2004. The people of Ukraine withstood threats of violence, pressure and intimidation, and the election was free and fair.

Mr. Lugar. Mr. President, I rise today in support of a bill that I have introduced authorizing the extension of permanent normal trade relations treatment (permanent normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. Lugar. Mr. President, I rise today in support of a bill that I have introduced authorizing the extension of permanent normal trade relations treatment. Ukraine is still subject to the provisions of the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Omnibus Trade Act of 1974, which sanctions nations for failure to comply with freedom of emigration requirements. Our bill would repeal permanently the application of Jackson-Vanik to Ukraine.

In the post Cold War era, Ukraine has demonstrated a commitment to meet these requirements, and in addition, has expressed a strong desire to abide by free market principles and good governance. Last November, I served as President Bush’s personal representative to the runoff election between Prime Minister Yanukovich and Victor Yushchenko. During that visit, I promoted free and fair election procedures that would strengthen worldwide respect for the legitimacy of the winning candidate. Unfortunately, that was not possible. The Government of Ukraine allowed, or aided and abetted, wholesale fraud and abuse that changed the results of the election. It is clear that Prime Minister Yanukovich did not win the election.

In response, the people of Ukraine rallied in the streets and demanded justice. After tremendous international pressure and mediation, Ukraine repeated the runoff election on December 26, 2004. The newly named Central Election Commission and a new set of election laws led to a much improved process. International monitors concluded that the process was generally free and fair. This past weekend Victor Yushchenko was inaugurated as President of Ukraine.

Extraordinary events have occurred in Ukraine over the last three months.
A free press has revolted against government intimidation and reasserted itself. An emerging middle class has found its political footing. A new generation has embraced democracy and openness. A society has rebellled against the illegal activities of its government. It is in our interest to recognize and protect these advances in Ukraine.

The United States has a long record of cooperation with Ukraine through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction. Ukraine inherited the third largest nuclear arsenal in the world with the fall of the Soviet Union. Through the Nunn-Lugar Program the United States has assisted Ukraine in eliminating this deadly arsenal and joining the Nonproliferation Treaty as a non-nuclear state.

One of the areas where we can deepen U.S.-Ukrainian relations is bilateral trade. Our trade relations between the U.S. and Ukraine are currently governed by a trade agreement signed in 1992. There are other economic agreements in place seeking to further facilitate economic cooperation between the U.S. and Ukraine, including a bilateral investment treaty which was signed in 1996, and a taxation treaty signed in 2000. In addition, Ukraine commenced negotiations to become a member of the World Trade Organization in 1993, further demonstrating its commitment to adhere to free market principles and fair trade. In light of its adherence to freedom of emigration requirements, democratic principles, compliance with threat reduction and several agreements on economic cooperation, the products of Ukraine should not be subject to the sanctions of Jackson-Vanik.

There are areas in which Ukraine needs to continue to improve. These include market access, protection of intellectual property and reduction of tariffs. The U.S. must remain committed to assisting Ukraine in pursuing market economic reforms. The permanent waiver of Jackson Vanik and establishment of permanent normal trade relations will be the foundation on which further progress in a burgeoning economic partnership can be made.

I am hopeful that my colleagues will join me in supporting this important legislation. It is essential that we act promptly to bolster this burgeoning democracy and promote stability and in this region. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 632
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, SECTION 1. FINDINGS.
Congress finds that:
(1) it is in the interest of the United States to promote the right and opportunity to emigrate, free of any heavy tax on emigration or on the visas or other documents required for emigration and free of any tax, levy, fine, fee, or other charge on any citizens as a consequence of the desire of such citizens to emigrate to the country of their choice;
(2) it has received normal trade relations treatment since concluding a bilateral trade agreement with the United States that enabled it to be treated under Title II, which remains in force and provides the United States with important rights;
(3) it has been found to be in full compliance with the freedom of emigration requirements under title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 since 1997;
(4) it has committed itself to ensuring freedom of religion and preventing intolerance;
(5) it has committed itself to continuing its efforts to return religious property to religious organizations in accordance with existing law;
(6) it has taken significant steps demonstrating its intentions to build a friendly and cooperative relationship with the United States including participating in peacekeeping efforts in Europe; and
(7) it has made progress toward meeting international standards in the most recent Presidential runoff elections, including in the implementation of Ukraine’s new elections laws.
SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 TO UKRAINE.
(a) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATIONS AND EXTENSION OF PERMANENT NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any provision of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2431 et seq.), the President may:
(1) determine that such title should no longer apply to Ukraine; and
(2) after making a determination under paragraph (1), in the case of Ukraine, proclaim the extension of unconditional and permanent non discriminatory treatment (permanent normal trade relations treatment) to the products of that country.
(b) TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV.—On and after the effective date of the extension under subsection (a)(2) of non discriminatory treatment to the products of Ukraine, chapter 1 of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 shall cease to apply to that country.

By Mr. JOHNSON:
S. 633. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of veterans who became disabled for life while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the American Veterans Disabled for Life Coin Act of 2005. This bill will authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a commemorative coin (500,000) honoring the millions of veterans of the United States Armed Forces who were disabled while serving our country. Revenues from the surcharge on the coin would go to the Disabled Veterans’ LIFE Memorial Foundation to help cover the costs of building the American Veterans Disabled for Life Memorial in Washington, DC. The mint date is scheduled for January 1, 2010.

In its own distinctive way, the American Veterans Disabled for Life Memorial will also allow the American people to show their appreciation to those who died defending freedom by honoring the disabled veterans who still live among us. It is not only appropriate, but necessary, to recognize the special sacrifices that disabled veterans have made to this country. It has been a long battle. It is the battle which has no heroes. Poorer still is the Nation which has them, but forgets.” The creation of this memorial will ensure that we, as a Nation, do not forget those who have been forever changed in service to our country.

The three-acre site for the Memorial is located on Washington Avenue at 2nd Street, SW., across from the U.S. Botanic Gardens, and in full view of the U.S. Capitol building. Federal legislation for the Memorial, Public Law 106-348, was signed into law by President Bill Clinton on October 24, 2000. Sponsors included Senator JOHN MCCAIN, Senator Max Cleland, Congressman SAM JOHNSON, and Congressman JOHN MURTHA. The National Capital Planning Commission unanimously approved the Capitol Hill location on October 10, 2001.

We have an obligation to assure that the men and women who each day endure the costs of freedom are never forgotten. The American Veterans Disabled for Life Commemorative Coin Act of 2005 will honor these veterans and help fund the American Veterans Disabled for Life Memorial.

The Disabled Veterans’ LIFE Memorial Foundation was co-founded in 1996 by the Lois Pope Life Foundation and the Disabled American Veterans. Lois Pope, one of America’s leading philanthropists, is the founder and President of the Lois Pope Leaders in Furthering Education Foundation. In addition to supporting veterans programs, this organization provides awards for medical research, scholarships, and summer camp programs. Formed in 1920, the Disabled American Veterans is a non-profit organization representing America’s disabled veterans, their families, and survivors.

The drive to build the Memorial, which is scheduled for completion within the next several years, is well under way, but has a long way to go. Prominent national figures including Retired Army General H. Norman Schwarzkopf, Poet Laureate Dr. Maya Angelou, and New York Giants star defensive end Michael Strahan are lending their support to this effort. I ask my colleagues in the Senate to join me in supporting America’s disabled veterans with this important legislation.

By Mr. CHAMBLISS:
S. 634. A bill to amend the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 to clarify allowable payment terms for sales of agricultural commodities and products to Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce legislation to reverse the unilateral change by the Department of Treasury’s Office of
Four years ago, Congress passed the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act (TSREEA), allowing sales of agricultural goods to Cuba for the first time in nearly four decades. The Act did not signal an end to the embargo or efforts to do so but merely exempted food and medicine from unilateral sanctions that harm local populations.

Currently, U.S. exporters require payment before turning over title and control of the goods. The exporters routinely ship goods to Cuba where they remain under the custody of the seller until such time as the seller certifies full payment. Only then are the goods released to Cuba. At no time is credit extended in any form to Cuba. This standard method of doing business has been in practice since sales to Cuba began.

TSREEA was meant to expand access for agricultural producers to the Cuban market. By taking into consideration the unique nature of agriculture trade with Cuba, my legislation intends to overturn OFAC’s new definition of “cash in advance.” We should not be making it harder to export agricultural products when the United States is experiencing trade deficits and committed to helping expand opportunities at home and abroad for our nation’s farmers and ranchers. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate on this important issue.

By Mr. SANTORUM (for himself, Mr. CONRAD, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 635. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the benefits under the medicare program for beneficiaries with kidney disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Kidney Care Quality Act, which Senator SANTORUM and I introduce today. With all of the attention now being paid to improving the quality of health care Americans receive, it is important for Congress to reaffirm our commitment to patients with kidney failure.

As part of this commitment, Congress should ensure that these patients receive high quality care and should take steps to improve the Medicare End Stage Renal Disease, ESRD, program. This bill would do just that. First, it establishes a quality demonstration project to reward high quality dialysis providers. It also establishes education programs to assist patients with kidney disease to learn important self-management skills that will help them manage their disease more effectively and improve their quality of life. The bill also seeks to help combat irreversible kidney failure by teaching individuals about the factors that lead to chronic kidney disease, the precursor to kidney failure, and how to prevent it, treat it, and, most importantly, reverse it.

Additionally, we recognize that some patients who currently receive dialysis in dialysis facilities and hospitals could benefit by receiving the treatments in their homes. Even though home dialysis can improve patients’ quality of life by allowing them to remain employed and to participate in other activities that promote well-being, only a small number of patients select the home dialysis option. According to the U.S. Renal Data System, 32 percent of all ESRD patients relied on home dialysis in 2001. The bill we are introducing today would require the Department of Health and Human Services to identify barriers patients face in choosing home dialysis options and take steps toward eliminating them.

Improving the ESRD program payment system is also a critical component of promoting high quality care for patients with kidney failure. Medicare Part D does not cap the payment system, PPS, in the ESRD program in the early 1980s. Since that time, we have learned a great deal about how the PPS methodology works. Yet, the ESRD program remains the only Medicare PPS that does not receive an annual update. As a result, dialysis facilities have difficulty hiring qualified health care professionals because they simply cannot match the salaries offered by hospitals and other providers that do receive an annual update.

For 2002, MedPAC calculated a projected margin on dialysis services of –0.63 percent when combining the composite rate and injectable drugs. Without a fair reimbursement rate, providers face significant hurdles in attracting high quality health care professionals. Our bill addresses this ongoing problem to ensure that providers receive fair payment for the services they provide.

Congress must reaffirm its commitment to Americans with kidney failure by improving the program through new educational programs, quality initiatives, and payment reform. The Kidney Care Quality Act is a comprehensive bill that moves this in the right direction. I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this important legislation.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 636. A bill to direct the Inspector General of the Department of Justice to submit semi-annual reports regarding settlements relating to false claims and fraud against the Federal Government; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I am re-introducing a bill directing the Inspector General of the Department of Justice to submit semi-annual reports regarding settlements relating to false claims and fraud against the United States.

The False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. § 3729 et seq., is the government’s single most effective program for recouping money improperly obtained from the United States by false claims and fraud. Initially passed during the Civil War at President Abraham Lincoln’s request to suppress fraud against the Union Army, the FCA was modernized and updated in 1986. Since President Ronald Reagan signed the 1986 amendments into law, settlements and judgments in FCA cases have exceeded $13 billion. No other anti-fraud program of the Federal Government can match this result.

Despite the significant success of the results, the Congress does not have a way to evaluate the performance of the FCA program. While the program, which is overseen by the Civil Division of the Department of Justice, appears to be doing well, it is not known at this time how the program is performing as compared to its potential. What percentage of the various frauds perpetrated against the United States is recouped in False Claims Act cases? How effectively does DoJ capture the money recouped by settlements and fraud against the Federal Government? How effectively does DoJ prevent fraud against the Federal Government? How effectively does DoJ share the proceeds of FCA cases with state and local law enforcement agencies?

DoJ is required to submit semi-annual reports to Congress regarding settlements relating to false claims and fraud against the United States. These reports do not provide Congress with the information it needs. I urge my colleagues to introduce today for which the bill will be well? How does DoJ move FCA cases? How effectively does DoJ use its tools to reward high quality health care providers, and how well does it reward them?

The purpose of this bill is to answer these questions. The bill requires DoJ to submit certain information that will allow Congress to evaluate the Department’s performance in managing FCA cases. Congress has committed to helping expand opportunities at home and abroad for our nation’s farmers and ranchers. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate on this important issue.
description of the estimated damages suffered by the United States, the amount recouped, the multiplier used to calculate the settlement amount, the criminal fines collected and whether the defendants were held liable in previous cases. The report will also inform Congress as to whether the defendants have been required to enter into corporate integrity agreements.

In addition, in order to understand how the DoJ is working, the Department of Justice will be required to inform Congress as to whether civil investigative demands were issued. The Department will also be required to provide certain information about the conduct of qui tam cases initiated by whistleblowers. For example, Congress will receive information about the length of time cases are under seal, whether whistleblowers (technically termed “relators”) sought a fairness hearing regarding a settlement and what share of the settlement they received. The Congress would also receive information about whether the agency that suffered from the fraud involved in the settlement was able to implement its corporate integrity agreements covered the conduct that is the subject of the settlement or compromise; and (i) whether the defendant or any of its divisions, subsidiaries, affiliates, or related entities—

(i) entered into a corporate integrity agreement related to the settlement or compromise; and
(ii) had previously entered into 1 or more corporate integrity agreements related to section 3730(b) of title 31, United States Code, and if so, whether the previous corporate integrity agreements covered the conduct that is the subject of the settlement or compromise being reported on or similar conduct.

(J) In the case of settlements involving Medicaid, the amounts paid to the Federal Government and to each of the States participating in the settlement or compromise; and
(K) whether civil investigative demands were issued in process of investigating the case.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mrs. Collins, Mrs. Boxer, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Corzine, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Kennedy, Schumer, Snowe, and Mr. Stevens):

S. 638. A bill to extend the authorization for the ferry boat discretionary program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that will greatly enhance Federal participation in financing and improving our Nation’s ferry transportation system.

Today I again introduce the Ferry Transportation Enhancement Act, or Ferry-TEA. I am proud to have Senators Collins, Boxer, Cantwell, Clinton, Corzine, Feinstein, Kennedy, Schumer, Snowe, and Stevens as original cosponsors. This bill will provide significantly more resources to State governments, public ferry systems, and private entities to be able for developing facilities for ferries.

Specifically, the bill would provide $150 million a year for the Federal Highway Administration’s Ferry Boat Discretionary Program. This is applied for every four years beginning with a fiscal year that is currently being provided under this program; add “ferry maintenance facilities” to the list of allowable use of funds under this program; add “ferries” to the Clean Fuels Program; establish a Ferry Joint Program Office to coordinate federal programs affecting ferry boat and ferry facility construction, maintenance, and operations and to promote ferry service as a component of the nation’s transportation system; and authorize the Department of Transportation to promote the development of an information database on ferry systems, routes, vessels, passengers and vehicles carried; and establish an institute for ferries to conduct R&D, conduct training programs, encourage collaborative efforts to promote ferries, and preserve historical information. This will parallel institutes that now exist for highways, transit, and rail.

Currently, the Federal investment in ferries is only one-tenth of one percent of the total Surface Transportation Program. There is virtually no coordination at the federal level to encourage and promote ferries as there are for other modes of transportation.

We: establish a Ferry Joint Program Office to coordinate federal programs affecting ferry boat and ferry facility construction, maintenance, and operations and to promote ferry service as a component of the nation’s transportation system; and authorize the Department of Transportation to promote the development of an information database on ferry systems, routes, vessels, passengers and vehicles carried; and establish an institute for ferries to conduct R&D, conduct training programs, encourage collaborative efforts to promote ferries, and preserve historical information. This will parallel institutes that now exist for highways, transit, and rail.

Finally, in many States like my home State of Washington they are an important part of the tourism industry and represent a part of our cultural identity.

The symbol of ferries moving people and vehicles on the waterways of the Puget Sound is as much a part of our cultural identity as computers, coffee, commercial aircraft and the Washington Apple.

Ferry use is growing.

In Washington State our ferry system—the Nation’s largest—transports approximately 26 million passengers each year and carries 11 million vehicles. This is more passengers in my one State than Amtrak transports on a yearly basis nationwide.

Other systems that serve New York/New Jersey, North Carolina, San Francisco, and Alaska also have significant numbers of passengers using the ferries.

The Nation’s six largest ferry systems recently carried 73 million people and 13 million vehicles in just one year.
The growth projection for ferry use is very high. For these larger systems, it is projected that by 2009 there will be a 14-per cent increase in passengers and a 17-per cent increase in vehicles being carried by ferries compared to 2002.

In San Francisco, that projection is a 46-per cent increase in passengers.

It is clear that many people are using ferries and more will be using them in the future.

This is all with very little help from the Federal Government.

Our investment in ferries pails in comparison to the federal investments in highways and other forms of mass transit. Our bill would provide the needed funding for these growing systems for new ferry boat construction, for ferry facilities and terminals, and for maintenance facilities.

The bill also would make ferries eligible under the Clean Fuels Program. Unlike buses, ferries are a form of mass transit that is cleaner than mass use of cars and trucks. Making them eligible for the Clean Fuels Program will encourage boat makers to design cleaner and more efficient vessels in the future. This will make ferry travel an even more environmentally-friendly means of transportation than it is today.

During the 108th Congress, I, with the help of several of my colleagues, was able to attach an amendment to the surface transportation reauthorization bill—SAFETEA. That amendment would have increased the funding for the Ferry Boat Discretionary Program from $38 million per year to $120 million per year and make other changes.

I thank Chairman INHOFE, Chairman BOND, and Senators Jeffords and Reid for working with us to include that important amendment.

As we again move to the Senate consideration of the reauthorization bill in the near future, I look forward to working with my cosponsors and the leaders of the Committee, which now includes Senator Baucus, to see all the elements of Ferry-TEA is included in the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 388

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 “Ferry Transportation Enhancement Act.”

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF FERRY BOATS AND FERRY TERMINAL FACILITIES.

(a) FUNDING.—Section 1064 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (23 U.S.C. 129 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) FUNDING.—

“(1) In general.—There shall be available, out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account), to the Secretary for obligation at the discretion of the Secretary $150,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2004 through 2009. Sums made available to carry out this section shall remain available until expended.

“(2) Allocation of funds.—The Secretary shall give priority in the allocation of funds from the Federal share of ferry projects under this section to public and private entities responsible for developing facilities for ferries, that carry the greatest number of passengers and vehicles, carry the greatest number of passengers and vehicles on a vessel, or provide critical access to areas that are not well-served by other modes of surface transportation.”

SEC. 3. ELIGIBILITY OF FERRY MAINTENANCE FACILITIES FOR FEDERAL FUNDING.

(a) MAINTENANCE FACILITIES.—Section 129(c) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and maintenance” after “terminal”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting “or maintenance” after “terminal” each place it appears.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1064 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (23 U.S.C. 129 note) amended by inserting “and maintenance” after “terminal” each place it appears.

SEC. 4. ELIGIBILITY OF FERRIES FOR CLEAN FUELS PROGRAM.

Section 5308 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clauses (i) and (iii) of subsection (a)(3)(A) and in subsection (e), by inserting “or ferries” after “buses” each place it appears;

(2) in subsection (e), by inserting “or ferry” after “bus” each place it appears;

(3) in the heading for subsection (e)(2), by inserting “or ferries” after “buses”;

(4) in the heading for subsection (e)(3), by inserting “or ferry” after “Bus”.

SEC. 5. FERRY JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Transportation shall establish a Ferry Joint Program Office in this section, referred to as the “Office”, to coordinate Federal programs affecting ferry boat and ferry facility construction, maintenance, and operations and to promote ferry service as a component of the Nation’s transportation system. The Ferry Joint Program Office shall coordinate with the Department of Homeland Security and other Federal and State transportation agencies, State transportation departments, in selecting the location for the Institute, the Secretary shall consider—

(1) the importance of public and private ferry service to the region’s transportation system, including methods of reducing wake and providing alternative propulsion;

(2) develop and conduct training programs for ferry system employees, Federal Government employees, and other individuals, as appropriate, on recent developments, techniques, and procedures pertaining to the construction and operation of ferry systems;

(3) encourage and assist collaborative efforts by public and private entities to preserve, improve, and expand the use of ferries as a mode of transportation; and

(4) preserve, utilize, and display historical information about the use of ferries in the United States and in foreign countries.

(b) LOCATION.—In selecting the location for the Institute, the Secretary shall consider—

(1) the importance of public and private ferry service to the region’s transportation system, including methods of reducing wake and providing alternative propulsion;

(2) the historical importance of ferry transportation to the region;

(3) the history and diversity of the region’s maritime community, including ferry construction and repair and other shipbuilding activities;

(4) the anticipated growth of ferry service and ferry boat building in the region;

(5) the availability of public-private collaboration in the region;

(6) the presence of nationally recognized research universities in the region.

(c) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for the Fiscal years 2004 through 2009, to carry out the provisions of this section. The Secretary shall make available the entire amount of funding provided to the Institute by public and private entities.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than a year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, and thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress describing the activities of the Institute and the progress in carrying out this section.

By Mr. CORZINE (for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, MRS. LINCOLN,
Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REID, Mr. KERRY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, and Mr. DAYTON:

S. 639. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reduce the age for receipt of military retired pay, including retired pay for nonregular service from 60 years of age to 55 years of age; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation lowering the retirement age for National Guard and Reserves from 60 to 55. This legislation, which I introduced last year, is an extremely modest step toward treating our reservists fairly and in accordance with the enormous sacrifices they are making. This bipartisan legislation is co-sponsored by Senators COCHRAN, LAUTENBERG, LINCOLN, LEAHY, REID, KERRY, JOHNSON, BEN NELSON and DAYTON.

This bill merely brings the retirement age for reservists down to the Federal civil servant retirement age, as was intended when the reservist retirement age was set fifty years ago. Our reservists are making enormous sacrifices, risking their lives in combat zones, and, in far too many instances, dying for their country. At the very least, they should have the same benefits as Federal civil servants.

But, there are other, bigger reasons for giving our reservists more equitable benefits. America has never placed greater demands on its reservists than it does now. Since September 11, 2001, more than 412,000 Guard and Reserve members have been called up, including 6,800 New Jersey National Guard members and 2,240 New Jersey Reservists. Many of them have been sent for yearlong combat tours in Iraq or Afghanistan.

We have entered a new era in which our reservists are no longer “weekend warriors.” They are accepting the lengthy deployments and combat roles previously reserved to regular active duty forces. Well over forty percent of the troops currently serving in Iraq are members of the National Guard and Reserves. It is time that their benefits more closely reflect those granted to active duty servicemembers. Lowering the retirement age for reservists to 55, when active duty servicemembers receive retirement benefits after 20 years, regardless of age, is a modest step toward equity.

At a time when reservist recruitment is falling short, an improvement in benefits will help fill critical gaps. According to recent reports, the Army Guard missed its recruiting goal by 12 percent in the last fiscal year. For the first four months of fiscal 2005, recruitment is 24 percent behind. Just a few weeks ago, on February 24, Lt. Gen. Roger Schultz, director of the Army Guard, was quoted in the Dallas Morning News saying “No doubt, if we kept up the 1.5 percent per year trend, our force would come apart.” And, as the Baltimore Sun reported, the head of the Army Reserve, Lt. Gen. James Helmly, told the Army Chief of Staff that his arm of the service was in danger of becoming a “broken force” under the current operations tempo.

By providing our reservists with the benefits they deserve, we can help reverse the paralysis and send a powerful message: that we value your service and recognize the incredible sacrifices you are making. And we will truly be honoring our heroes.

This bill has broad support and has been endorsed by key members of the Military Coalition, including the Reserve Officers Association, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Military Officers Association of America, the Air Force Sergeants Association, the Air Force Association, the Retired Enlisted Association, the Fleet Reserve Association, the Naval Reserve Association, and the National Guard Association.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.

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

S. 639

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

SECTION 1. REDUCTION IN AGE FOR RECEIPT OF MILITARY RETIRED PAY FOR NONREGULAR SERVICE.

(a) REDUCTION IN AGE.—Section 12731(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “at least 60 years of age” and inserting “at least 55 years of age”.

(b) APPLICATION TO EXISTING PROVISIONS OF LAW OR POLICY.—With respect to any provision of law, or of any policy, regulation, or directive of the executive branch, that refers to a member or former member of the uniformed services as being eligible for, or entitled to, retired pay under chapter 1223 of title 10, United States Code, but for the fact that the member or former member is under 60 years of age, such provision shall be carried out with respect to such member or former member as if such provision referred to being 60 years of age a reference to the age in effect for qualification for such retired pay under section 12731(a) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the first day of the first month beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to retired pay payable for that month and subsequent months.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. FRIST, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 641. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Dr. DeBakey, M.D.; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to acknowledge the lifetime achievements of Dr. Michael Ellis DeBakey, a public servant and world-renowned cardiologist, by offering legislation to award him the Congressional Gold Medal.

Throughout his life Dr. DeBakey has made numerous advancements in the field of medicine; he is only 23 years of age and still attending medical school, Dr. DeBakey developed a roller pump for blood transfusions—the precursor and major component of the heart-lung machine used in the first open-heart operation. This device later led to national recognition for his expertise in vascular disease. His service to our country did not stop there.

Dr. DeBakey put his practice on hold and volunteered for military service during World War II with the Surgeon General’s staff. During this time, he received the rank of Colonel and Chief of Surgical Consultants Division.

As a result of his military and medical experience, Dr. DeBakey made numerous recommendations to improve the military’s medical procedures. His efforts led to the development of mobile army surgical hospitals, better known as MASH units, which earned him the Legion of Merit in 1945.

After WWII, Dr. DeBakey continued his hard work by proposing national and specialized medical centers for those soldiers who were wounded or needed follow-up treatment. This recommendation evolved into the Veterans Affairs Medical Center System and the establishment of the commission on Veterans Medical Problems of the National Research Council.

In 1948, Dr. DeBakey joined the Baylor University College of Medicine, where he started its first surgical residency program and was later elected the first President of Baylor College of Medicine.

Adding to his list of accomplishments Dr. DeBakey performed the first successful coronary bypass surgery, opening the doors for surgeons to perform preventative procedures to save the lives of many people with heart disease. He was also the first to successfully use a partial artificial heart. Later in his career, President Lyndon B. Johnson appointed Dr. DeBakey as Chairman of the President’s Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke, which led to the creation of Regional Medical Programs. These programs coordinate medical schools, research institutions and hospitals to enhance research and training.

Dr. DeBakey continued to amaze the medical world when he pioneered the field of telemedicine by performing the first open-heart surgery transmitted over satellite and then supervised the first successful multi-organ transplant, where a heart, both kidneys and a lung were transplanted from a single donor into four separate recipients.

These accomplishments have led to national recognition. Dr. DeBakey has received both the Presidential Medal of Freedom with Distinction from President Johnson and the National Medal of Science from President Ronald Reagan.

Recently, Dr. DeBakey worked with NASA engineers to develop the DeBakey Ventricular Assist Device, which may eliminate the need for some patients to receive heart transplants.
I stand here today to acknowledge Dr. DeBakey’s invaluable work and significant contribution to medicine by offering a bill to award him the Congressional Gold Medal. His efforts and innovative surgical techniques have saved the lives of thousands, if not millions, of people. I ask my Senate colleagues to join me in recognizing the profound impact this man has had on medical advances, the delivery of medicine and how we care for our World War II, Dr. DeBakey is a native of Texas, he has made Texas proud. He has guided the Baylor College of Medicine and the city of Houston into becoming a world leader in medical advancement. On behalf of all Texans, I thank Dr. DeBakey for his lifetime of commitment and service not only to the medical community but to the world. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The Senate agreed by unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the bill ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 641

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Michael Ellis DeBakey, M.D., was born on September 7, 1908 in Lake Charles, Louisiana, to Shaker and Raheeja DeBakey.

(2) Dr. DeBakey, at the age of 23 and still a medical student, reported a major innovation, a roller pump for blood transfusions, which later became a major component of the heart-lung machine used in the first successful open-heart operation.

(3) Even though Dr. DeBakey had already achieved a national reputation as an authority on vascular disease and had a promising career as a surgeon and teacher, he volunteered for military service during World War II, joining the Surgeon General's staff and rising to the rank of Colonel and Chief of the Surgical Consultants Division.

(4) As a result of this first-hand knowledge of military service, Dr. DeBakey made numerous recommendations for the proper staging of emergency medical care, work that led to the development of mobile army surgical hospitals or MASH units, and earned Dr. DeBakey the Legion of Merit in 1945.

(5) Dr. DeBakey proposed the systematic medical follow-up of veterans and recommended the creation of specialized medical centers in different areas of the United States to treat wounded military personnel returning from war, and from this recommendation evolved the Veterans Affairs Medical Center System and the establishment of the President's Commission on Veterans Medical Problems of the National Research Council.

(6) In 1948, Dr. DeBakey joined the Baylor University College of Medicine, where he developed the first surgical residency program in the City of Houston, and today, guided by Dr. DeBakey's vision, the College is one of the most respected health science centers in the Nation.

(7) In 1953, Dr. DeBakey performed the first successful procedures to treat patients who suffered from heart attacks leading to severe strokes, and he later developed a series of innovative surgical techniques for the treatment of aneurysms enabling thousands of lives to be saved.

(8) In 1964, Dr. DeBakey triggered the most explosive era in modern cardiac surgery, when he performed the first successful coronary bypass, once again paving the way for surgeons worldwide to offer hope to thousands of patients who might otherwise succumb to heart disease.

(9) Two years later, Dr. DeBakey made medical history again, when he was the first to successfully use a partial artificial heart, a concept so revolutionary that he could not be weaned from a heart-lung machine following open-heart surgery.

(10) In 1968, Dr. DeBakey supervised the first successful heart transplant, in which a heart, both kidneys, and lung were transplanted from a single donor into four separate recipients.

(11) In 1984, President Lyndon B. Johnson appointed Dr. DeBakey to the position of Chairman of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke, leading to the creation of Regional Medical Programs established "to encourage and assist in the establishment of regional cooperative arrangements among medical schools, research institutions, and hospitals, for research and training".

(12) In the mid-1960's, Dr. DeBakey pioneered the field of telemedicine with the first demonstration of open-heart surgery to be transmitted overseas by satellite.

(13) In 1969, Dr. DeBakey was elected the first President of Baylor College of Medicine.

(14) In 1969, President Richard M. Nixon bestowed on Dr. DeBakey the Presidential Medal of Freedom with Distinction, and in 1985, President Ronald Reagan conferred on him the National Medal of Science.

(15) Working with NASA engineers, he refined existing technology to create the DeBakey Ventricular Assist Device, one-tenth the size of current versions, which may eliminate the need for heart transplantation in some patients.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL—PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.

(a) The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the presentation, on behalf of the Congress, of a gold medal of appropriate design, to Michael Ellis DeBakey, M.D., in recognition of his many outstanding contributions to the Nation.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For purposes of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this paragraph as the "Secretary") shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 2 under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 4. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) NATIONAL MEDALS.—The medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 5. AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS;

(a) AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund such amounts as may be necessary to pay for the costs of the medals struck pursuant to this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals authorized under section 3 shall be deposited into the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Talent, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Ensign, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Craig, Mr. Burns, Mr. Chambliss, Mr. Bunning, Mr. Smith, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Graham, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Santorum, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Brownback, Mr. Nelson of Nebraska, and Mr. Nelson of Florida).

S. 642. A bill to support certain national youth organizations, including the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that my Senate colleagues and I will be introducing the Support Our Scouts Act of 2005 today.

This legislation will ensure that the Defense Department can and will continue to provide the Scouts the type of support it has provided in the past, such as at Jamborees and on bases. This bill also ensures that Scouts have access to public facilities, forums, and programs that are open to a variety of other youth or community organizations.

Why am I introducing this legislation? Since the Supreme Court decided Boy Scouts of America v. Dale, Boy Scouts of America’s relationship with government at all levels has been the target of multiple lawsuits.

The Federal Government is defending a lawsuit brought by the ACLU aimed at severing ties between Boy Scouts and the Department of Defense and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The effect of these attempts at exclusion is that the Federal, State, and local levels are far-reaching and has had a discernible “chilling” effect on government support for our Scouts.

This is the greatest legal challenge facing Boy Scouts today. Boy Scouts of America, like other non-profit youth organizations, depend, on its ability to use public facilities and participate in these programs and forums. The Support Our Scouts Act of 2005 addresses these issues by removing any doubt that the Federal government will support the Scouts to hold meetings and go camping on Federal property.

The Boy Scouts of America is a congressionally chartered organization. Pentagon support for Scouts is authorized in U.S. law. It serves a patriotic, charitable, and educational purpose. Since 1910, Boy Scout membership has totaled more than 110 million young Americans.

Today, more than 3.2 million youths and 1.2 million adults are members of the Boy Scouts and are dedicated to fulfilling the Boy Scouts’ mission. That number includes more than 40
members of the United States Senate and more than 150 members of the House of Representatives who have been involved in Scouting. I was a Boy Scout, and all three of my sons were as well. This unique American institution is committed to preparing our youth for life by instilling in them values such as honesty, integrity, and character.

Through exposure to the outdoors, hard work, and the virtues of civic duty, the Boy Scouts have developed millions of Americans into superb citizens and future leaders. The Support Our Scouts Act ratifies our longstanding commitment to this valued civic organization. It clarifies that no Federal law, including any rule, regulation, directive, instruction, or order, shall be construed to limit any Federal agency from providing any form of support to the Boy Scouts of America or any group officially affiliated with the Boy Scouts of America or the Girl Scouts of the United States of America.

Activities supported include holding meetings, jamborees, camporees, or other scouting activities on Federal property, or hosting or sponsoring any official event of such organization. The Scouts Act is also being introduced by a bipartisan group of Members in the House. I believe this bill will receive broad, bipartisan support in both chambers of Congress and that we will pass it. It is common sense legislation that all fair and reasonable people can support. I encourage Scout supporters—indeed, all Americans—to contact their Senators and Representatives and ask them to support the “Support Our Scouts Act of 2005.”

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record. There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SEC. 2. SUPPORT FOR YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS.

This Act may be cited as the “Support Our Scouts Act of 2005.”

SEC. 3. EQUAL ACCESS FOR YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS.

The Widows and Orphans Act of 2005, similar to the one I introduced last Congress, will benefit women and children who have already faced terrible situations. We must not stand by as they are left to die.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. BOYSTER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. REED, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DODD, and Mrs. CLINTON):

S. 645. A bill to reinstate the Public Safety and Recreational Firearms Use Protection Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to speak about a common sense bill that will protect American citizens and law enforcement officers. The Assault Weapons Ban and Law Enforcement Officers Protection Act is designed to restore and strengthen the ban on assault weapons that expired on September 13, 2004.
The Government Accountability Office recently reported that 47 people on the terrorist watch list legally purchased firearms in this country last year. I personally believe that a person on the terrorist watch list, who isn’t allowed to buy commercial firearms, should not be able to purchase any weapon. But they especially shouldn’t be able to buy assault weapons, which possess unique, military-bred, anti-personnel design characteristics. These features, I think, make it easy for a shooter to simply point a weapon—as opposed to taking careful aim—and quickly spray a wide area with a lethal hail of bullets.

These features make assault weapons especially attractive to terrorists and criminals, and virtually useless to hunters or sport shooters.

Before the previous ban on assault weapons expired last November, some people said that the expiration of the ban would make it easier to fix a shooter to simply point a weapon—also opposed to taking careful aim—and quickly spray a wide area with a lethal hail of bullets.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 645

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 “Assault Weapons Ban of 2005 and Law Enforcement Protection Act of 2005”.

SEC. 2. RESTRICTION ON MANUFACTURE, TRANSFER, AND POSSESSION OF CERTAIN SEMIAUTOMATIC ASSAULT WEAPONS.

(a) RESTRICTION. — Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after subsection (a) the following:

(1) It shall be unlawful for a person to manufacture, transfer, or possess a semiautomatic assault weapon.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the possession or transfer of any semiautomatic assault weapon otherwise lawfully possessed under Federal law on the date of enactment of this subsection.

(3) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any firearm that—

(A) is manually operated by bolt, pump, level, or slide action;

(B) has been rendered permanently inoperable or

(C) is an antique firearm.

(4) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

(A) the manufacture for, transfer to, or possession by the United States or a department or agency of the United States, or a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision of a State, or a transfer to or possession by a law enforcement officer employed by such an entity for purposes of law enforcement (whether on or off duty);

(B) the transfer to a licensee under title I of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 for purposes of establishing and maintaining an on-site physical protection system and security organization required by Federal law, or possession by an employee or contractor of such licensee (constitute for such purposes or off-site for purposes of licensee authorized training or transportation of nuclear materials;

(C) the possession, by an individual who is retired from service with a law enforcement agency and is not otherwise prohibited from receiving a firearm, of a semiautomatic assault weapon transferred to the individual by the agency upon such retirement;

(D) the manufacture, transfer, or possession of a semiautomatic assault weapon by a licensed manufacturer or licensed importer for the purpose of test or experimentation authorized by the Secretary.

(5) It shall be unlawful for any person to transfer a semiautomatic assault weapon to which paragraph (1) does not apply, except through:

(A) a licensed dealer, and for purposes of subsection (c) in the case of such a transfer, the weapon shall be considered to be transferred from the business inventory of the licensed dealer and the dealer shall be considered to be the transferor;

(B) a court, a law enforcement agency if the transfer is made in accordance with the procedures provided for in subsection (c) of this section and section 923(p).

(c) The Attorney General shall establish and maintain, in a timely manner, a record of the make, model, and date of manufacture of any semiautomatic assault weapon which the Attorney General has made aware has been used in relation to a crime under Federal or State law, and the nature and circumstances of the crime involved, including the outcome of relevant criminal investigations and proceedings. The Attorney General shall annually submit the record to Congress to make the record available to the general public."

(b) DEFINITION OF SEMIAUTOMATIC ASSAULT WEAPON. — Section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after paragraph (29) the following:

(30) The term ‘semiautomatic assault weapon’ means any of the following:

(A) RIFLES. — The following rifles or copies or duplicates thereof—

(i) AK, AKM, AKS, AK-47, AK-74, ARM, MAK-90, Mitr, NHM 90, NHM 91, SA 85, SA 93, VEPR;

(ii) AR-10;

(iii) AR-15, Bushmaster XM15, Armalite M15, or Olympic Arms PCR;

(iv) AR70;

(v) Galco Liberty;

(vi) Dragunov SVD Sniper Rifle or Dragunov SVU;

(vii) Fabrique National FN/FAL, FN/LAR, or FNC;

(viii) Hi-Point Carbine;

(ix) HK-91, HK-93, HK-94, or HK-PSG-1;

(x) KEL-Tec Sub Rifle;

(xi) MI Carbine;

(xii) Saiga;

(xiii) SAR-8, SAR-4800;

(xiv) SIG542 with detachable magazine;

(xv) SLG 95;

(xvi) SLR 95 or 96;

(xvii) Steyr AUG;

(xviii) Sturm, Ruger Mini-14;

(xix) Tavor;

(xx) Thompson 1927, Thompson M1, or Thompson 1927 Commando;

(b) PISTOLS. — The following pistols or copies or duplicates thereof—

(i) Calico M-185;

(ii) MAC-10, MAC-11, or MP5A3;

(iii) Olympic Arms OA;

(iv) TEC-9, TEC-DC9, TEC-22 Scorpion, or AB-10;

(v) Uzi;

(vi) Shotguns.—The following shotguns or copies or duplicates thereof—

(i) Armscor 30 BG;

(ii) SPAS 12 or LAW 12;

(iii) Sikler 12 or

(iv) Streetsweeper;

(e) FIXED MAGAZINE RIFLES.—A semiautomatic rifle that has the ability to accept a detachable magazine, and that has—

(i) a folding or telescoping stock;

(ii) a threaded barrel;

(iii) a pistol grip;

(iv) a forward grip; or

(v) a barrel shroud.

(f) FIXED MAGAZINE PISTOLS.—A semiautomatic pistol that has a fixed magazine with the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds, except for an attached tubular device designed to accept, and used to operate, only with .22 caliber rimfire ammunition.

(g) DELTA MAGAZINE PISTOLS.—A semiautomatic pistol with a fixed magazine that has the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds.

(h) SEMIAUTOMATIC SHOTGUNS.—A semiautomatic shotgun that has—

(i) a folding or telescoping stock; or

(ii) a pistol grip;
(ii) the ability to accept a detachable magazine; or

(iv) a fixed magazine capacity of more than 5 rounds.

(3) FIREARMS OR SHOTS GUNS.—A shotgun with a revolving cylinder.

(J) FRAMES OR RECEIVERS.—A frame or receiver that is identical to, or based substantially on, a firearm previously recovered on, a firearm described in any of subparagraphs (A) through (I) or (L).

(K) CONVERSION KITS.—A conversion kit.

(L) MILITARY OR LAW ENFORCEMENT WEAPONS.—A semiautomatic rifle or shotgun originally designed for military or law enforcement use, or a firearm based on the design of a firearm from which a semiautomatic firearm is not particularly suitable for sporting purposes, as determined by the Attorney General. In making the determination, there shall be a rebuttable presumption that a firearm procured for use by the United States military or any Federal law enforcement agency is not particularly suitable for sporting purposes, and a firearm shall not be determined to be particularly suitable for sporting purposes solely because the firearm is suitable for use in a sporting event.

(c) FAILURE TO ABIDE.—

(1) VIOLATION OF SECTION 922(V).—Section 922(a)(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

(2) USE OR POSSESSION DURING CRIME OF VIOLENCE OR DRUG TRAFFICKING CRIME.—Section 922(o)(1)(B)(i) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the part and inserting "a semiautomatic assault weapon, after "short-barreled shotgun,".

(d) IDENTIFICATION MARKINGS FOR SEMIAUTOMATIC ASSAULT WEAPONS.—Section 923(i) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

(e) RELATED DEFINITIONS.—Section 922(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

(f) BARREL SHROUD.—The term "barrel shroud" means a shroud that is attached to, or partially or completely encircles, the barrel of a firearm so that the shroud protects the user of the firearm from heat generated by the barrel, but does not include a slide that encloses the barrel, and does not include an extension of the stock along the bottom which does not encircle or substantially encircle the barrel.

(g) CONVERSION KIT.—The term "conversion kit" means any part or combination of parts designed and intended for use in converting a firearm into a semiautomatic assault weapon, and any combination of parts from which a semiautomatic assault weapon can be assembled if the parts are in the possession or under the control of a person.

(h) DETACHABLE MAGAZINE.—The term "detachable magazine" means an ammunition feeding device that can readily be inserted into a firearm.

(i) FIXED MAGAZINE.—The term "fixed magazine" means an ammunition feeding device contained in, or permanently attached to, a firearm.

(j) FOLDING OR TELESCOPING STOCK.—The term "folding or telescoping stock" means a stock that folds, telescopes, or otherwise operates to reduce the length, size, or any other dimension or otherwise enhances the concealability of a firearm.

(k) FORWARD GRIP.—The term "forward grip" means a grip located forward of the trigger, including any projections as a pistol grip.

(l) PISTOL GRIP.—The term "pistol grip" means a grip, a thumbhole stock, or any other characteristic that can function as a grip.

(m) THREADED BARREL.—The term "threaded barrel" means a feature or characteristic of this subsection that allows for the attachment of a firearm as defined in section 5845(a) of the National Firearms Act (26 U.S.C. 5845(a)).

SEC. 3. BAN ON LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 2(a), is amended by adding after subsection (v) the following:

(b) PENALTIES.—Section 922(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

(c) STUDY BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

(1) STUDY.—The Attorney General shall investigate and study the impact of this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and in particular shall determine their impact, if any, on violent and drug trafficking crime. The study shall be conducted over a period of 18 months, commencing 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 30 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall prepare and submit to Congress a report setting forth in detail the findings and determinations made in the study under this subsection.

SEC. 5. UNLAWFUL WEAPONS TRANSFERS TO JUVENILES.

Section 922(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(B) by adding at the end following:

(2) PENALTIES.—Section 922(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. Shelby:

S. J. Res. 10. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which requires (except during time of war and subject to suspension by Congress) that the total amount of money expended by the United States during any fiscal year not exceed the amount of certain revenue received by the United States during such fiscal year and not exceed 20 per cent of the gross national product of the United States during the previous calendar year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Shelby. Mr. President, as we continue to debate the Federal Government’s fiscal year 2006 budget, I can think of no better time to discuss the need for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. It is for that reason that I stand before you today—to
introduce a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

This is the same amendment that I have introduced every Congress since the 97th Congress. Throughout my tenure in Congress, during good economic times and bad, I have devoted much time and attention to this idea because I believe that one of the most important things the Federal Government can do to enhance the lives of all Americans and future generations is to balance the Federal budget.

Our Founding Fathers, wise men indeed, had great concerns regarding the capability of those in government to operate within budgetary constraints. Alexander Hamilton once wrote that: "...there is a general propensity in those who govern, founded in the constitution of man, to shift the burden from the present to a future day."

Thomas Jefferson commented on the moral significance of this "shifting of the burden from the present to the future. The question whether one generation has the right to bind another by the deficit it imposes is a question of such consequence as to place it among the fundamental principles of government. We should consider it a sacred trust that the hard-earned tax dollars and morally bound to pay them ourselves."

I completely agree with these sentiments. History has shown that Hamilton was correct. Those who govern have, in fact, saddled future generations with the responsibility of paying for their debts. Over the past 30 years, annual deficits have become routine and the Federal Government has built up massive debt. Furthermore, Jefferson's assessment of the significance of this is also correct: intergenerational debt shifting is morally wrong.

Over the years, we have witnessed countless "budget summits" and "bi-partisan budget deals," and we have heard, time and again, the promises of "deficit reduction." But despite all of these charades, the Federal budget remains severely out of balance today. The truth is, it will never be balanced as long as the President and the Congress are allowed to shortchange the welfare of future generations to pay for current consumption. This is evidenced by the fact that I stood in this same place, introducing this same legislation during both the 106th and the 107th, while the Federal budget was actually in balance. But alas, I stand here today with an enormous Federal deficit and a ballooning Federal debt.

A balanced budget amendment to the Constitution is the only certain mechanism to break the cycle of deficit spending and ensure that the Government does not continue to saddle our children and grandchildren with the current generation's debts. A permanently balanced budget would have a constitutional mandate in the economic lives of the American people. A balanced budget would dramatically lower interest rates thereby saving money for anyone with a home mortgage, a student loan, a car loan, credit card debt, or any other interest rate sensitive payment responsibility. Simply by balancing its books, the Federal Government would put real money into the hands of hard working people. Moreover, if the demand for capital is reduced, more money would be available for private sector use, which in turn, would generate substantial economic growth and create thousands of new jobs.

More money in the pockets of Americans and more job creation by the economy can become a reality with a simple step—a balanced budget amendment. On the other hand, without a balanced budget amendment, the Government will continue to waste the taxpayers' money on unnecessary interest payments. In fiscal year 2004, the Federal Government spent more than $321 billion just to pay the interest on the national debt. That is more than the amount spent on all education, job training, and the programs combined. We might as well be taking these hard-earned tax dollars and pouring them down the drain. I believe that we could be better spent on improving education, developing new medical technologies, finding a cure for cancer, or even returning it to the people who earned it in the first place. But instead, about 15 percent of the Federal budget is being wasted on interest payments because advocates of big government continue to block all efforts to balance the budget.

A balanced budget amendment to the Constitution can be the solution to this perpetual problem. A balanced budget amendment will put us on a path to paying off our national debt, which is currently almost $8 trillion. This amendment will help ensure that taxpayers' money will no longer be wasted on interest payments. Opponents of a balanced budget amendment treat it as if it is something extraordinary. They are right, a balanced Federal budget would be extraordinary. And I believe that adopting an amendment that would require the Federal Government to do what every American already has to do—balance their checkbook—is exactly what this country needs to prove that Washington is serious about accomplishing the most important thing. A balanced Federal budget amendment is simply a promise to the American people that the Government will spend their hard-earned tax dollars responsibly. I think that we owe our constituents and future generations of Americans that much.

We do not have more budget deals or false promises from Washington to reduce the deficit. What we need is a hammer to force Congress and the President to agree on a balanced budget, not just this year, but forever. A constitutional amendment to balance the Federal budget is the only hammer forceful enough to make that happen.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this important legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S.J. Res. 10
Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to be valid only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years after the date of final passage of this joint resolution:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The total amount of money expended by the United States in any fiscal year shall not exceed the total amount of revenue received by the United States during such fiscal year, except revenue received from the issuance of bonds, notes, or other obligations of the United States.

"SECTION 2. The total amount of money expended by the United States in any fiscal year shall not exceed the amount equal to 20 percent of the gross national product of the United States during the last calendar year ending before the beginning of such fiscal year.

"SECTION 3. Sections 1 and 2 of this Article shall not apply during any fiscal year during any part of which the United States is at war as declared by Congress under section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

"SECTION 4. Sections 1 and 2 of this Article may be suspended by a concurrent resolution approved by a three-fifths vote of the Members of each House of Congress. Any suspension of sections 1 and 2 of this Article under this section shall be effective only during the fiscal year during which such suspension is approved.

"SECTION 5. This Article shall take effect on the first day of the first fiscal year beginning after the date of the adoption of this Article.

"SECTION 6. Congress shall have power to enforce this Article by appropriate legislation."

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:
S.J. Res. 11. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college and to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation amending the Constitution to permit direct popular elections for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States.

I am mindful of the fact that altering the wording of one of our country's most sacred documents requires careful thought, study and debate. But for me the status quo raises too many problems and questions.

The Electoral College is an archaic system. It may have had its role during the formative years of the Republic. But it is hardly appropriate for the 21st century modern democracy that we have become.
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Fundamental fairness dictates that we have a single, nationwide count of popular votes. Hopefully my proposal represents the starting point for how best to structure a system to accomplish that.

My approach is simple: the President is elected through a direct popular vote of the American people. Every American's vote counts the same, whether they live in Florida, Maine, California, or North Dakota. The complexity of the current electoral college system is swept away. With my legislation the winner of the presidency is the individual who tallies the most votes cast in the election.

For those who believe the Electoral College is a reasonable basis for electing the President, consider the following: would a foreign country today, creating a new democratic election system, rely on the U.S. Electoral College as a model? Not likely.

Let me begin by offering a few facts and observations about the current system: the Electoral College allows a candidate to lose 39 States in a general election but still win the Presidency; the Electoral College allows a candidate to lose a general election, by 10 million popular votes or more, yet still be elected President; in a recent presidential election, a candidate received nearly 20 million popular votes, roughly 19 percent of all votes cast, but that translated into 0 electoral votes; the Electoral College allows an elector to refuse to represent the majority of popular votes; it allows a presidential candidate in his State's election—he can arbitrarily switch sides and throw his lot in with an alternative candidate, which has happened nine times since 1820; when a presidential election is decided by a single vote—which the Electoral College adequately represents the voting needs of the country. In the 1780s there were no formal political parties as such, no experience with conducting national campaigns and no reason to believe the logic of its head in presidential elections throughout the 19th century. Minority presidents, so-called for winning the electoral vote but losing the popular vote, were elected three times—John Quincy Adams in 1824, Rutherford B. Hayes in 1876, and Benjamin Harrison in 1888.

And in 2000 the same problem re-surfaced, the fourth time in our Nation's short history, with Vice President Al Gore edging George Bush by 537,895 popular votes, but losing the electoral college by a mere 5 votes. The Nation can be thankful, frankly, that we have only had disputed elections in just these four instances. A shift of a few thousand votes from one candidate to another in past presidential elections could have ordained similar disarray. Some noteworthy examples include: despite losing the popular vote by the sizable margin of 1.7 million votes, Gerald Ford in 1976 needed only 5,559 more votes in Ohio and 3,487 in Hawaii to flip a bloc of 270 electoral votes and he would have been returned to the White House.

And California, Illinois and Ohio posted 29,000 more votes in Thomas Dewey’s column to J OHN KERRY — yet, in 1948, the face of history may have inched itself forward. The 15th Amendment in 1870 extended the franchise to all men—finally important, the 12th Amendment to amend the Constitution passed in 1804 to streamline the process of contingent elections. I would observe that passage of the 12th Amendment was an admission that the Electoral College was, and remains, appropriately subject to change.

Legislators in 1804 did not delay in amending the Constitution for reasons of fairness and practicality, nor should we in 2004 fail to address the imperfect design that thwarts the will of the American public.

Even with the 12th Amendment in place, the Electoral College managed to perpetuate a system that would allow the Democrat to another in past presidential elections could have ordained similar disarray. Some noteworthy examples include: despite losing the popular vote by the sizable margin of 1.7 million votes, Gerald Ford in 1976 needed only 5,559 more votes in Ohio and 3,487 in Hawaii to flip a bloc of 270 electoral votes and he would have been returned to the White House.

And California, Illinois and Ohio posted 29,000 more votes in Thomas Dewey’s column to J OHN KERRY — yet, in 1948, the face of history may have inched itself forward. The 15th Amendment in 1870 extended the franchise to all men—finally important, the 12th Amendment to amend the Constitution passed in 1804 to streamline the process of contingent elections. I would observe that passage of the 12th Amendment was an admission that the Electoral College was, and remains, appropriately subject to change.

Legislators in 1804 did not delay in amending the Constitution for reasons of fairness and practicality, nor should we in 2004 fail to address the imperfect design that thwarts the will of the American public.

Even with the 12th Amendment in place, the Electoral College managed to perpetuate a system that would allow the Democrat to another in past presidential elections could have ordained similar disarray. Some noteworthy examples include: despite losing the popular vote by the sizable margin of 1.7 million votes, Gerald Ford in 1976 needed only 5,559 more votes in Ohio and 3,487 in Hawaii to flip a bloc of 270 electoral votes and he would have been returned to the White House.

And California, Illinois and Ohio posted 29,000 more votes in Thomas Dewey’s column to J OHN KERRY — yet, in 1948, the face of history may have inched itself forward. The 15th Amendment in 1870 extended the franchise to all men—finally important, the 12th Amendment to amend the Constitution passed in 1804 to streamline the process of contingent elections. I would observe that passage of the 12th Amendment was an admission that the Electoral College was, and remains, appropriately subject to change.

Legislators in 1804 did not delay in amending the Constitution for reasons of fairness and practicality, nor should we in 2004 fail to address the imperfect design that thwarts the will of the American public.

Even with the 12th Amendment in place, the Electoral College managed to perpetuate a system that would allow the Democrat to another in past presidential elections could have ordained similar disarray. Some noteworthy examples include: despite losing the popular vote by the sizable margin of 1.7 million votes, Gerald Ford in 1976 needed only 5,559 more votes in Ohio and 3,487 in Hawaii to flip a bloc of 270 electoral votes and he would have been returned to the White House.

And California, Illinois and Ohio posted 29,000 more votes in Thomas Dewey’s column to J OHN KERRY — yet, in 1948, the face of history may have inched itself forward. The 15th Amendment in 1870 extended the franchise to all men—finally important, the 12th Amendment to amend the Constitution passed in 1804 to streamline the process of contingent elections. I would observe that passage of the 12th Amendment was an admission that the Electoral College was, and remains, appropriately subject to change.
win the electoral vote count, 271 to 267, and the Presidency, even though Bush enjoyed a sizable 3.5 million margin in popular votes cast.

According to some estimates, we have had no fewer than 22 near misses, all of which have ended up as contentious as the 2000 contest. We are tempting fate by ignoring this problem: sooner or later a dramatic incongruity will occur between an electoral vote winner contrasted against a different popular vote winner whose margin of victory is within the margin of error.

Electoral College anomalies don’t end with disparities between the electoral and popular vote winners. The phenomenon of the “faithless elector” reflects a further structural defect in the Electoral College System.

History shows that electors have not been faithful to the presidential and vice presidential tickets winning the most votes in their respective states. They may initially pledge to the winning ticket, but enjoy individual discretion to change their vote when electoral votes are formally counted.

Contemporary examples are as follows: in 1968, Dr. Lloyd Bailey, a North Carolina elector initially pledged to Republican Nixon, switched his vote to George Wallace of the American Independent Party; in 1972, Roger MacBride, a Virginia elector for Richard Nixon switched his vote to John Horsers of the Libertarian Party; in 1976, a Pennsylvania elector for Gerald Ford voted for Ronald Reagan; in 1988, Margarat Leach, a West Virginia elector for Michael Dukakis, voted instead for Lloyd Benton; and in 2000, Barbara Lett-Simmons, a District of Columbia elector for Democrat Albert Gore Jr., cast a blank ballot.

These arbitrary decisions did not affect the outcome of each of those presidential election years. But they all flouted the electoral will of the people. The fact that such capricious switching is permitted, irrespective of the outcomes of the popular vote results in the states in question, is cause for great concern. What might happen if electors break their pledges to a particular candidate en masse? Is that possible and legally enforceable? The answer appears to be yes.


In that situation, what prevents one of the candidates directing his electors to another candidate, before the formal meeting of the Electors to count and certify the electoral votes occurs in the month following the November election, to allow him to gain the necessary 270 electoral votes in exchange for policy concessions or worse, a massive cash payment? Would that kind of corrupt transaction be allowed? What element of the current Electoral College system prevents such an unfortunate outcome?

This may not be likely, given our strong two party system, but it is possible. Yet we tolerate the risk of it happening, year after year, we assume it will never occur. Someday we may regret our indecision to fix what we know is wrong with the Electoral College system.

Twenty-five years ago in the 96th Congress, a majority of the Senate voted 51 to 48 to support abolishing the Electoral College and replace it with direct popular elections. That legislation, S.J. Res. 26, fell short of the necessary two-thirds required for a constitutional amendment, but I am encouraged that more than half the body supported the concept.

A few years before that, the House voted overwhelmingly in the 91st Congress, 468 to 4, for direct popular election of the President. Alas, the effort fell short in the Senate.

I am prepared to press the case for this idea, on a bipartisan basis, through extensive committee deliberations and onto the Senate floor. The time has come for the Senate to reconsider the essential building blocks of our democracy.

Some might claim that offering a constitutional amendment is a political gambit to overcome my own State’s weak position in the Electoral College voting system. It is a fact that smaller States, such as South Dakota, Wyoming, and others, maintain disproportionately large influence in the process compared to California.

I would respond to that as follows: my approach does equate the vote of a Californian, Rhode Islander and South Dakotan as being equal. But it also means that millions of votes cast for Republican candidates in future presidential races in my home state will have meaning and value. Their votes will count for something.

In the 2000 contest, George Bush received over 4.5 million votes in California. That should have counted for something—but it did not. All 54 of California’s electoral votes went to Vice President Al Gore.

The domination of Democratic presidential candidates in California in the modern era, it is clear that my party would not benefit from a direct popular election in California.

But for me, this is about principle over politics, it is the right thing to do, even if it gives renewed life to Republican presidential candidates in my home State.

As it stands now, California is not a place where Republican and Democratic candidates genuinely compete for votes. They come to California to fill their campaign coffers but take a pass with real voters. That needs to change—for California, yes, but also for New York, Texas, for Utah and for so many other States in the country.

I have tried to understand the counterearguments to a nationwide popular vote. They reflect a desire to empower both regional and rural interests, and deny major population centers from having excessive power. I appreciate the notion that we don’t want clusters of cities and particular regions where the greatest numbers of Americans reside. New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, to dominate the electoral landscape.

At the same time, a presidential candidate’s priorities, record and vision for the country will determine how far he can go in the nominating and general election process. Stitching together a cross section of American voters, who represent different economic and social backgrounds, professions, parts of the country, religious faiths, and so much more holds the key to attaining a winning plurality or majority of votes in presidential races.

I would contend that it is up to the candidates to appeal to the broadest group of Americans but to level the playing field in doing process each American’s vote, regardless of where that person lives in the country, should be counted equally.

Right now, that is just not the case. Our system is not undemocratic, but it is certainly indirect, and we have the power to do something about it.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Electoral College Abolition Resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

S.J. Res. 11

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after the date of its submission to the States for ratification:

“SECTION 1. The President and Vice President shall be elected by the people of the several States and the district constituting the seat of government of the United States. The persons having the greatest number of votes for President and Vice President shall be elected.

“SECTION 2. The voters in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of Representatives in Congress from that State, except that the legislature of any State may prescribe such disabilities as aforesaid in cases of treason, bribery, and other crimes.

“SECTION 3. Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors, and the place for giving their votes; and may also determine the rules by which the electors shall appoint the President and Vice President; Provided, That the place of choosing the electors may be in or near the seat of the government of the State, and that no person except a citizen of the United States, and resident within that State, shall be qualified to be an elector.

“SECTION 4. Each elector shall cast his vote jointly applicable to President and Vice President, vote for two persons for President, and one person for Vice President, and if a greater number of persons be selected for President than can be elected, the electors casting the greatest number of votes for President, shall be elected; the rest shall be chosen as in the case of Vice President.”
candidate shall consent to being joined with more than one other person.

"Section 5. Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any candidate for President or Vice President before the day on which the President-elect or the Vice President-elect has been chosen, and for the case of a tie in any such election.

"Section 6. This article shall take effect one year after the twenty-first day of January following ratification."

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 103—CONDEMNING THE 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BLACK PRESS OF AMERICA

Mr. SANTORUM (for himself, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. LUGAR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 83

Whereas on February 20, 1940, the Black Press of America gathered for the first time in Chicago, Illinois;

Whereas the Black Press of America joins together over 200 African-American community newspapers from across the United States;

Whereas the African-American press has profusely and heroically fought the rights of African-Americans;

Whereas African-American newspapers artificated the ideals of freedom and equality during three times in the history of the United States when the country failed to honor its commitment to the founding principles of the Nation;

Whereas the African-American press has fostered pride, solidarity, and self-reliance within the African-American community;

Whereas the African-American press has profoundly and heroically fought the fights for the rights of African-Americans;

Whereas African-American newspapers continue to broaden the social discourse surrounding the struggle of today’s African-Americans for equal opportunity; and

Whereas commemorating the Black Press of America acknowledges the significant role all African-American newspapers have played in the history of the United States: Now, therefore, it is

Resolved, That the Senate commemorates the 65th Anniversary of the Black Press of America by recognizing:

(1) the significant contributions all African-American newspapers have made from the time of slavery and segregation to the present day; and

(2) the continued contributions African-American newspapers make to the ideal of equal opportunity for all Americans.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 173. Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. TALENT, and Ms. CANTWELL) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 174. Mr. COLEMAN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 175. Mr. LINCOLN, Mr. SCHUMACHER, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 176. Mr. LEVIERBERG (for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. AKAKA) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 177. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. DODD, Mrs. MURRAY, MR. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. CORZINE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. LEVIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 178. Mr. LEVIERBERG (for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. AKAKA) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 179. Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. DODD, and Ms. SABINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 180. Mr. MAURER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 181. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 182. Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COLLINS, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 183. Mr. SALAZAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 184. Mr. SALAZAR (for himself, Mr. TORGAN, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. CONRAD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 185. Mr. SCHUMACHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 186. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. CHAFFEE, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. VONNOVICH, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. OBAMA, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. CARPER) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra.

SA 187. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 188. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. KYL, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. AKAKA) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 189. Mr. DODD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 190. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 191. Mr. DODD (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. MITKEL, Mr. MURRAY, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. BINGAMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. SALAZAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 192. Mrs. LINCOLN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 193. Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 194. Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 195. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Ms. MURRAY, Ms. MURRAY, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. OBAMA) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 196. Mrs. CLINTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 197. Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. DEWINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 198. Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 199. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. KERRY, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 200. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 201. Mr. DODD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 202. Mr. DAYTON (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 203. Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. OBAMA) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 204. Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. MIKULSKI, and Mr. AKAKA submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 205. Mr. BAYH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 206. Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 207. Mr. CARPER proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra.
SA 208. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table. SA 209. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table. SA 210. Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. MUKULSKI, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table. SA 211. Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table. SA 212. Mr. DORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table. SA 213. Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. REED, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table. SA 214. Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. Wyden, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. McCAIN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra. SA 215. Mr. SALAZAR (for himself and Mr. CONRAD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra. SA 216. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table. SA 217. Mr. KOHL (for himself, Mr. Hatch, and Mr. BIDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table. SA 218. Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. CRARI, Mr. ENSHIN, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KYL, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra. SA 219. Ms. LANDRIEU proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra. SA 220. Ms. COLLINS (for Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mrs. CLINTON)) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra. SA 221. Mr. BAYH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table. SA 222. Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. JERFORDS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table. SA 223. Mr. VITTER proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra. SA 224. Mr. VITTER proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, supra. TEXT OF AMENDMENTS SA 173. Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. TALENT, and Ms. CANTWELL) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; as follows:

On page 17, line 16, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 17, line 17, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 18, line 16, increase the amount by $1,500,000,000.
On page 18, line 17, increase the amount by $1,500,000,000.
On page 26, line 14, decrease the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 26, line 15, decrease the amount by $2,000,000,000.

SA 174. Mr. COLEMAN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 17, line 16, increase the amount by $1,479,000,000.
On page 17, line 17, increase the amount by $354,960,000.
On page 17, line 21, increase the amount by $1,094,460,000.
On page 17, line 25, increase the amount by $29,580,000.
On page 24, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,479,000,000.
On page 24, line 17, decrease the amount by $354,960,000.
On page 24, line 21, decrease the amount by $1,094,460,000.
On page 24, line 25, decrease the amount by $29,580,000.

SA 175. Mr. VOINOVICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 65, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 1. SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING BIPARTISAN BUDGET REMEDIATION.
This is the sense of the Senate that Congress should enact a biennial budget for the Federal Government.

SA 176. Mr. COLEMAN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 17, line 16, increase the amount by $1,479,000,000.
On page 17, line 17, increase the amount by $354,960,000.
On page 17, line 21, increase the amount by $1,094,460,000.
On page 17, line 25, increase the amount by $29,580,000.
On page 26, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,479,000,000.
On page 26, line 15, decrease the amount by $354,960,000.
On page 26, line 18, decrease the amount by $1,094,460,000.
On page 17, line 16, increase the amount by 
3,000,000.000.
On page 17, line 19, increase the amount by 
1,500,000.000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by 
200,000,000.000.
On page 17, line 2, increase the amount by 
420,000,000.000.
On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by 
80,000,000.000.
On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by 
$37,000,000.000.
On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by 
$1,547,000,000.000.
On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by 
$1,122,000,000.000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by 
$2,442,000,000.000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by 
$2,466,000,000.000.
On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by 
$837,000,000.000.
On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by 
$1,547,000,000.000.
On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by 
$2,122,000,000.000.
On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by 
$2,440,000,000.000.
On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by 
$2,466,000,000.000.
On page 15, line 15, increase the amount by 
$700,000,000.000.
On page 15, line 16, increase the amount by 
$400,000,000.000.
On page 15, line 20, increase the amount by 
$314,000,000.000.
On page 15, line 24, increase the amount by 
$75,000,000.000.
On page 16, line 3, increase the amount by 
$35,000,000.000.
On page 16, line 7, increase the amount by 
$24,000,000.000.
On page 16, line 15, increase the amount by 
$1,550,000,000.000.
On page 16, line 16, increase the amount by 
$245,000,000.000.
On page 16, line 20, increase the amount by 
$542,000,000.000.
On page 16, line 24, increase the amount by 
$176,000,000.000.
On page 17, line 3, increase the amount by 
$207,000,000.000.
On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by 
$240,000,000.000.
On page 23, line 17, increase the amount by 
$192,000,000.000.
On page 23, line 21, increase the amount by 
$24,000,000.000.
On page 23, line 23, increase the amount by 
$21,000,000.000.
On page 30, line 16, decrease the amount by 
$1,674,000,000.000.
On page 30, line 17, decrease the amount by 
$1,922,000,000.000.
On page 48, line 6, increase the amount by 
$2,490,000,000.000.
On page 48, line 7, increase the amount by 
$837,000,000.000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by 
$320,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by 
$387,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by 
$60,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by 
$35,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by 
$710,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by 
$755,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by 
$200,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by 
$21,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by 
$837,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 25, increase the amount by 
$710,000,000.000.
On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by 
$755,000,000.000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by 
$320,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by 
$387,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by 
$60,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by 
$35,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by 
$710,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by 
$755,000,000.000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by 
$755,000,000.000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by 
$320,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by 
$387,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by 
$60,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by 
$35,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by 
$710,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by 
$755,000,000.000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by 
$320,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by 
$387,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by 
$60,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by 
$35,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by 
$710,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by 
$755,000,000.000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by 
$320,000,000.000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by 
$387,000,000.000.
In this section, the term destroyers under the next generation de-
next generation destroyer program through
will not acquire any destroyer under the
tion assume that the Department of Defense
to pursue a winner-take-all strategy
for the acquisition of destroyers under the
Defense to be conducted in 2005 has not been completed.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) it is ill-advised for the Department of Defense to pursue a winner-take-all strategy for the acquisition of destroyers under the next generation destroyer program (DDX) program; and

(2) the amounts identified in this resolution assume that the Department of Defense will not acquire any destroyer under the next generation destroyer program through a winner-take-all strategy.

(c) WINNER-TAKE-ALL STRATEGY DEFINED.—In this section, the term "winner-take-all strategy" with respect to the acquisition of destroyers under the next generation destroyer program, means the acquisition (including design and construction) of such destroyers through a single shipyard.

SA 184. Mr. SALAZAR (for himself, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. CONRAD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. CANT- WELL, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 12, line 16, increase the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 12, line 20, increase the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 12, line 24, increase the amount by $9,000,000.
On page 13, line 3, increase the amount by $90,000,000.
On page 13, line 7, increase the amount by $5,000,000.
On page 30, line 16, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 30, line 17, decrease the amount by $90,000,000.
On page 48, line 6, decrease the amount by $9,000,000.
On page 48, line 7, increase the amount by $23,000,000.

SA 185. Mr. SALAZAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $9,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $5,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $9,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $5,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $90,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $9,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $5,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $90,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $9,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $5,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $9,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $9,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $5,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $90,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.
On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $62,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 17, line 16, increase the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 17, line 17, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 17, line 21, increase the amount by $17,000,000.
On page 17, line 25, increase the amount by $9,000,000.
On page 18, line 4, increase the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 18, line 16, increase the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 18, line 17, increase the amount by $13,000,000.
On page 18, line 21, increase the amount by $19,000,000.
On page 18, line 25, increase the amount by $3,000,000.
On page 19, line 4, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 30, line 16, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 30, line 17, decrease the amount by $330,000,000.
On page 48, line 6, increase the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 48, line 7, increase the amount by $14,000,000.

SA 186. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. VINOVICH, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. OBAMA, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HARKER, and Mr. CARPER) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; as follows:

On page 57, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 408. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(a) PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of Senate enforcement, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any one of the three applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term "applicable time period" means any one of the 3 following periods:

(A) The first year covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget;

(B) The period of the first 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget;

(C) The period of the first 5 fiscal years following the first 5 fiscal years covered in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) DIRECT-SPENDING LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (4), the term "direct-spending legislation" means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(4) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms "direct-spending legislation" and "revenue legislation" do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget;

(B) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

(b) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this section shall—

(A) use the baseline surplus or deficit used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget;

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(c) PAY-AHEAD.—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit defined in subparagraph (b) when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not counted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that direct spending or revenue effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted pursuant to reconciliation instructions signed into law after the beginning of that calendar year shall not be available.

(d) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended by the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(e) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair ruling on a point of order relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be.

(f) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(g) SUNSET.—This section shall expire on September 30, 2010.

SA 187. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 59, strike lines 19 through 23.

SA 188. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. KYL, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. AKAKA) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 18. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE STATE CRIMINAL ALIEN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Control of illegal immigration is a Federal responsibility.

(2) The State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (referred to in this section as "SCAAP") provides critical funding to States and localities for reimbursement of costs incurred as a result of housing undocumented criminal aliens.

(3) Congress appropriated $350,000,000 for SCAA to reimburse State and local governments for these costs in fiscal year 2003.

(4) Congress appropriated $300,000,000 for SCAA to reimburse State and local governments for these costs in fiscal year 2004.

(5) Congress appropriated $305,000,000 for SCAA to reimburse State and local governments for these costs in fiscal year 2005.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this concurrent resolution assume that:

(1) Congress will appropriate $750,000,000 for SCAA for fiscal year 2006; and

(2) Congress will enact long-term reauthorization of SCAA to reimburse State and local governments for the financial burdens undocumented criminal aliens place on their local criminal justice systems.

SA 189. Mr. DODD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $1,134,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $846,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $324,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $318,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $1,135,000,000.
On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $846,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $321,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $318,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $1,511,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $150,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $567,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $423,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $212,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $182,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $150,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $567,000,000.
On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by $423,000,000.
On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by $212,000,000.
On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by $150,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by $150,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $717,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $1,140,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,352,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,511,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $150,000,000.
On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,140,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,352,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $1,511,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,511,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by $1,511,000,000.
On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by $150,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $567,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $425,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by $121,000,000.
On page 7, line 7, increase the amount by $150,000,000.
On page 7, line 16, decrease the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 7, line 17, decrease the amount by $3,022,000,000.
On page 8, line 6, increase the amount by $1,511,000,000.
On page 8, line 7, increase the amount by $150,000,000.

SA 190. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which funding level for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program to the amount that is promised in the No Child Left Behind Act. The additional $1.25 billion that the amendment calls for is offset by eliminating tax loopholes and includes some deficit reduction.

SA 192. Mrs. LINCOLN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $15,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $21,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $32,000,000.
On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $4,000,000.
On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $13,000,000.
On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $21,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $32,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $32,000,000.
On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $32,000,000.
On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $32,000,000.
On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $32,000,000.
On page 4, line 11, increase the amount by $32,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $13,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $21,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $32,000,000.
On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by $32,000,000.
On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by $32,000,000.
On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by $32,000,000.
On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $32,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $32,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $32,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

SA 191. Mr. DODD (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. BIDEN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mrs. LINCOLN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. SALAZAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $50,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $1,460,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $756,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $252,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $50,000,000.
On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $1,460,000,000.
On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $756,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $252,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $1,259,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $730,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $758,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $126,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by $730,000,000.
On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by $758,000,000.
On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by $126,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $755,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $1,133,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,259,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,259,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by $755,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,133,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $1,259,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,259,000,000.
On page 17, line 16, increase the amount by $1,259,000,000.
On page 17, line 17, increase the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 17, line 21, increase the amount by $730,000,000.
On page 17, line 25, increase the amount by $758,000,000.
On page 18, line 4, increase the amount by $126,000,000.
On page 30, line 16, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.
On page 30, line 17, decrease the amount by $2,518,000,000.
On page 48, line 6, increase the amount by $21,000,000.
On page 48, line 7, increase the amount by $25,000,000.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$740,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$822,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>$582,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>$822,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>$822,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>$822,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$822,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$822,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>$822,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>$822,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>$822,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$71,030,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$71,013,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$71,326,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$81,524,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$81,879,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$3,775,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$73,096,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$321,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$321,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$321,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$321,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$321,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$321,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>$355,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research and development on many emerging aeronautics technologies is often too expensive or removed in terms of time from commercial application to garner the necessary level of support from the private sector. (2) The advances made possible by Government-funded research in emerging aeronautics technologies have enabled a long-standing positive balance of trade and air superiority on the battlefield for the United States in recent decades. (4) The aeronautics industry has grown increasingly mature in recent years, with growth dependent on the availability of the research workforce and facilities provided by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

Recent NASA studies have demonstrated the competitiveness, and scientific merit, and necessity of nearly all existing aeronautics wind tunnel and propulsion testing facilities.

A minimum level of investment by NASA is necessary to maintain these facilities in operational condition and to prevent their financial collapse. (b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that:

(1) the level of funding provided for the Aeronautics Mission Directorate within the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should be increased by $1,582,700,000 between fiscal year 2006 and fiscal year 2010; and

(2) the increases provided should be applied to the Vehicle Systems portion of the Aeronautics Mission Directorate budget for use in subsonic and hypersonic aeronautical research.

SA 199. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. KERRY, and Mrs. MERRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $1,800,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $3,900,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $3,700,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $3,900,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $1,800,000,000.

On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $3,900,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $3,900,000,000.

On page 3, line 1, increase the amount by $3,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $1,800,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $3,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $3,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $5,700,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $3,900,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 16, increase the amount by $1,800,000,000.

On page 20, line 17, increase the amount by $1,800,000,000.

On page 20, line 20, increase the amount by $3,900,000,000.

On page 20, line 21, increase the amount by $3,900,000,000.

On page 20, line 24, increase the amount by $3,700,000,000.

On page 20, line 25, increase the amount by $3,700,000,000.

On page 21, line 3, increase the amount by $3,900,000,000.

On page 21, line 4, increase the amount by $3,900,000,000.

On page 21, line 7, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 21, line 8, increase the amount by $4,000,000,000.

On page 30, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,800,000,000.

On page 30, line 17, decrease the amount by $17,300,000,000.

At the end of title V, insert the following:

SEC. ———. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CHILD POVERTY.

—

It is the sense of the Senate that:

Recent NASA studies have demonstrated the competitiveness, and scientific merit, and necessity of nearly all existing aeronautics wind tunnel and propulsion testing facilities.

The advances made possible by Government-funded research in emerging aeronautics technologies have enabled a long-standing positive balance of trade and air superiority on the battlefield for the United States in recent decades.

The aeronautics industry has grown increasingly mature in recent years, with growth dependent on the availability of the research workforce and facilities provided by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

Recent NASA studies have demonstrated the competitiveness, and scientific merit, and necessity of nearly all existing aeronautics wind tunnel and propulsion testing facilities.

A minimum level of investment by NASA is necessary to maintain these facilities in operational condition and to prevent their financial collapse.

It is the sense of the Senate that:

(1) the level of funding provided for the Aeronautics Mission Directorate within the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should be increased by $1,582,700,000 between fiscal year 2006 and fiscal year 2010; and

(2) the increases provided should be applied to the Vehicle Systems portion of the Aeronautics Mission Directorate budget for use in subsonic and hypersonic aeronautical research.

SA 200. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $41,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $104,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $138,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $278,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $341,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $41,000,000.

On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $104,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $338,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $22,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $216,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $152,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $8,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $216,000,000.
On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $152,000,000.
On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $8,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $190,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $108,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $76,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $1,040,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $108,000,000.
On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by $76,000,000.
On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by $108,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $184,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $183,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $190,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $190,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $108,000,000.
On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by $184,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $188,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $190,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by $190,000,000.
On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by $108,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by $108,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $76,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $4,000,000.
On page 8, line 4, increase the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 8, line 16, decrease the amount by $216,000,000.
On page 8, line 17, decrease the amount by $380,000,000.
On page 8, line 6, increase the amount by $190,000,000.
On page 8, line 7, increase the amount by $108,000,000.

SA 202. Mr. DAYTON (for himself, Mr. AKARA, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2006 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $12,100,000,000.
nearly 4,000,000 victims of all types of crimes annually, with priority for programs serving victims of domestic violence, sexual assault and child abuse, and previously underserved victims; and
(G) the Antiterrorism Emergency Reserve, to assist victims of domestic and international terrorism.
(4) Just 4 months ago, a strong bipartisan, bicameral majority in Congress affirmed its support for the Crime Victims Fund and increased its commitment to crime victims in the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–405), which establishes Federal crime victims rights and authorized 2 new VOCA-funded victim programs.
(5) For fiscal year 2000, all amounts deposited into the Crime Victims Fund in each fiscal year were made available for authorized programs in the subsequent fiscal year.
(6) Beginning in fiscal year 2000, Congress responded to large fluctuations of deposits into the Fund by delaying obligations from the Fund above certain amount, as follows:
(A) For fiscal year 2000, $300,000,000.
(B) For fiscal year 2001, $337,500,000.
(C) For fiscal year 2002, $550,000,000.
(D) For fiscal year 2003, $600,000,000.
(E) For fiscal year 2004, $625,000,000.
(F) For fiscal year 2005, $625,000,000.
(7) In the conference report on an omnibus spending bill for fiscal year 2000 (Public Law 106–113), Congress explained that the reason for delaying annual Fund obligations was “to protect against wide fluctuations in receipts into the Fund, and to ensure that a stable level of funding will remain available for these programs in future years.”
(8) VOCA mandates that “...all sums deposited into the Fund in any fiscal year that are not made available for obligation by Congress in the subsequent fiscal year shall remain in the Fund for obligation in future fiscal years, without fiscal year limitation.”
(9) In fiscal year 2006, the President recommended “rescission” of $1,297,000,000 from amounts in the Fund.
(10) The rescission proposed by the President would result in no funds being available to support crime victim services at the start of fiscal year 2007. Further, such rescission would make the Fund vulnerable to fluctuations in receipts into the Fund, and would not ensure that a stable level of funding will remain available for vital programs in future years.
(I) Retention of all amounts deposited into the Fund for the immediate and future use of crime victim services as authorized by VOCA is supported by many major national victim organizations, including—
(A) Justice Solutions, NPO;
(B) National Organization for Victim Assistance;
(C) National Alliance to End Sexual Violence;
(D) National Children’s Alliance;
(E) National Association of VOCA Assistance Administrators;
(F) National Association of Crime Victim Compensation Boards;
(G) Mothers Against Drunk Driving;
(H) National Center for Victims of Crime;
(I) National Organization for Parents of Murdered Children;
(J) National Coalition Against Domestic Violence;
(K) Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape; and
(L) National Network to End Domestic Violence.
(II) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Senate that the funding levels in this resolution assume that all amounts that have not been deposited into the Crime Victims Fund, including amounts deposited in fiscal year 2006 and thereafter, shall remain in the Fund for use as authorized under the Victims of Crime Act of 1994.
SA 294. Mr. BINGAMAN (for Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. DE WINE, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. CHAFEE)) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:
On page 40, after line 8, insert the following:
SEC. 5. RESERVE FUND FOR CRIME VICTIMS.
(a) The Chairman of the Committee on the Appropriations Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the aggregates, functional totals, allocations, and spending limits in this resolution by up to $1,000,000,000 over the total of fiscal years 2006 through 2010 for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would—
(1) provide resources for Guard and Reserve members who have been called up to active duty and are serving abroad and have experienced a loss in their wage income as a result of their active duty service; and
(2) provide tax relief to companies that voluntarily continue to pay the salaries of their Guard and Reserve employees during their active duty service;
provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.
SA 294. Mr. BINGAMAN (for Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. DE WINE, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. CHAFEE)) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:
On page 40, after line 8, insert the following:
SEC. 5. RESERVE FUND FOR CRIME VICTIMS.
(a) The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the aggregates, functional totals, allocations, and spending limits in this resolution by up to $1,000,000,000 over the total of fiscal years 2006 through 2010 for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would—
(1) provide resources for Guard and Reserve members who have been called up to active duty and are serving abroad and have experienced a loss in their wage income as a result of their active duty service; and
(2) provide tax relief to companies that voluntarily continue to pay the salaries of their Guard and Reserve employees during their active duty service;
provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.
SA 294. Mr. BINGAMAN (for Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. DE WINE, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. CHAFEE)) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:
On page 40, after line 8, insert the following:
SEC. 5. RESERVE FUND FOR CRIME VICTIMS.
(a) The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the aggregates, functional totals, allocations, and spending limits in this resolution by up to $1,000,000,000 over the total of fiscal years 2006 through 2010 for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would—
(1) provide resources for Guard and Reserve members who have been called up to active duty and are serving abroad and have experienced a loss in their wage income as a result of their active duty service; and
(2) provide tax relief to companies that voluntarily continue to pay the salaries of their Guard and Reserve employees during their active duty service;
provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

SA 206. Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2006 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:
On page 40, after line 8, insert the following:
SEC. 5. RESERVE FUND FOR INDIAN HEALTH CARE.
(a) The Chairman of the Committee on the Appropriations Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the aggregates, functional totals, allocations, and spending limits in this resolution by up to $1,000,000,000 over the total of fiscal years 2006 through 2010 for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would—
(1) provide resources for Guard and Reserve members who have been called up to active duty and are serving abroad and have experienced a loss in their wage income as a result of their active duty service; and
(2) provide tax relief to companies that voluntarily continue to pay the salaries of their Guard and Reserve employees during their active duty service;
provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

SA 207. Mr. CARPER proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; as follows:
SA 208. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 42, line 14, strike “that” and all that follows through “designates” on line 15, and insert: “that the Congress designates as an emergency requirement”.

SA 209. Mr. COCHRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 41, line 17, strike “au”- and all that follows through “in” on line 19, and insert: “authority in”

SA 210. Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. PENGOLD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $700,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $700,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $700,000,000.
On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $700,000,000.
On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $700,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $700,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $700,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $650,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 4, line 11, increase the amount by $2,500,000,000.
On page 5, line 1, decrease the amount by $2,500,000,000.
On page 5, line 2, decrease the amount by $2,200,000,000.
On page 5, line 3, decrease the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 4, decrease the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, decrease the amount by $1,200,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by $800,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $2,500,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $3,200,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $2,250,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $1,500,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,100,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $2,500,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by $3,200,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, decrease the amount by $5,200,000,000.

SA 211. Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by $600,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $100,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $90,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $80,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $60,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $50,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $40,000,000.
On page 5, line 26, increase the amount by $30,000,000.
On page 5, line 27, increase the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 5, line 28, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 5, line 29, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 5, line 30, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 5, line 31, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 5, line 32, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 5, line 33, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 5, line 34, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 5, line 35, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 5, line 36, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 5, line 37, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 5, line 38, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 5, line 39, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 5, line 40, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

SA 212. Mr. DORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, decrease the amount by $5,000,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, decrease the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.

SA 213. Mr. PRTOR (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. REED, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $1,200,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $1,200,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $1,200,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $1,200,000,000.
On page 20, line 16, increase the amount by $1,200,000,000.
On page 20, line 17, increase the amount by $1,200,000,000.
On page 30, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,200,000,000.
On page 30, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,200,000,000.
On page 48, line 6, increase the amount by $1,200,000,000.
On page 48, line 7, increase the amount by $1,200,000,000.

SA 214. Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; as follows:

On page 40, after line 8, insert the following:

SEC. 1. RESERVE FUND FOR REDUCING EXPENDITURES UNDER MEDICARE PART D.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, functional totals, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution upon enactment of legislation that provides the Secretary of Health and Human Services with the authority to participate in the negotiation of contracts with manufacturers of covered part D drugs to achieve the best possible prices for such drugs under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, that requires the Secretary to negotiate contracts with manufacturers of such drugs for each fallback prescription drug plan, and that requires the Secretary to participate in the negotiation for a contract for any such drug upon the request of a prescription drug plan or an MA-PD plan, by the amount of savings in that legislation, to ensure that those savings are reserved for reducing expenditures under such part.

SA 215. Mr. SALAZAR (for himself and Mr. CONRAD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; as follows:

On page 9, line 15, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 9, line 16, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.
On page 9, line 20, decrease the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 9, line 24, decrease the amount by $12,000,000.
On page 10, line 3, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.
On page 17, line 16, increase the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 17, line 17, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 17, line 21, increase the amount by $17,000,000.
On page 17, line 25, increase the amount by $9,000,000.
On page 18, line 4, increase the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 18, line 16, increase the amount by $56,000,000.
On page 18, line 17, increase the amount by $13,000,000.
On page 18, line 21, increase the amount by $19,000,000.
On page 18, line 25, increase the amount by $3,000,000.
On page 19, line 4, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

SA 216. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 9, line 15, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 9, line 16, decrease the amount by $56,000,000.
On page 9, line 20, decrease the amount by $12,000,000.
On page 9, line 24, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 10, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 14, line 15, increase the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 14, line 16, increase the amount by $56,000,000.
On page 14, line 20, increase the amount by $12,000,000.
On page 14, line 24, increase the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 15, line 3, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

SA 217. Mr. KOHL. (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. BIDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 23, line 17, increase the amount by $12,000,000.
On page 23, line 21, increase the amount by $280,000,000.
On page 23, line 25, increase the amount by $250,000,000.
On page 24, line 4, increase the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 24, line 8, increase the amount by $150,000,000.
On page 26, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 26, line 15, decrease the amount by $120,000,000.
On page 26, line 18, decrease the amount by $250,000,000.
On page 26, line 24, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 27, line 2, decrease the amount by $150,000,000.

SA 218. Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KYL, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; as follows:

On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by $352,000,000.
On page 23, line 17, increase the amount by $217,000,000.
On page 23, line 21, increase the amount by $35,000,000.
On page 9, line 15, decrease the amount by $352,000,000.
On page 9, line 16, decrease the amount by $317,000,000.
On page 9, line 20, decrease the amount by $35,000,000.

SA 219. Ms. LANDRIEU proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; as follows:

On page 40, after line 8 insert the following:

SEC. 2. DEFICIT NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PATRIOTIC EMPLOYERS OF NA- TIONAL GUARDSMEN AND RESERVISTS.

In the Senate, if a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment is offered thereto, or if a conference report is submitted thereon, that provides a 50 percent tax credit to employers for compensation paid to employees who are on active duty status as members of the Guard or Reserve in order to make up the difference between the employee's civilian pay and military pay and/or for compensation paid to a worker hired to replace an active duty Guard or Reserve employee, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall adjust the revenue aggregates and other appropriate aggregates, levels, and limits in this resolution, to the extent that such legislation would not increase the deficit for fiscal year 2006 and for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

SA 220. Ms. COLLINS (for Mr. LIEBERMAN, for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mrs. CLINTON) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; as follows:

On page 16, line 15, increase the amount by $715,000,000.
On page 16, line 16, increase the amount by $102,000,000.

On page 16, line 20, increase the amount by $254,000,000.

On page 16, line 24, increase the amount by $220,000,000.

On page 17, line 3, increase the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by $140,000,000.

On page 23, line 17, increase the amount by $122,000,000.

On page 23, line 21, increase the amount by $14,000,000.

On page 23, line 25, increase the amount by $14,000,000.

On page 26, line 14, decrease the amount by $855,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, decrease the amount by $214,000,000.

On page 26, line 18, decrease the amount by $258,000,000.

On page 26, line 21, decrease the amount by $294,000,000.

On page 26, line 24, decrease the amount by $139,000,000.

SA 221. Mr. BAYH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 65, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 2. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FEDERAL AGENCY AUDITS.

It is the sense of the Senate that in the event that the President of the United States does not receive a qualified opinion with no material weaknesses or noncompliance relating to their annual financial audits, the Committee on Appropriations shall freeze the salary and travel budget for all of the political appointees at that Federal agency for the following fiscal year.

SA 222. Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SARABANS, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 65, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 2. SENSE OF THE SENATE TO MAKE MORE EFFICIENT AND EQUITABLE, FINCALLY RESPONSIBLE APPROPRIATIONS AND REVENUE DECISIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Federal programs and policies directly influence local growth patterns through the location of Federal facilities, spending on public infrastructure, tax incentives, and Federal regulations.

(2) A majority of Americans favor walkable neighborhoods, shorter commutes, and open space protection, which are land development patterns favored by smart growth.

(3) Federal programs and policies should support local development choices that improve the condition of town centers, transit and pedestrian-oriented development, increased access to rail and public services, open space and parklands, and a greater mix of housing, commercial, and retail uses.

(4) Federal incentives should encourage enhanced community quality of life, fiscally sound reinvestment in existing infrastructure, a balanced transportation system, and safe, decent, affordable places for people to live.

(5) Investing in existing infrastructure is a fiscally responsible use of resources. When not properly planned, local development decisions may actually burden the Federal budget by requiring the construction of new water, sewer, and transportation infrastructure in low-density areas, rather than funding the maintenance of existing infrastructure. Poorly planned development also often results in increased commuting times, traffic congestion, impaired air quality, loss of open space and environmentally sensitive areas, public health problems, lack of affordable housing, and poor accessibility to critical services such as schools and hospitals.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this resolution assume that in making appropriations and revenue decisions, the Senate should—

(1) support Federal policies that encourage growth patterns that make efficient and equitable use of available housing, transportation, and infrastructure resources, including such policies as brownfields development programs, farmland protection programs, the retention of the Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG), and Federal facility decisions, such as those made by the General Services Administration that consider the benefits of utilizing existing infrastructure; and

(2) address the unintended consequences of urban and suburban sprawl resulting from specific Federal programs and policies through the allocation of budgetary authority to provide incentives for sustainable growth.

SA 223. Mr. VITTER proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010; as follows:

On page 68, strike line 24, after the second period insert the following: “in dealing with homeland security assistance grants that relate to port security, Congress should (1) allocate port security grants under a separate, dedicated program intended specifically for port security enhancements, rather than as part of a combined program for many different infrastructure programs that could lead to reduced funding for port security, (2) direct the Secretaries of Homeland Security to both distribute port security grants to the Nation’s port facilities more quickly and efficiently and give ports the financial resources needed to comply with congressional mandates, and (3) allocate sufficient funding for port security to enable port authorities to comply with mandated investments, ensure the protection of our Nation’s maritime transportation, commerce system, and cruise pas-
Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2005 at 3:00 p.m. in open session to receive testimony on national security space policy and programs in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2006. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sub-committee on Strategic Forces be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2005 at 3:00 p.m. in open session to receive testimony on national security space policy and programs in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2006. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Property Rights be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on “Obscenity Prosecution and the Constitution” on Wednesday, March 16, 2005, at 3:00 p.m. in SD226. The tentative witness list is attached.

Panel I: Robert Destro, Professor of Law, Columbus School of Law, Catholic University of America, Washington, DC; Patrick Trueman, Senior Legal Counsel, Family Research Council, Former Chief, Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC; Frederick Schauer, Frank Stanton Professor of the First Amendment, Shorenstein Center, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2005 at 9:15 a.m. to conduct a hearing regarding S. 606 The Reliable Fuels Act and The Safe, Clean, and Secure Nuclear Future Act of 2005 and the committee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Property Rights be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on “Obscenity Prosecution and the Constitution” on Wednesday, March 16, 2005, at 3:00 p.m. in SD226. The tentative witness list is attached.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2005 at 2:30 p.m. to hold hearing on EU Arms to China.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2005 at 9:30 a.m. in open session to receive testimony on national security space policy and programs in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2006. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sub-committee on Airland be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2005 at 9:30 a.m., in open session to receive testimony on army transformation and the future combat system in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2006. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2005 at 3:00 p.m. in open session to receive testimony on national security space policy and programs in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2006. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
Senate budget resolution; provided further that the Senate then resume debate on the Smith amendment under the previous order.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, tomorrow it is my expectation that the Senate will complete action on the budget resolution. We will continue the amendment process tomorrow morning. Under the previous order, we will conclude debate on all remaining amendments during tomorrow morning’s session. All time has been allocated for tomorrow. It is anticipated that we will begin voting on the remaining amendments around 1:20 or 1:30 tomorrow afternoon, and we will keep Senators posted as to the timing of this vote-arama. We are working through the list of filed and offered amendments so we can minimize the number of votes we will need to have during tomorrow’s session. But Senators should be expected to stay on the floor throughout the afternoon and into the evening. These will be 10-minute votes, and Senators should plan their schedules around being on the floor in order not to miss any of these crucial votes.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:48 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 17, 2005, at 9 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate: Wednesday, March 16, 2005.

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD


THE ABOVE NOMINATION WAS APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEE’S COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DUTY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY


IN THE COAST GUARD

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF VINCENT M. WEBER TO BE CAPTAIN.

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN C. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH ANDREW H. ZUCKERMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 4, 2005.

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT M. KEITH AND ENDING WITH DANIEL E. WARD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 31, 2005.

FOREIGN SERVICE


FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PETER FERNANDEZ AND ENDING WITH ROSS G. KEAMER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2005.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GEORGE SUFFNER AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM ZARIT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 2005.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES D. RATHBUN AND ENDING WITH ANDREW P. SEAMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 2005.
HONORING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF STATE REPRESENTATIVE YVONNE TOUREILLES

HON. HENRY CUELLAR OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, rise today to honor the contributions of State Representative Yvonne Toureilles of my Congressional District.

Yvonne Gonzalez Toureilles was born and raised in Texas. Her father worked as a truck driver while studying to become a pharmacist. With a family on the way, he helped Yvonne's mother finish her degree and become a teacher. Yvonne's parents did more than just tell her that education brings opportunity, they showed her.

She aimed high and graduated with honors from the University of Texas at Austin with a Bachelor of Arts degree. Later, she enrolled and received a Juris Doctor from the University of Texas School of Law.

After earning her law degree, Yvonne put her education to work for the State of Texas—first learning the process as a researcher at the Texas House of Representatives, then defending Department of Public Safety troopers for several years as an Assistant Attorney General. Yvonne also served as Legal Counsel for the Texas Workforce Commission.

Yvonne has served as Treasurer and Vice-President of the Coastal Bend Bar Association and is a member of the Coastal Bend Women Lawyers Association.

Yvonne Gonzalez Toureilles then came home to South Texas to raise her family. After marrying her high school sweetheart, Marc Toureilles, at the Saint Theresa Catholic Church in Premont, they gave birth to their first child, Genevieve, in Alice, Texas. Yvonne then moved to South Texas to raise her family. After earning her law degree, Yvonne put her education to work for the State of Texas—first learning the process as a researcher at the Texas House of Representatives, then defending Department of Public Safety troopers for several years as an Assistant Attorney General. Yvonne also served as Legal Counsel for the Texas Workforce Commission.

Yvonne has served as Treasurer and Vice-President of the Coastal Bend Bar Association and is a member of the Coastal Bend Women Lawyers Association.

Yvonne Gonzalez Toureilles then came home to South Texas to raise her family. After marrying her high school sweetheart, Marc Toureilles, at the Saint Theresa Catholic Church in Premont, they gave birth to their first child, Genevieve, in Alice, Texas. Yvonne now lives and works in Alice where her practice primarily consists of family law.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have this opportunity to recognize State Representative Yvonne Gonzalez Toureilles.

CONGRATULATING ROBERT KERRIGAN SR. AND ROBERT KERRIGAN JR. ON RECEIVING THE MICHAEL F. KING JR. ARMY VETERAN'S AWARD

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask you and my esteemed colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to a father and son who have received the Michael F. King Jr. Armed Forces Veteran's Award from the Quiet Man Society on behalf of the St. Patrick's Day Parade Association of Lackawanna County.

This award is presented annually to local individuals who, after serving in our country's military, returned to Northeastern Pennsylvania and by their actions and involvement in community events exhibited continued service to God, Family and Country.

The award was endowed by The Quiet Man Society in honor of Mr. King, an original member of the Society. Mr. King, a twice-wounded veteran of World War II, is most fondly remembered for the countless hours he selflessly worked on behalf of St. Paul's Church, Holy Rosary Church, Holy Family Residence, the Penn Ridge Club and the Irish American Men's Association.

The previous winners of the Award had the honor of presenting the Michael F. King Jr. Armed Forces Veteran's Award to the recipients. In selecting this year's honorees, has attempted to answer a question pondered not only by our region's WWII veterans but also by our country's Founding Fathers: Would there be individuals in future generations who would answer the "call to arms" to preserve and protect the freedoms and liberties that the prior generations had fought so hard to gain? The Committee believes that the sacrifices, dedication and service that the Kerrigans have given for our country and community provide the answer to that question.

Robert Kerrigan Sr. is a native of Scranton and a 1966 graduate of Holy Rosary High School. He was drafted in August 1966 and served in the U.S. Infantry during the Vietnam War from January 1969 to January 1970. He and his wife, Ellen Bauer Kerrigan, reside in the East Mountain section of Scranton. They have four children: Michael, Robert Jr., Kevin and Colleen.

Mr. Kerrigan Sr. is most widely recognized as a member of Local 81 IBEW, where he has served on the Executive Board for 12 years. In addition, he has been a member of IBEW's Joint Apprentice Training Council for several years. This council has overseen the electrical installation of lighting for numerous charitable organizations, including St. Joseph's Center, Friendship House and the Italian Festival.

Without hesitation, it can be said that the various events held by these groups were successful in large part because of the selfless commitment of Mr. Kerrigan Sr. and all the members of Local 81 IBEW. Because of their efforts, thousands of members of the community have enjoyed themselves at many festivals, and have had the opportunity to contribute to other worthy causes.

Mr. Kerrigan Sr. is also a member of VFW Post 5209, Veterans of Foreign Wars Inc., Post 1. The younger Mr. Kerrigan is a 1997 graduate of Scranton High School. He has attended Penn State University. He joined the U.S. Army Reserve in 2001 and was attached to the 828th Quartermaster Company. He has served with the 233rd Quartermaster Company in Operation Iraqi Freedom from April 2003 through November 2003. Most recently, he was awarded The Army Commendation Medal for Outstanding Duty and Selfless Commitment.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Robert Kerrigan Sr. and Robert Kerrigan Jr., a father and son who have demonstrated their love of country and who are most deserving of this award.

IN HONOR OF FATHER TARAS CHUBENKO

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Father Taras Chubenko on his 25th anniversary as pastor of St. Demetrius Ukrainian Orthodox Cathedral. Father Chubenko celebrated the event at the Dinner and Dance on March 12, 2005, in Carteret, New Jersey.

During his time with the Cathedral, Father Chubenko has worked diligently to help improve St. Demetrius and its services. Under his strong leadership, St. Demetrius has successfully completed various restructuring and renovation projects. Father Chubenko is a member of the Diocese's Metropolitan Council and has served as Dean of the New Jersey Deanery. In the past, he held the positions of Consistory Business Administrator and Treasurer of the Diocese for more than seven years.

Father Chubenko is active in many organizations and plays an integral role in the community. For 25 years, he has been the Chaplain to various groups in Carteret, including the Office of Emergency Management, the volunteer fire department, and the police department. At one time the president of the Carteret School Board of Education, he spent a total of nine years as a member of the Board. In the past, Father Taras served as the chairperson of the mayor's Children's Relief Fund and 9/11 World Trade Center Scholarship Fund Committee. He has also lent his wisdom and time as the mentor of two mayors of Carteret.

Born in Germany, Father Chubenko and his family immigrated to the United States when he was a child. He studied at St. Sophia's Seminary and became an ordained priest in 1980. That same year, he began his service at St. Demetrius, where he has remained ever since. For his outstanding service, Father Chubenko was promoted to the rank of Proto-Priest in 1982 and later achieved the highest rank of Protopresbyter in 1990.

He and his wife are the proud parents of four sons.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Father Taras Chubenko for his many years of dedicated service to St. Demetrius Ukrainian Orthodox Cathedral and the people of Carteret. His strong leadership and active involvement in the community has helped revitalize the Cathedral and improve the lives of many.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.
national terrorist activities continue even now. The organization is still active within the southern Lebanese Shab’a farm region. Still supported by both Iran and Syria, Hezbollah operates cells in Europe, Asia, Africa, and both North and South America. According to U.S. intelligence, today Hezbollah is the largest terrorist network on the globe—much larger than even Al Qaida.

Sparked by Hariri’s death, both the international and Lebanese communities have cried out for the removal of Syria’s last troops within the country. While I too support this effort, I must nonetheless ask how will this ensure stability in Lebanon if a local terrorist group of this magnitude is still allowed to exist within the country’s borders? By adding Hezbollah to its list of international terrorist organizations, the European Union would require its member states to freeze all Hezbollah assets and to seek out and arrest its members. By doing so, the EU will help make substantial headway in putting an end to the terrorist group and show its unreserved support for both the security and autonomy of Lebanon.

Recognizing the Achievements of Hays County Commissioner Debbie Gonzales Ingalsbe

Hon. Henry Cuellar
Of Texas
In the House of Representatives
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Hays County Commissioner Debbie Gonzales Ingalsbe for her accomplishments in public service.

Ms. Ingalsbe comes from a family with a tradition of public service—her father was also a Hays County Commissioner. She is a lifelong resident of San Marcos, and has the distinction of being the first female commissioner in Hays County history.

Ms. Ingalsbe began her career in service as a Deputy Constable after graduating from the Travis County Sheriff’s Academy. She has worked tirelessly as commissioner to improve the quality of life in Hays County. She has been especially involved in the issue of health care. She directed all of the county’s tobacco settlement funds toward public health, permitting Hays County to build one of the most comprehensive and advanced public health facilities in the State.

Commissioner Ingalsbe continues to give of her time and energy to make the San Marcos area a better place to live. She is a member of a long list of community organizations, including San Marcos EMS, the Hays/Caldwell County Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse, and the San Marcos Area Food Bank. Her commitment to her fellow citizens is laudable.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had this opportunity to recognize the many achievements of Hays County Commissioner Debbie Ingalsbe.
Center of Wyoming Valley and the Victims Re-
source Center. Carol also served as the United Jewish Appeal Campaign Co-Chair-
person and Vice President of the Jewish Fed-
eration of Greater Wilkes-Barre. Carol is a
member of the American Counseling Associa-
tion, the American Psychological Association,
and the Residential and Educational Devel-
opmental Education and Counseling. She is
a graduate of the 2000 class of Leadership Wilkes-Barre.

Carol graduated from Wilkes University in
1966 and in 1996 received a Masters degree in
Community Counseling from the University of
Scranton. She is a member of Chi Omega Iota,
the International Counseling Honor Soci-
ety, and was listed in “Who’s Who Among
Students in American Universities and Col-
leges.”

Carol and David live in Kingston and are
the parents of six children: Rachel, who is married
to Jay Skaistis; Hannah; Nathaniel; Sarah;
Nami; and Zachary. They have one grand-
daughter, Talia Rose Skaistis.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratu-
lating this couple who has given so much of
their time and talents to their community and
are most deserving of this award.

CONGRATULATING FAIRLEIGH DICKINSON UNIVERSITY ON THE 2005 NORTHEAST CONFERENCE CHAMPIONSHIP TITLE

HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great pleasure to honor and commend
the Fairleigh Dickinson University Men’s Bas-
ketball Team, the Knights, who won the 2005 Northeast Conference Championship (NEC) game on March 9, 2005. The Knights are re-
turning to the 2005 NCAA Tournament for the first time since 1998, and will face number one ranked Illinois on March 17 in Indianapolis.

The Knights hosted the NEC Tournament championship game last Wednesday evening, March 9th, at their home court in Hackensack, NJ where they secured a hard fought win over the Wagner College Seahawks by a score of 58–52. The highlights of the game included Center Andrea Crosariol scoring 18 points, just two points shy of his career high, and jun-
or guard Chad Timberlake scoring 11 points.

Senior guard Mensah Peterson scored 7 of his 13 points in the final three minutes, with an
impressive 3-point shot made with 24 seconds left on the clock to secure the Knights’ tri-
mphant.

Head coach, Tom Green has had his fair share of accomplishments during his 22 years
at Fairleigh Dickinson University. He has led
the Knights to 17 winning seasons, 5 NEC Tournament semi-final appearances and eight
NEC Championship games.

Today, Coach Green continues to lead a
team of talented and bright young men. Junior
forward Gordon Klaiwer was named to the All–
NEC First Team and senior guard Tamien
Trent was selected to the All–NEC Second Team in a vote conducted by the league’s head coaches. The duo boasts a combined average of 32 points per game for the highest scoring offense in the NEC during the regular season.

Founded in 1942, Fairleigh Dickinson Uni-
versity, located in my Congressional District, has provided Northern Jersey with a quality
level of higher education. The university’s sixth
president, Dr. J. Michael Adams, serves as an
outstanding motivator by encouraging his stu-
dents to expand their perspectives of the world
by embarking on utilizing sophisti-
cated technology in order to enact rapid
change through education.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Dr.
Adams for his tireless efforts to continually
raise the level of education at this fine institu-
tion. I also thank Coach Green and the out-
standing team members of the Knights for their
dedication to their school and for the pas-
ion they have for the sport of basketball. I
commend the Fairleigh Dickinson University
Knights for their stellar season, including the
NEC Championship title, and I offer Coach
Green and his team the best of luck in the Big
Dance.

ENACTMENT OF THE 1965 VOTING RIGHTS BILL

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my
privilege to draw the attention of the House to
a significant event in civil rights history which
took place in this very chamber on March 15,
forty years ago. It was on that evening, that
President Lyndon Johnson addressed a joint
session of the Congress to seek the enact-
ment of the 1965 voting rights bill he was
about to submit. It was the first time in nine-
teen years that a president had addressed a
joint session to request domestic legislation.

Tumultuous events taking place in Selma, Alabama, had influenced the timing of the
President’s request. In one of the most stirring
appeals of his Presidency, Johnson said:

At times history and fate meet at a single
time in a single place to shape a turning
point in the story of man’s unending search
for freedom. So it was at Lexington and Concord . . . So it was last week in Selma, Alabama . . .

What happened at Selma is part of a far larg-
er movement directed to every state and
section of America. It is the effort of
American Negroes to secure for themselves
the full blessings of American life. . . . Their
cause must be our cause, too. Because it is
not just Negroes, but really all of us who
must overcome the crippling legacy of big-
oty and injustice.

And we shall overcome!

Those exalted words drawn from the free-
dom hymn of the civil rights movement, spoken
by the President of the United States, to the
resounding ovation of the Congress, car-
ried by television around the nation and
around the world, marked the crossing of a
major milestone in American civil rights his-
tory.

Yet, many Americans, myself included,
who came of age during the struggle for
true equality, know of its extraordinary achieve-
ments, as well as the short-
comeings, of this federal venture into conflict
resolution are barely known in official Wash-
ington, and even less so by the American
public. This first written history of the Com-
mittee on Human Relations, published by the
University of Missouri Press. The
book is entitled, Resolving Racial Conflict: The
Community Relations Service and Civil Rights

[From the 2001 Fall-Winter Catalogue of the
University of Missouri Press]

RESOLVING RACIAL CONFLICT: THE COMMUNITY
RELATIONS SERVICE AND CIVIL RIGHTS (1964–
1989)

(By Bertram Levine)

In 1964, when the Civil Rights Act was passed, Congress wisely created an agency based in the U.S. Department of Justice to help
forestall or resolve racial or ethnic dis-
putes evolving from the act. Mandated by
law and by its own methology to shun pub-
licity, the Community Relations Service de-
served self-effacement to a fine art. Thus
the accomplishments, as well as the short-
comings, of this federal venture into conflict
resolution are barely known in official Wash-
ington, and even less so by the American
public. This first written history of the Com-
munity Relations Service has used the experi-
ences of the men and women who sought to
resolve the most volatile issues of the day to
tell the fascinating story of this unfamiliar agency.

This multi-racial cadre of concilia-
tion and mediation specialists worked be-
hind the scenes in more than 20,000 con-
frontations involving racial and ethnic mi-
norities.

From Selma to Montgomery, at the en-
campment of the Poor Peoples’ Campaign in
Resurrection City, to the urban riots of the
sixties, seventies, and eighties, the struggle for
school desegregation battles north and
south, at the siege of Wounded Knee, and
during the Texas Gulf Coast fishing wars be-
tween Southeast Asian refugees and Anglos,
these federal peacemakers lessened the at-
mosphere of racial violence in every major
U.S. city and thousands of small towns. These confrontations ranged from disputes that attracted worldwide attention to the everyday affronts, assaults, and upheavals that marked the nation’s adjustment to wider power sharing within an increasingly diverse population. While Resolving Racial Conflict examines some of the celebrated breakthroughs that made change possible, it also delves deeply into the countless behind-the-scenes local efforts that converted possibility to reality.

Among the many themes in this book that provide new perspective for understanding racial conflict in America are the effects of protest and conflict in engineering social change; the variety of civil rights views and experiences of African Americans, Native Americans, Asians, and Hispanics; the role of police in minority relations; and the development and refinement of techniques for community conflict resolution from seat-of-the-pants intervention to sophisticated professional practice. Resolving Racial Conflict will appeal to students of civil rights and American history in both the general and academic communities, as well as students of alternative dispute resolution and peace and conflict studies.

HONORING NATIONAL WOMEN’S HISTORY PROJECT AND PRESIDENT MOLLY MURPHY MACGREGOR

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the National Women’s History Project, NWHP, and its President and co-founder, Molly Murphy MacGregor of Sonoma County, California, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the organization. The mission of the NWHP is to recognize and celebrate the diverse and historic accomplishments of women by providing information and educational materials and programs.

In 1978 in Sonoma County, Molly originated the plan for the first Women’s History Week, which became an annual event. In 1980, she co-founded the NWHP in Santa Rosa, California with Mary Ruthsdotter, Maria Cuevas, Bonnie Eisenberg and Susanne Otteman have also worked with specialists around the country to integrate a women’s perspective into the school curriculum. The NWHP has received funding for this outreach from the U.S. Department of Education and has been recognized by the National Education Association, the National Association for Multicultural Education, and the Center for Women Policy Studies.

Molly has been honored by numerous groups including the California Commission on the Status of Women, the Sonoma County NAACP, and the Giraffe foundation (for “sticking her neck out”). In 1999 she was chosen as one of three appointments from the White House to the Women’s Progress Commission. Mr. Speaker, as a longtime resident of Sonoma County, it has been my pleasure to work with Molly Murphy MacGregor and the National Women’s History Project to promote understanding and appreciation of the role of women in our culture. Their vision has helped create a legacy that everyone in this country can honor and appreciate.

WELCOME TO THE WORLD, KEEGAN RILEY SHAW

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, today, my wife Emilie and I are celebrating the arrival of our 15th Grandchild—Keegan Riley Shaw. This morning at 7:51 a.m., two days before St. Patrick’s Day, our son and daughter-in-law, J.C. and Angela Shaw, gave birth to this 7-pound, 10-ounce baby boy.

There is a special bond between Grandparents and Grandchildren. We are truly blessed.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF BECKER COUNTY CONSTABLE JIMMY WILLBORN

HON. HENRY CUELLAR
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Constable Jimmy Willborn for his exceptional career in law enforcement.

Jimmy Willborn has served in law enforcement for more than 40 years. He holds a Master Peace Officers License, and for 31 years, he worked to keep his fellow citizens safe as a member of the San Antonio Police Department.

During his career, he has been a consistent advocate for better law enforcement. He is the founder of the Blue Santa program, and the former Director of the Texas Narcotics Control Program. He helped to build connections with other law enforcement agencies as the Secretary/Treasurer of CLEAT, the Combined Law Enforcement Associations of Texas. He put his expertise to work as a developer of the National and State Control Policy for Drug and Violent Crimes, in 1994 and 1995.

Jimmy Willborn currently serves as Constable for Precinct 2 of Bexar County, Texas. He also works as a lobbyist for the South West Texas Constable’s and Justice of the Peace Association, attempting to help legislators craft bills that will strengthen the Texas Law enforcement community. He is currently lobbying in support of one that will help to keep Texas’ children safe by creating reduced-speed school zones around high schools.

Mr. Speaker, Constable Jimmy Willborn is a dedicated guardian for the people of Bexar County, and his community is safer and stronger as a result of his presence. I am proud to have the opportunity to recognize his service.

CONGRATULATING RON D’ELISEO ON BEING HONORED AS PERSON OF THE YEAR

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask you and my esteemed colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Ron D’Eliseo, who was recognized at a reception on February 20, 2005 at The Grammery Ballroom in Pittston. The Sunday Dispatch chose Ron D’Eliseo as the Greater Pittston Person of the Year for 2004.

Ron D’Eliseo and his wife Brenda have three children, Robert, Ronnie and Christen. Robert, who will be nine years old in July, has autism. Ron chose to channel his heartache into finding a way to help others. He decided to raise money for autism awareness and research, organizing a motorcycle benefit cruise called the Ride for Robert. The benefit has Robert riding with Ron on his American Iron Horse Texas Chopper or his old Harley Davidson.

The Earthly Angels Autism Fund of the Luzerne Foundation is a result of the Ride for Robert. The Ride, now in its sixth year, has helped raise more than $40,000. Ron’s efforts have helped parents of autistic children understand this devastating illness. He established and maintains a library at Milestone’s in Wyoming.

Through Earthly Angels, Ron has helped sponsor autistic children learn to ride horses at a summer camp, a swimming program at the Greater Pittston YMCA and a music therapy program at St. Joseph’s Center in Scranton. More recently, Earthly Angels made a donation to the family of an autistic boy from Williamsport, Pennsylvania, who died from cold weather exposure when he wandered away from home.

Ron is planning an autism conference and dinner in 2006. Ron also is active in his church, Our Lady of Mount Carmel in Pittston. Ron D’Eliseo is an everyday hero who took his pain and used it to help others. A humble man, I know that Ron does not take credit for what he has done. Instead, he praises his
family and friends, people who have supported his cause, and perhaps most of all, Robert.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating this father who has given so much of himself.

HOUSE DEMOCRACY ASSISTANCE COMMISSION RESOLUTION

SPEECH OF
HON. RON PAUL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 2005

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation. We have absolutely no constitutional authority to establish a commission to “assist” parlaments throughout the world. Despite all the high-sounding rhetoric surrounding this legislation, we should not fool ourselves. This is nothing more than yet another scheme to funnel United States tax dollars to foreign governments. It is an international welfare scheme and an open door to more U.S. meddling in the internal affairs of foreign countries.

How can we tell an American family struggling to pay its bills that it must pay more taxes so a foreign parliament can purchase fancy plasma screen televisions, or the latest computer equipment, or ultra-modern communications equipment? Can anyone here justify this?

Mr. Speaker, this bill will do more than just take money from Americans. This commission will enable members of Congress and congressional staff employees to travel the world meddling in the affairs of foreign governing bodies. It is counterproductive to tell other nations how they should govern themselves, as even if we come loaded with dollars to hand out, our meddling is always resented by the local population—just as we would resent a foreign government telling us how to govern ourselves. Don’t we have enough of our own problems to cope with without going abroad in search of foreign parliaments to aid?

I urge my colleagues to reject this wasteful and counterproductive scheme.

THE RADIOPROTECTANT PROCUREMENT ACT OF 2005

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Radioprotectant Procurement Act of 2005. This bill directs the Departments of Health and Human Services and Homeland Security to review all potentially viable radiation countermeasures and to move toward procurement of those which the government deems safe and effective against a nuclear or radiological attack.

The threat of a radiological or nuclear attack is one of the gravest faced by the United States. The results of such an attack could be catastrophic, causing death, widespread radiation sickness, economic hardship and at the very least, tremendous strain on public health resources. These effects could be mitigated if the proper radiation countermeasures are rapidly administered.

Currently, the medical options for responding to acute radiation exposure are very limited. Decontamination of individuals through showering and changing clothes is currently the main tool we have to “treat” large numbers of actual or suspected casualties. But this does little to protect or mitigate the radiation sickness caused by initial radiation exposure or radioactive fallout.

The good news is that there are a number of drugs and other medical countermeasures that have the potential to counteract the health effects of radiation exposure. The Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute is now testing at least one product that might actually slow or stop the destruction of bone marrow caused by radiation and resulting diminution of the body’s immune system—a leading cause of sickness and death from irradiation. Unfortunately, no such radioprotectants are stockpiled in amounts adequate enough to be effective against large-scale nuclear or radiological attacks.

In 2004, President George W. Bush signed into law the Project Bioshield Act of 2004, authorizing the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct and support research and development of effective countermeasures. The Radioprotectant Procurement Act seeks to accelerate these efforts, as every day that passes without obtaining a needed countermeasure is another day that we remain vulnerable against that threat.

If we can give people a drug that will keep them alive and healthy after being exposed to high levels of radiation, then I think we should do everything we reasonably can to get that drug purchased and distributed as quickly as possible.

The bill I am introducing today calls upon the Federal Government to do just that, and to move as expeditiously as possible in this regard. I look forward to continuing to work with the Administration and my colleagues in this body to make sure that these new and innovative medical countermeasures continue to be responsibly but quickly developed, tested, and stockpiled. The American people deserve nothing less.

Thank you Mr. Speaker and I ask my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring and enacting this important bill.

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF ACTION AGAINST THE CANADIAN SEAL HUNT

HON. JAMES P. MORAN
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I join many of my colleagues and 8.5 million members of the Humane Society of the United States in designating March 15th as the International Day of Action Against the Canadian Seal Hunt. Across the world in 50 cities, citizens will be coming together at Canadian Embassies and Consulates to call for an end to the horrific slaughter of harp and hooded seals.

The Canadian seal hunt season runs from November 15, 2004, to May 15, 2005. They alone, and 975,000 from 2003–2005. They have also helped to pay for this hunt with $20 million in subsidies provided to the sealing industry between 1995 and 2001. While there are quotas in place, they are not enforced by the government. According to the Humane Society of the United States the number of seals killed in 2002 surpassed the quota by more than 37,000 seals, and in 2004, by nearly 16,000. These numbers do not take into account the number of seals who were wounded and perish later.

While this season’s seal hunt opened on November 15, 2004, the bulk of the killings will begin taking place in the next few weeks as new seal pups are born. These new seal pups are called “beaters” by the hunters. While hunters do kill adult seals, an estimated 95 percent of those killed are twelve days to twelve months old. These seals, who are either clubbed or shot to death, are killed primarily for their skins.

In 1991, an independent team of veterinarians found that the seal hunt did not adhere to Canada’s animal welfare regulations. Most disturbing of their findings is that 42 percent of the seals they studied had likely been skinned alive while conscious. This high percentage of live skinnings alone is a disturbing number, but combined with the other details of the seal hunt it is clear that it is time for an end to this practice.

The Canadian fishing industry claims that the seal hunt needs to continue because they eat too many cod and adversely impact the fish population. However, two Canadian government marine scientists have stated clearly that the true cause of cod depletion was over fishing. They also noted that, “the consensus among the international community is that seals are not responsible for the collapse in cod stocks.”

The Canadian Department of Fisheries and Oceans Minister hailed the seal hunt by saying it will harvest “a valuable natural resource.” Harp and hooded seals are not a natural resource, but animals that should not have to endure the suffering inflicted through the government authorized seal hunt.

I join with not only the Humane Society of the United States, but also with Greenpeace, Nova Scotia Humane Society and the World Society for the Protection of Animals, among many other organizations, in calling for the Canadian government to end this barbaric and inhumane practice.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. XAVIER BECERRA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 14, 2005, I was unable to cast my floor vote on rollcall Nos. 66, 67, and 68. The votes I missed include rollcall No. 66 on motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 135, providing for the establishment of a commission in the House of Representatives to assist parliamentarians in emerging democracies; rollcall No. 67 on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 101, urging the European Union to add Hezbollah to the European Union to add Hezbollah to the list of terrorist organizations.
HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF TEXAS STATE REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT PUENTE

HON. HENRY CUÉLLAR
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. CUÉLLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Robert Puente for his distinguished career in public service.

Robert Puente is currently serving his eighth term in the Texas Legislature. He is Chair of the House Natural Resources Committee and serves on the Local Ways and Means Committee. Mr. Puente is especially involved in ensuring that Texas always has an adequate water supply; he is co-chair of the Study Commission for Water on Environmental Flows, and is a member of the Texas Water Advisory Council.

Mr. Puente is a proud product of the Texas higher educational system. He graduated from St. Mary’s University in San Antonio with a Bachelor’s degree in Political Science, and he received his Doctorate in Jurisprudence from the University of Texas Law School in 1982.

Included among Mr. Puente’s many legislative accomplishments are his work on the passage of the Edwards Aquifer Authority legislation and the establishment of the Aquifer Authority’s elected board, and his support for SB1, which implemented a comprehensive water plan for the state.

Representative Puente continues to live in San Antonio with his wife, Carmen Puente, and his three children. In addition to his legislative activities, he finds the time to participate in a number of different community organizations.

Mr. Speaker, Representative Robert Puente’s far-sighted legislative work has helped secure the future of San Antonio and our great state of Texas, and I am proud to have the opportunity to recognize him here.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from votes in the House on Monday, March 14th, due to a previous and unavoidable commitment. Therefore, I was unable to vote on H. Res. 135 (Rollcall No. 66), H. Res. 101 (Rollcall No. 67), and S. 384 (Rollcall No. 68). Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on all three measures considered before the House.

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to an old friend and a wonderful man, Wing Fat. He passed away on Friday, February 25th after a full, rich life, at the age of 79. We should all be so lucky as to have the many close friends and the large and loving family that he did.

Wing Fat was born in Canton, China in 1925. When he was ten years old, along with his father he emigrated to America, settling in Sacramento. As a young adult, he served in the U.S. Air Force and graduated from Sacramento State University. For sixty-six years, Wing Fat worked in “Frank Fat’s,” his legendary father’s restaurant, until his retirement just a few years ago. Before his retirement, the very successful Fat family restaurant business grew to include ten restaurants.

Wing Fat and “Frank Fat’s” were mainstays in the Sacramento political and cultural communities. A well-known location for political deal-making, the restaurant was renowned as much for Wing Fat’s personality as it was for the great food. Wing Fat was a truly warm man, whose affectionate laugh and inviting presence always made those around him feel welcome and comfortable. Although he had much to boast, he was remembered as “one of the humblest men you could ever meet.” His warmth and humility were matched only by his tact; his motto was “You listen, but you never tell.” When he passed away he took decades of private political information with him, gleaned from years of being a trusted host to the Sacramento political community. It is no surprise that Wing Fat became such a successful restaurateur and that his business became a trusted venue for those involved in Sacramento politics.

Mr. Fat generously shared his successes with his friends and his community. In addition to the counsel he offered countless mayors and council members, Mr. Fat founded a number of local cultural and civic organizations that will contribute to the Sacramento area for years to come. In November 2004, Mr. Fat culminated his truly generous philanthropic career with a $1 million dollar donation to the Sacramento Asian Sports Foundation to build a new sports center in Laguna.

Mr. Speaker, Sacramento has lost a civic treasure and a wonderful man. Although it will never be the same without Wing Fat, he leaves behind a wonderful family, friends whose lives he touched, restaurants that continue to provide a warm place for people to gather, and charitable work and donations that will enrich Sacramento for years to come. I am honored to have an opportunity here to say not only “goodbye” to Mr. Fat, but also to say “thank you.”

RECOGNIZING BENNETT COLLEGE ON THE OCCASION OF PRESIDENT JOHNNETTA B. COLE’S APPEARANCE BEFORE THE TIDewater ALUMNAE CHAPTER, MARCH 18-19, 2005

HON. J. RANDY FORBES
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Bennett College and its President Dr. Johnnetta B. Cole, on the occasion of her appearance before the Tidewater Alumnae Chapter for its annual White Breakfast on March 19, 2005.

Bennett College is an historically black college and university founded in 1873 in Greensboro, North Carolina through the inspiration of newly emancipated slaves. Instruction was first held in the basement of St. Matthew’s United Methodist Church until the Freedmen’s Aid and Southern Education Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church assumed responsibility for support of the school in 1874. Through a $10,000 gift from philanthropist Lyman Bennett the school was able to prosper and grow, and the school was renamed in his honor. In 1926, the school was organized as a college for women, a role that it continues to serve today. In 1989, Bennett College had the distinction of having First Lady Barbara Bush as its commencement speaker.

For over 130 years, Bennett College has served the needs of the African American community in North Carolina and its surrounding area. Since 1930, Bennett College has graduated over 5,000 women, many serving in the education profession. My home city of Chesapeake, Virginia has been particularly reliant on the service of Bennett College alumnae as career teachers in the Chesapeake Public School System. I am grateful to Bennett College for this contribution to my congressional district.

In 2002, the esteemed Dr. Johnnetta B. Cole became the 14th president of Bennett College. Her career as a college university professor and administrator spans over three decades. In 1987, she made history again as the first African American woman to serve as president of Spelman College. In 2004, she was made history again as the first African American woman to serve as chair of the board of United Way of America. I am proud to have her visit my district and applaud the Tidewater Alumnae Chapter of Bennett College for bringing her to Virginia on the occasion of their annual White Breakfast.

The Tidewater Alumnae Chapter has distinguished itself in southeastern Virginia through its contribution to the community. Among their members are many present and former teachers of the Chesapeake Public School System. Their professional contribution to my district is significant, and I thank them for their accomplishments on the occasion of their annual White Breakfast.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Bennett College, Dr. Johnnetta B. Cole and the Tidewater Alumnae Chapter of Bennett College for their record of service and contribution to our Nation and to my district. It is truly my honor and privilege to recognize Bennett College, Dr. Cole and the Tidewater
Our local law enforcement officers are now a part of the front line in the battle to keep America safe from terrorist threats and on a daily basis confront the specter of further attacks. We must recognize the crucial role our local law enforcement plays in the War on Terror and provide them the support they need to keep us safe.

The New Jersey State Law Enforcement Officers Association, in recognition of the importance of coordinating law enforcement, numbers Federal, State, County and Municipal Law Enforcement agents in its membership. By working together professionally and with the association, our law enforcement officers can easily share information about criminal threats.

Our thoughts and prayers are with our law enforcement officers and with their families. We owe a great debt to those who work to keep us safe and it is only fitting that Congress recognize the work of these guardians of peace.

LEGISLATION CONDEMNING RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION AND INDIFFERENCE IN INDIA

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce this Resolution to condemn the alleged state-sponsored and complicity of the government authorities in Gujarat, led by Chief Minister Narendra Modi, in the face of the religious persecution of the Gujarati people.

In February of 2002, India experienced its greatest human rights atrocities in a decade; orchestrated violence against Muslims in the state of Gujarat that claimed at least 2,000 lives in a matter of days. Three years after horrific incident, Narendra Modi, the Chief Minister of Gujarat, has been indicted by various Indian and International human rights organizations for his complicity in the violence.

Mr. Modi himself has not been shy about professing his anti-Christian, anti-Muslim, and anti-stable stance. He has repeatedly demeaned the Muslim population of his state by accusing them of treachery; he has actively sought to interfere in the practice of the Christian faith in Gujarat, and he has caused wide-scale displacement of indigenous populations in the State in the face of stiff popular resistance. I find Mr. Modi’s actions to be of the most reprehensible sort.

In an article in the Hindu Times on March 2, 2005, former Indian President K.R. Narayanan stated that “there was a ‘conspiracy’ between the BJP governments at the Centre and the state behind the 2002 Gujarat riots . . . “. Further, a number of Indian human rights organizations, international human rights organizations, and a former Supreme Court Justice all recognize Chief Minister Modi’s complicity in the violence.

He has attacked Muslims and Christians with vile venom, and proceeding both the state's highest court and major international human rights groups, has condemned terrible, violent religious hate crimes, all the while, shielding those said to have committed them. In fact, in a scathing indictment of Mr. Modi, the Supreme Court of India referred to the Chief Minister and his government as “the modern day Nero’s”. Moreover, in a recent unprecedented order, the Supreme Court of India ordered the reopening of all the criminal cases that Mr. Modi had closed, regarding over 2,000 police cases in which the non-Hindu victims filed reports of rapes, killings, and destruction of their property.

Such actions by high ranking government officials of any religion are unacceptable and must not be tolerated. I urge my colleagues to join me in condemning religious intolerance and promoting religious freedom, so that others may see what our great democracy stands for.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF TEXAS REPRESENTATIVE CARLOS URESTI

HON. HENRY CUELLAR
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize State Representative Carlos I. Uresti for a lifetime of distinguished public service. Representative Uresti is a native of San Antonio, and a graduate of McCollum High School. He continued his education by earning a Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science and a Teacher’s Certificate from Saint Mary’s University. After graduation he served four years in the United States Marine Corps, where he was awarded the Naval Achievement Medal. When his service to the Marines was over he returned to San Antonio and enrolled at Saint Mary’s school of Law, where he received his law degree in 1992. He is currently is a partner at the Law Offices of Gonzales Hoblit & Ferguson.

In June 1997 Carlos Uresti was elected to the Texas House of Representatives. He honorably serves as Chairman of the Committee of Human Services, and as a member on the Committee on Elections and Select Committee on Healthcare Expenditures. As a former Marine, he is proud to serve as a member of the Texas House Veterans Coalition and the United States Marine Corps League.

During his time in office, Representative Carlos Uresti fought to prevent child abuse and neglect. He was instrumental in the creation of Bexar County’s Blue Ribbon Task Force, a coalition that brings community members together to fight the cause against child abuse, and is a member of numerous organizations that help educate our youth.

Mr. Speaker, Representative Carlos I. Uresti is a credit to his community and I am honored to have had this opportunity to recognize the many achievements of this great public servant.

THANKING MARY D. WATTS FOR HER SERVICE TO THE HOUSE

HON. ROBERT W. NEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of her retirement in April 2005, we rise to thank...
Ms. Mary D. Watts for 26 years of distinguished service to the United States House of Representatives.

Mary began serving the United States House of Representatives in 1979 as a Technical Support Specialist working at House Information Systems. Milestones during her career at the House include conducting the first evaluations for office fax machines in 1980 and Personal Computers in 1984. She was instrumental in establishing training and support for House staff to make use of the new technologies associated with desktop computers.

As the Division Manager for the Customer Services Group, Mary managed the House computer helpdesk staff, Field Service Technicians and System Integrators providing technical support, and consulting services to every Member, Committee and Leadership office of the House.

Managing the day-to-day operations of the Technical Support Branch, Mary is responsible for information technology solutions and support services for 12,000 personal computers and over 4,000 BlackBerry wireless devices in Washington, DC and more than 950 district offices across this country.

Mary’s contributions while serving the United States House of Representatives have been significant. Her passionate customer service, organizational knowledge and personnel management skills earned her the reputation among her colleagues and customers as a person with a calm demeanor and respect for everyone.

On behalf of the entire House community, we extend congratulations to Mary for her many years of dedication and outstanding contributions to the House of Representatives. We wish Mary many wonderful years in fulfilling her retirement dreams.

SMALL COMMUNITY OPTIONS FOR REGULATORY EQUITY ACT

HON. C.L. “BUTCH” OTTER
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Small Community Options for Regulatory Equity Act. Rural communities across my state and elsewhere are being unfairly burdened by Environmental Protection Agency regulations that have questionable benefit.

While we all want to ensure a clean, safe drinking water supply for our communities, we must remember that fiscal restraints sometimes require tradeoffs and accommodations. Many small communities believe that EPA regulations will do more harm than good by wasting limited public health funds complying with standards that do little to advance the interests of public health.

For those of you who may have forgotten the arsenic debate of just a few years ago, let me refresh your memory. The Safe Drinking Water Act was used in the past to clean up pollution caused by previous business practices. Now the EPA is using the act to clean up Mother Nature herself. Arsenic is a naturally occurring element in the soil and water of many Western states, including Idaho.

Using questionable science, the EPA has committed to ensuring all domestic water systems meet the arbitrary 10 parts-per-billion standard for arsenic—no matter how small those systems are. This is down from the 50 parts-per-billion standard set in 1975.

When the Safe Drinking Water Act was passed, Congress provided flexibility for EPA to determine when economically or technologically feasible to obtain a certain level of reduced contamination. Essentially, the act states that if it’s too expensive, smaller systems simply need to get as close to the standard as they reasonably can. Unfortunately, EPA has decided not to use that flexibility. EPA has determined that paying $1,000 per year per user for the smaller water systems to meet the arsenic standard is affordable.

We know that many of our rural communities have low-income residents who make difficult decisions each month. They must choose which bills to pay and which to put off. These folks aren’t worried about the cable bill; they’re worried about being able to cover their heat, food, power and even prescription drug costs every month. And when faced with those choices, they often pay their water bill first. But the EPA—in its infinite wisdom—has decided to place a higher priority on marginal reductions in arsenic level than such basic needs as food and shelter.

That is unacceptable, which is why I am introducing legislation today to allow small and rural communities, those under 10,000 in population, to choose whether they want EPA to enforce regulations on naturally occurring contaminants. If the eligible community determines it is too costly to comply with the rule, it can request exemption from the regulation, which EPA must grant.

No one is talking about removing all arsenic from the water. We are talking about removing parts per billion, which is removing a very small amount of something that is barely even there. There is no bright line of concentration at the parts-per-billion level beyond which arsenic becomes unsafe. EPA views 9.9 parts-per-billion as safe and 10.1 as unsafe, despite the fact that there is little health difference between such small differences. EPA can’t determine how much arsenic ingestion above the federal standard is harmful. While EPA has said that arsenic concentrations above its standard don’t necessarily present an unreasonable risk to health, concentrations above 10 parts-per-billion do create a significant financial burden for small communities.

This mandate doesn’t consider the unintended consequences and it can’t balance competing local priorities. Local communities are in the best position to determine where their scarce resources need to go. EPA is not in a position to help the communities and suggesting ways they can comply or technology they can use. Rather than being a good partner, EPA is once again just an enforcer, and is waiting until 2006 to impose fines on communities that are not in compliance. Such one-size-fits-all government “solutions” do nothing to make the water cleaner; they only provoke bitterness and stifle cooperation.

One small community in Idaho already has had to lay off its only police officer in order to afford studies and other requirements related to complying with the arsenic regulation. Now we are asking people to choose between real public safety and a theoretical health benefit. Further compounding the problem for this rural community, the EPA recently denied its request for a compliance extension, as provided for in the agency’s own regulation. Community leaders know they can’t comply by 2006 and are trying to do the right thing—but EPA refuses to help them.

We are supposed to have a democratic process here in the United States. In this case, the EPA is overriding the will of local citizens. I believe it’s time to put the power back into the hands of those most impacted to determine what truly is best for them.

I remain concerned that this regulation will have very adverse economic impacts on thousands of rural communities across the nation, without addressing legitimate human health concerns. Since there is no economically feasible way for small communities to meet this standard and the standard may result in no health benefits, I support allowing each eligible rural community to decide whether to comply. I encourage you to join me in cosponsoring the Small Community Options for Regulatory Equity Act.
URGING THE EUROPEAN UNION TO ADD HEZBOLLAH TO THE EU’S LIST OF TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS

SPEECH OF
HON. ALCIE L. HASTINGS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 2005

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 101, a resolution urging the European Union to add Hezbollah to the European Union’s list of terrorist organizations.

Over the past two decades, Hezbollah has been synonymous with terror, suicide bombings and kidnappings. This Iran-backed, Lebanese-based terrorist group serves as an umbrella organization of radical Islamic Shiite groups and entities. Hezbollah, which the U.S. government estimates consists of several thousand militants, has balked at recent U.N. Security Council resolutions requiring it to disarm. This terrorist group is responsible for more than 800 people. Its political rhetoric includes calls for the destruction of the State of Israel. Most recently, both Israeli and Palestinian officials noted an alarming increase in Hezbollah support for terrorism in the Palestinian territories. The organization enjoys funding of $10 million to $20 million monthly from Iran, a country that continues to seek a nuclear weapon.

U.S. intelligence has shown that Hezbollah cells operate in Europe, Africa, South America, and North America. Hezbollah’s reported involvement in the 1983 suicide bombing attack that killed 241 United States Marines in Beirut and other acts of atrocities begs its inclusion to the European Union’s list of terrorist organizations.

Mr. Speaker, a critical part of the war on terror is identifying terrorist threats and the organizations and people who carry out acts of atrocity. I am encouraged by the European Union Parliament’s passing of a resolution urging the European Union leadership and the member governments to list Hezbollah as a terrorist entity. I applaud this step and hope that it leads to the inclusion of Hezbollah on the European Union’s list of terrorist organizations.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF TEXAS STATE REPRESENTATIVE RYAN GUILLEN

HON. HENRY CUELLAR
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Representative Ryan Guillen for his commitment to building a better future for South Texas.

Ryan Guillen is a native of Starr County, with deep roots in the Texas business community. Before entering the public service, he worked as a commodities trader, a rancher, a teacher, and an independent small businessman. This experience helped to shape his priorities: in the legislature, he acted to help teachers, firefighters and policemen with low interest loans, authored a bill to lower taxes for the disabled and elderly, and passed legislation to reform government in his county.

Representative Guillen was elected to the Texas House in November, 2002, and quickly distinguished himself. He was named Freshman Legislator of the Year by the Freshman Democratic Caucus of the Texas House of Representatatives, and passed more bills than any other member of the first-term Democratic class. He is the only Democrat appointed to the Legislative Council Board, a powerful committee which oversees the internal operations of the Texas Legislature.

He has been especially committed to the issue of education. He fought to restore cuts to teacher insurance, authored a bill to increase school district funding in Texas by $1.2 billion dollars, and worked to protect the rights of all Texas children to an equal, high quality education.

Mr. Speaker, Representative Guillen has distinguished himself as a passionate and effective legislator, and he has a bright future ahead of him. I am proud to have the chance to recognize his work.

CONGRATULATING THE ST. JOSEPH HIGH SCHOOL INDIANS ON THEIR INDIANA CLASS 3A GIRLS STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. CHRIS CHOCOLA
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the South Bend St. Joseph’s High School Indians on their Indiana High School Athletic Association Girls Basketball Class 3A state championship.

For the second time in three years, the St. Joe Indians’ girls basketball team found themselves at the Conseco Fieldhouse in Indianapolis, Indiana for the state championship game. As the final game horn sounded on Saturday March 5, 2005, the Indians won by a score of 70–57 defeating Corydon Central High School. Over 9,000 fans witnessed a 24–10 run in the fourth quarter allowing the Indians to bring home St. Joseph County’s first state championship in girls basketball. This victory capped off a 25–1 record for the season.

I would like to acknowledge Head Coach Mike Megyese and Assistant Coaches Lou Megyese, Dan Applegate, Clem Litka and Brad Dunlap on an extraordinary season.

As their many fans know, this team has been led by an outstanding group of seniors who have taken St. Joseph’s to an incredible 83–18 record during their four years.

On behalf of the citizens of Indiana’s Second Congressional District, I would like to congratulate South Bend’s newest champions including seniors Aimee Litka, Corey Jo Keim, Katie St. Clair, Erin Newsom; juniors Melissa Leahlitner, Ashley Miller, Becky Newsom; sophomores Sydney Smallbone, Kristen Dockery; and freshmen DeBorah Wilson and Carly Tompkins.

Student Managers Sarah Pendl, Katie Dunlap, Christie Norkowski, Courtney Szymanski, Gary Paczesny and Erin Rempala also deserve a special congratulation for their contributions to the team.

Mr. Speaker, I know that everyone in St. Joseph County including the Diocese of Fort Wayne—South Bend Superintendent Michelle Hittle, the St. Joseph High School staff including Principal Daniel Swygart, Athletic Director Frank Pomares, Assistant Athletic Director Kristi Beechoy, and all of the St. Joseph Indians’ parents and fans are extremely proud of the accomplishment these young women have achieved.

Again, I would like to congratulate the Indians of St. Joseph High School on winning the county’s first ever girls state basketball championship.

CIVIC PARTICIPATION AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 2005

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce the Civic Participation and Rehabilitation Act of 2005, legislation that will provide persons who have been released from incarceration the right to vote in Federal elections.

With just two states, Maine and Vermont, placing no restrictions on the voting rights of offenders or ex-offenders, the United States may have the most restrictive disenfranchisement policy in the world. Such prohibitions may have the most restrictive disenfranchisement policy in the world. Such prohibitions prevent the right to vote undermine both the voting system and the fundamental rights of ex-offenders. This legislation will serve to clarify and extend voting rights, as well as assist former felons with their reintegration into our democracy.

This past November it was estimated that approximately 2.3 percent of the voting age population, about 5 million people, were prohibited from voting because of state felon disenfranchisement laws. While it is undeniable that this group of disqualified voters was large enough to influence the outcome of close elections, partisan concerns obscure the fact that our varied, state-by-state approaches to the voting system and the fundamental rights of ex-offenders. This legislation will serve to clarify and expand voting rights, as well as assist former felons with their reintegration into our democracy.

In addition to tainting this country’s fundamental principles of the right to vote, denying voting rights to ex-offenders denies them of the opportunity to fully participate and contribute to their society. Disenfranchisement laws isolate the right to vote undermine both and serve as one more obstacle in their attempt to successfully reintegrate into society. Restricting voting rights, a critical tool of self-empowerment, can only lead to higher rates of recidivism, community apathy, and other social ills. We fail not just ex-offenders by denying them the right to vote, but the rest of a society that has struggled throughout its history to be legitimate and inclusive. Just like poll taxes and literacy tests prevented an entire class of
citizens, namely African Americans, from integrating into society after centuries of slavery, felon disenfranchisement laws prevent ex-offenders from reintegrating into society after retribution.

Statistics on felon disenfranchisement indicate that representation is clearly warranted. The Sentencing Project estimates that 4.7 million Americans, or 1 in 43 adults, have currently or permanently lost the right to vote as a result of a felony conviction. 1.4 million or 13 percent of African American men are disenfranchised, a rate seven times the national average. Given current rates of incarceration, 3 in 10 of the next generation of African American men can expect to be disenfranchised at some point in their lifetime. An estimated 676,730 women are currently ineligible to vote as a result of a felony conviction. These statistics have prompted state responses. Most recently, Alabama, Nevada, Wyoming, and Connecticut, have adopted legislation that expands voting rights for ex-felons. We must now act at the Federal level.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF TEXAS STATE REPRESENTATIVE RUTH MCCLENDON

HON. HENRY CUELLAR
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Representative Ruth Jones McClendon for her dedicated service to the people of Texas.

Ruth McClendon has been a tremendous advocate for public safety and public health in the State of Texas. She is the creator of the Neighborhoods on Patrol program, which has won acclaim from President George W. Bush for its effectiveness in reducing crime. She founded the Community Crime Prevention Network to fight neighborhood crime, sponsored legislation to support community policing and increase penalties for church burnings, and hosted a seminar with constituents to help them respond to gang activity.

While in the legislature, Representative McClendon passed two children’s asthma bills, for which she received the American Lung Association of Texas Public Policy Award for 2001. She created a medical academy to prepare medical students to practice in inner city neighborhoods, and worked to pass a bill to dedicate $400 million for a pediatric cancer center in San Antonio.

Her legislative activity has brought her numerous awards, including listins in the World’s Who’s Who of Women and Who’s Who in Texas. She is a graduate of Texas Southern University, and holds an honorary doctorate from Guadalupe College Theological Seminary. She was the first African-American woman elected to the San Antonio City Council, and was named a 2003 Headliner by the San Antonio Chapter of Women in Communications.

Mr. Speaker, Ruth Jones McClendon has been a strong, effective public servant, and a role model and guardian for her community. She deserves our gratitude, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to recognize her for her work.

SOUTH PARK HIGH SCHOOL

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call your attention to the great South Park High School in Buffalo, New York which this year is celebrating 90 years of excellence in educating Western New York’s young people.

Saturday-one year ago this week, on St. Patrick’s Day, the Neighborhood Hall of South Buffalo broke ground at 150 Southside Parkway for the construction of what would become City of Buffalo Public School Number 206.

That same year, on June 1st, the cornerstone was placed at PS 206, also known as South Park High School, marking the institution as the fifth public high school built in the City of Buffalo.

On September 7, 1915, the doors of South Park opened; welcoming 680 students and 32 faculty members.

Home of the Sparks, the South Park faithful proudly display their school spirit through the black and red tradition.

Over the last nine decades the teachers and administrators at South Park have motivated, nurtured and educated thousands of Buffalo’s youth, preparing each for the road ahead and providing all with the tools necessary to pursue a limitless future.

I am proud to call myself an alumnus of South Park and grateful for the wealth of knowledge and values I have obtained through my experiences at South Park.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to commemorate the 90th Anniversary of Buffalo’s South Park High School and wish the institution continued success in instilling pride and excellence in Western New York people for decades to come.

CONGRATULATING BETTY MILLER ON RECEIVING THE JOSEPH F. SAPORITO LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask you and my esteemed colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to Betty Miller, who was recognized at a reception held February 20, 2005, at the Gramercy Ballroom in Pittston. The Sunday Dispatch has chosen Betty Miller, who was recognized at a reception held February 20, 2005, at the Gramercy Ballroom in Pittston. The Sunday Dispatch has chosen Betty Miller as the recipient of the Joseph F. Saporito Lifetime of Service Award.

My good friend Betty Miller is a selfless woman who has devoted her life to making life better for others. Of all her accomplishments— and there are many—Betty is perhaps proudest of the Wyoming Monument Association. She is in her 47th year as president of this organization, and she was preceded by her mother-in-law. Sarah Perkins Miller was president for 35 years of people of the Wyoming Monument Association. The Association has more than 350 members—all women—many of whom are direct descendents of those who died in the Wyoming Massacre of July 3, 1778. Betty’s ancestors, William Reynolds and Elias Roberts, are listed on the Monument among the victims of the Wyoming Massacre.

The first attempts to build a memorial date back to 1809. In the spring of 1841, the women of Luzerne County came together and raised the money for the monument. In 1860, the State of Pennsylvania gave the title to the land to the Wyoming Monument Association.

I was pleased to work with Betty in getting the Wyoming Monument rightfully listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Betty is proud of the Monument and proud of the role women have played in its history.

Betty has been actively involved with the Greater Pittston Salvation Army Advisory Board for 22 years and served as chair of the board on two occasions. During the latest Red Kettle Campaign, Betty—at the age of 88—rang a bell for the Salvation Army for 6 days in a row, from 9 in the morning to 5 in the evening.

In 1976, she was appointed to the Bicentennial Commission and participated in planning the national celebration of its 200th anniversary. She received a special commendation from the governor for her role in the Bicentennial.

Betty volunteers at the Veterans’ Administration Hospital. Betty was presented with the Four Chaplains Legion of Honor Membership Award by the Chapel of the Four Chaplains in Philadelphia and later received the Humanitarian Award for “distinguished service to fellow man.”

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating this fine lady who has given so much of herself. She is most deserving of accolades from The Sunday Dispatch.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE AND WORK OF SERBIAN PRIME MINISTER ZORAN DJINDJIC

HON. DAN BURTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 2003, Serbia’s Prime Minister Zoran Djindjic was brutally assassinated in broad daylight on the streets of Belgrade, Serbia.

As Serbia’s first democratically-elected, non-communist Prime Minister following the fall of Slobodan Milosevic, Zoran Djindjic brought to his office and the people of Serbia more than democracy and freedom—he brought with him the hopes and dreams of the Serbian people. Under the oppressive rule of tyrannical dictators and autocrats, the Serbian people were emotionally and physically battered and scarred by years of ethnic civil-war and bombings. Prime Minister Djindjic promised them a better future filled with peace and prosperity.

...
Along with other democratic allies, and anti-war protesters, Zoran Djindjic effectively protested and toppled the corrupt regime of Slobodan Milosevic through a steadfast, determined, yet peaceful process.

Along with his fellow reformers, Mr. Djindjic created the Democratic Party, and led it to a series of successful electoral victories, ultimately culminating in Mr. Djindjic’s ascension to the post of Prime Minister of Serbia on January 25, 2001.

During his 2 years in office, Prime Minister Djindjic worked tirelessly to shed the image of a “backward” Serbia. Under his effective leadership, Prime Minister Djindjic systematically realigned Serbia with the Western ideals of democracy, reform and capitalism.

Through a heroic and selfless act of courage, Prime Minister Djindjic arrested and extradited the man he helped remove from power, and sent Slobodan Milosevic, and his fellow fugitive war criminals to the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) where they were indicted and tried.

Prime Minister Djindjic went to great lengths to bring foreign investment and capital back into Serbia’s economy by embracing free market concepts, thus laying the groundwork for Serbia’s long-term fiscal security and prosperity.

In addition, Prime Minister Djindjic advanced Serbia’s relationship with the Trans-Atlantic community. By centering Serbia’s foreign policy initiatives, Prime Minister Djindjic has positioned Serbia to become a working and peaceful member of the European Union (EU) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

Mr. Djindjic worked relentlessly to improve the lives of everyday Serbs through economic development, structural and political reform, and an open, and peaceful foreign policy.

Unfortunately for the people of Serbia, Mr. Djindjic’s work was cut short by an assassin’s bullet outside his office on March 12, 2003.

So, on this day, let the House of Representatives remember the life and work of Mr. Zoran Djindjic, Prime Minister of Serbia, and let us hope and pray for a better and more prosperous future for the people of Serbia, and the whole Balkan region.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF STATE SENATOR JEFF WENTWORTH

HON. HENRY CUELLAR
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005
Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the many accomplishments of Texas State Senator Jeff Wentworth.

Senator Wentworth has deep roots in Texas. A fourth generation Texan, he graduated from Alamo Heights High School, went to college at Texas A&M, and received his law degree from Texas Tech University School of Law. He has been serving the public in many capacities for most of his adult life: his previous employment includes one year as a university system regent; six years as a county commissioner, three years as a congressional assistant, and three years as an Army counterintelligence officer.

He served five years in the Texas House of Representatives, and was first elected to the Texas Senate in 1992. He is currently the Senate President Pro Tempore, and Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. He chairs the Texas Legislative Tourism Caucus, and remains a practicing lawyer, with the firm of Loeffler Tuggey Pauerstein Rosenthal, LLP.

Senator Wentworth is now in his fifth term, and continues to work tirelessly for the more than 700,000 constituents in his district. Jeff Wentworth is a genuine American success story, and a tremendous advocate for the people of San Antonio and for all the people of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have this opportunity to recognize the many achievements of State Senator Jeff Wentworth.

A TRIBUTE TO ANNE L. BLUMENBERG

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005
Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to Anne L. Blumenberg, founder of the Community Law Center in Baltimore. Anne, who recently retired as the Law Center’s long-time executive director, has been instrumental in developing legal strategies to empower neighborhoods and communities.

Anne is a remarkable woman who has dedicated her life to improving our community. Over the years, she has performed ground-breaking work in the areas of low-income housing acquisition, community-based planning, coalition building and community advocacy. Through her efforts, the Community Law Center has become a leading advocacy organization for community and economic development in distressed neighborhoods.

She has lead the way in fighting predatory real estate practices that have been so destructive to many Baltimore neighborhoods.

A graduate of Catholic University’s Columbus School of Law, Anne founded the Community Law Center in 1983, becoming its executive director in 1986. The Community Law Center’s philosophy has been that access to lawyers could help revitalize neighborhoods. Initially, most of the work focused on public safety. In recent years, that focus has shifted to real estate and economic development. The Center’s successes include: enactment of legislation giving community groups legal standing in drug nuisance cases; and legal action against owners of vacant properties.

I hope my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives will join me in saluting Anne L. Blumenberg for her work in helping neighborhoods and communities maintain some degree of control over their destinies.

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF JENNIFER GRODKY

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005
Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Jennifer Grodky, a dedicated, intelligent and compassionate woman whom I have been very fortunate to have as my Legislative Director for the past four years.

Jennifer joined my office shortly after I was elected to Congress in 2000. Having received excellent training as an intern for former Congressman Julian Dixon of California, Jennifer quickly assumed her role as Legislative Director with great ease and competence. She played an instrumental part in establishing my office protocol and creating a strong legislative staff.

As Legislative Director, Jennifer has coordinated my legislative agenda with much success. She has overseen my introduction of numerous bills, including two which have become law. Her extensive knowledge of the legislative process and a wide array of public policy issues has proved invaluable to my office. Since Jennifer’s first day in the office, she has approached each and every task I have given her with the utmost professionalism and dedication.

Jennifer’s keen understanding of the health care challenges facing my district and the nation has been particularly important to me as a member of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce and Chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus’ Task Force on Health. Jennifer has organized numerous briefings and events to heighten awareness about accessing affordable health care and persisting racial and ethnic health disparities, including spearheading very successful events sponsored by the Congressional Hispanic, Black, and Asian Pacific American Caucuses in Los Angeles, California, and Miami, Florida.

Jennifer played a lead role in developing the Healthcare Equality and Accountability Act, the Democratic Caucus’ comprehensive bill to address racial and ethnic health disparities, and shares my strong concern for the growing HIV/AIDS epidemic. Her passion for improving our nation’s health care system, particularly for the Latino and other minority communities, is one of Jennifer strongest attributes.

As my appropriations staffer for the past four years, Jennifer has helped me to secure millions of dollars in federal assistance for important projects in East Los Angeles, the San Gabriel Valley, including the expansion of the Azusa Health Clinic and the development of computer training classes at Project Amiga.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WALTER B. JONES
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005
Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 10, 2005, I was unavoidably detained and could not cast a vote on the final passage of H.R. 3 —the Transportation Equity Act. Had I been here, I would have voted “yes.”
in South El Monte. These projects have, and will continue to make, an enormous difference in the lives of families living in the 32nd Congressional District of California.

Jennifer’s intelligence, kindness, and professionalism have earned her the trust and respect of her colleagues. She has served as a mentor to all of the staff, teaching them about the legislative process and various public policy issues with patience and understanding, earning the nickname “Mama Grodsky” among my staff.

Jennifer’s departure from my office will be a tremendous loss to my staff and me. While I am sad to see Jennifer leave my office, I am proud of her new career advancement as the Director of Federal Affairs for the University of Southern California. As a Magna Cum Laude graduate and proud alumnus of this renowned university, Jennifer will be an invaluable asset to her new office. The University of Southern California will be very fortunate to have such a talented and bright young woman to lead its Washington, DC, and district offices in El Monte and East Los Angeles in wishing Jennifer the best of luck in all of her future endeavors.

TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT: A LEGACY FOR USERS

SPEECH OF
HON. BRAD SHERMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 2005

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for language in H.R. 3 which would permit states to exempt certain hybrid vehicles from high occupancy vehicle regulations.

The legislation provides that alternative fuel vehicles as well as vehicles that achieve a highway fuel economy rating of 45 miles per gallon or greater may be exempted from HOV requirements. 

I would like to insert into the record a memo prepared at my request by the Congressional Research Service which analyzes the HOV provisions of H.R. 3 with respect to the treatment of hybrid vehicles.

It is important to note that based on my conversations with the authors of this legislation as well as this memo, the language of H.R. 3 would permit states to exempt certain hybrid vehicles from high occupancy vehicle requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important that the States have the flexibility to regulate the hybrid use of HOV lanes while they are in use, in terms of where hybrids will be permitted in HOV lanes and when they may be permitted.

The language in H.R. 3 seems to achieve this purpose.

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE
WASHINGTON, DC
March 9, 2005

HON. BRAD SHERMAN
HYBRID VEHICLES’ ACCESS TO HOV LINES
UNDER H.R. 3

As you requested, this memorandum provides an analysis of the high occupancy vehicle (HOV) provisions in the Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (H.R. 3), as reported in the House, specifically, you asked about the treatment of hybrid vehicles in H.R. 3.

Section 1208 of the bill adds a new Section 168 to Title 23 of the United States Code. Section 168(b)(1) permits—brackets not required—states to exempt ‘low emission and energy efficient vehicles’ from HOV requirements through September 29, 2009. The bill does not specifically address hybrid vehicles: instead, the bill states that alternative fuel vehicles as well as vehicles that achieve a highway fuel economy rating of 45 miles per gallon or greater may be exempted. Eligible vehicles must also meet the new Tier 2 light vehicle emissions standards, and must be certified by the Environmental Protection Agency. It should be noted that a state must actively establish a program to exempt vehicles—the exemption is not automatic.

Further, you asked whether states would have the authority to exempt vehicles from specific HOV lanes at specific times, or whether the state would be required to exempt vehicles from all HOV lanes. The section on vehicle exemptions states that ‘the State agency may allow vehicles certified as low emission and energy-efficient vehicles . . . to use the HOV facility . . .’ In this and several other subsections, the bill refers to an ‘HOV facility’ in the singular. The Federal Highway Administration treats every separate section of highway as a separate ‘HOV facility.’ For example, in Virginia the HOV lanes outside the Capital Beltway in Interstate 66, the lanes inside of the beltway on I-66, and the lanes on I-95/I-395 are all treated as separate facilities. The restrictions on time and minimum occupancy differ for all three facilities. Because of these distinctions, it appears that states could choose to exempt vehicles from one facility (i.e. highway) and not another.

What is less clear is whether states could designate specific lanes (within a facility) and times. The bill requires states to ‘establish procedures for enforcing the restrictions on the use of the facility by such vehicles.’ This would seem to grant the state latitude in determining when and where low emission and energy efficient vehicles could be exempted from the HOV restrictions. However, allowing compliant vehicles exemptions at some times but not others—or in some lanes but not others—would add a level of complexity to the enforcement of HOV restrictions. It therefore seems an open question whether states would choose to exempt compliant vehicles from restrictions on all state HOV facilities, or on specific facilities without specifying which lanes could be used or at what time.

It should be noted that H.R. 3, as introduced, would have required states to charge tolls for all vehicles exempted from the HOV restrictions. The version as reported allows such tolls, but does not require them. It should also be noted that states would be required to limit or discontinue the exemptions, if they were found to decrease traffic flow along the HOV lanes.

Sincerely,

BRAD YAOCUNI

INTRODUCTION OF PROTECTION OF CIVIL LIBERTIES ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, last year, using the 9/11 Commission Report as a guide, we passed the National Intelligence Reform Act. In addition to reorganizing our nation’s intelligence system, it created a Civil Liberties Board. Unfortunately, this newly created Civil Liberties Board is only a shell of what is needed in order to be effective. Therefore we are introducing “The Protection of Civil Liberties Act” to amend the current board. With the exception of making the Board an independent agency, this bill would reinstate the provisions that were taken out in conference. These monsoon provisions give the Board the authority it needs. Specifically the bill:

1. Gives the Board subpoena power. Currently the board needs the permission of the Attorney General to issue a subpoena. Also, the Board lacks access to the private contractors who currently perform many critical intelligence functions.

2. Creates the Board as an independent agency in the executive branch. Currently the board is in the Executive Office of the President.

3. Requires that all 5 members of the Board be confirmed by the Senate. Currently only the Chair and the Vice Chair will be confirmed.

4. Requires that no more than 3 members can be from the same political party. Currently there is no provision that ensures a bipartisan Board.

5. Sets a term for Board members at 6 years. Currently members will serve at the pleasure of the President.

6. Creates the chairman as a full-time member of the Board. This increases the likelihood that the Board will meet regularly.

7. Restores the qualifications of Board members that were originally included in the Senate bill. This would require that members have prior experience with protecting civil liberties, among other things. Currently there are no such requirements.

8. Restores reporting requirements to Congress. One of the major recommendations of the 9/11 Commission was the need for more Congressional Oversight. Restoring the reporting requirement language requiring semiannual reports helps achieve this goal.

9. Requires each executive department or agency with law enforcement or antiterrorism functions should designate a privacy and civil liberties officer. Currently the law only expresses a sense of Congress that a privacy and civil liberties officer be established. This is important legislation and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF EFFECTIVE RADIOPROTECTANT DRUG

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to bring attention to a pressing national
need. The resolution I present here is a recognition of our responsibility to protect the American people from the horrors of radiation exposure as best we can.

In this era of terrorism, the ultimate fear has always been the detonation of either a nuclear or radiological device in an American city by terrorists. A large-scale nuclear device is capable of causing large-scale damage. After a blast occurs the radiation that follows is also an enormous concern.

We cannot counter the effects of a thermonuclear explosion. However, science is developing countermeasures to the medical effects of radiation exposure. These whole-body drugs, known as radioprotectors, represent a great step forward in protecting American citizens from the horrors of terrorism in the nuclear age.

This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that these drugs, if proven safe and effective, should be purchased and stockpiled by the federal government at the earliest possible opportunity under Project Bioshield.

This resolution recognizes the potential of these drugs to defend American citizens against a potential terrorist threat and makes a great step forward in protecting American citizens from the horrors of terrorism in the nuclear age. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution as part of our responsibility to safeguard American lives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LANE EVANS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, on the afternoon of March 10th until the morning of March 15th, I was part of an official congressional delegation to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the Battle of Iwo Jima. The delegation also had official events in Guam and Hawaii. Due to my absence I was not able to make the following votes and would like the record to indicate that I would have voted "aye" on roll call votes number 62. I would have voted "yea" on roll call votes number 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 68.

TRIBUTE TO FLORIDA MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY, AN OUTSTANDING HBCU AND A TRULY GREAT INSTITUTION OF HIGHER LEARNING

HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to pay tribute to Florida Memorial University during campus ceremonies to be held on Friday, March 18, 2005. Founded in 1879 as the Florida Baptist Institute in Live Oak, Florida under the aegis of the Baptist Church and the leadership of the Rev. Matthew Gilbert, Florida Memorial University is one of the oldest academic centers in Florida. It was later transferred to Jacksonville in 1892 as the Florida Baptist Academy. It was on this campus that faculty member J. Rosamond Johnson and his brother James Weldon Johnson co-wrote "Lift Ev’ry Voice and Sing," which is now known as the Negro National Anthem.

In 1968 the College moved to Miami, Florida where it has grown to include a student body of 1,378 students from all over Florida, the Nation and the Caribbean. President Dr. Albert E. Smith has inspired leadership of the institution and its 66-member faculty. Dr. Smith has been very effective in attracting talented professors and students, and in shaping one of Florida’s most beautiful college campuses.

Florida Memorial offers thirty-eight degree programs through its seven academic divisions. It is accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and is recognized by the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (ACSBB) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

Throughout its glorious history, Florida Memorial has graduated thousands of professionals who have made history and are making productive, innovative contributions to this Nation and the world. It is for this reason that this transformation from Florida Memorial College to Florida Memorial University is genuinely deserved, for it manifests in no small measure the excellence of its programs and its significance in our community.

My best wishes to President Smith, his staff, faculty, student body and alumni on this great achievement. It is thrilling to imagine what this great institution will achieve in the next 124 years.

A TRIBUTE TO SAM LAMANTIA JR.

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to Sam Lamantia Jr., a man with a heart of gold who has spent 27 years raising money to help abused children. Sam is a master barber in Baltimore, and in 1978 he almost single-handedly started the Ed Block Courage Awards.

Sam Lamantia conceived of the award as a way to help abused children in Baltimore. Named for Ed Block, the athletic trainer for the Baltimore Colts, the award was first designed to honor one Baltimore Colt player a year. Since then, 17 Ed Block Courage Houses have opened in NFL cities around the Nation, helping abused children and their families.

Sam moved with his family from Italy to Baltimore as a young child. In Baltimore, he grew up playing and loving sports. As an adult, Sam and his boyhood friends from the Eastside Athletic Club began sponsoring sports teams and giving back to local charities. Eventually, they conceived of the Ed Block Courage Award, and Sam talked many of his clients who were members of the Baltimore Colts into helping. Sam’s vision of giving back to the community has now grown to include 28 NFL teams and their players.

I hope my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives will join me in saluting Sam Lamantia Jr., a true hero who has found a way to help bring hope back into the lives of abused children.

RECOGNIZING VERIZON’S HISPANIC SUPPORT ORGANIZATION

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the California Chapter of Verizon’s Hispanic Support Organization for hosting the 7th Annual Hispanic Support Organization National Conference. Since its establishment in 1988, the Hispanic Support Organization, a Verizon employee resource group, has been working to advance the professional needs of Hispanic employees, improve the communities where Hispanics live in, and support Verizon’s initiatives in the Hispanic community.

It is my pleasure to recognize groups like Verizon’s Hispanic Support Organization for their service to the professional development of our Latino community. This year’s theme for the conference is called: "Construyendo Nuestro Futuro y Destino/Building Our Future and Our Destiny." The Hispanic Support Organization has been doing this kind of investment in our community for more than 16 years. With the growth of the Hispanic community in the United States, it is important that organizations keep providing opportunities for the personal and professional development of Hispanics.

Verizon’s Hispanic Support Organization has done an outstanding job with their mentorship program and scholarship program, while at the same time providing financial assistance to organizations that serve the needs of the Hispanic community. The intellectual and social benefit that the Hispanic Support Organization provides to its members fosters an environment of support and encourages the creation of leaders in our community. I wish the Hispanic Support Organization much success at its conference in Los Angeles this week and in the future.

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT FOR H.R. 1292—SPECIALY ADAPTED HOUSING CORRECTION

HON. STEVE BUYER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, Chapter 21 of title 38, United States Code, provides for grants to adapt or acquire suitable housing for certain severely disabled veterans, including veterans who are unable to ambulate without assistance. The maximum grant amount for a severely disabled veteran is $50,000.

Public Law 108–183 extended eligibility for the adaptive housing grant to severely disabled servicemembers who have not yet been processed for discharge from military service, but who will qualify for the benefit upon discharge due to the severity of their disabilities. Prior to Public Law 108–183, qualifying servicemembers were not allowed to apply for or receive the grant until they were actually discharged from military service.

Section 401 of S. 2486, Public Law 108–454, extends eligibility for specially adapted housing grants to veterans with permanent and total service-connected disabilities due to
the loss, or loss of use, of both arms at or above both elbows.

An inadvertent error occurred in the drafting of the Veterans Benefits Improvement Act of 2004, which the Committee discovered too late to be corrected without jeopardizing passage of the same bill both the House and Senate before adjournment. The error resulted in the omission of the change made by Public Law 108–183 for catastrophically disabled servicemen. H.R. 1292 serves to correct that oversight.

Mr. Speaker, this is a necessary correction to ensure the Department of Veterans Affairs continues to assist those severely disabled servicemen who require their homes be adapted to their disability. I urge my colleagues to support it.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

TO AWARD THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE TUSKEGEE AIRMEN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce my recent introduction of legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the Tuskegee Airmen. The Congressional Gold Medal was first awarded over 200 years ago to Americans whose courage and determination in battle exemplified the spirit of our nation.

In keeping with this tradition, I am honored to join with Senator Levin in concurrently introducing this legislation to bestow Congress's highest honor to this deserving group of individuals.

The Tuskegee Airmen overcame segregation and prejudice to become one of the most highly respected fighter groups of World War II. In so doing, they helped to destroy the racist conceptions of their time, and set in motion the eventual desegregation of the Armed Services.

Before 1940, African Americans were barred from flying for the U.S. military. However, the great threat posed by the Nazis, and the demands of Black Americans for full citizenship, including the right to fight for their country as patriots, persuaded the American government to provide an opportunity for African Americans to serve, even though in segregated units.

The Airmen completed 15,500 missions, destroyed 260 enemy aircraft, sank one enemy destroyer, and demolished numerous enemy installations. They also would have the WWII distinction of never losing a bomber under their escort, despite flying in some of the enemies' most heavily defended areas. During their World War II service, the Airmen would earn 150 Distinguished Flying Crosses, 744 Air Medals, 8 Purple Hearts, and 14 Bronze Stars. At the war's end they had not only helped to defeat the Germans, they helped to set in motion the eventual desegregation of the Armed Services a few years later.

The Tuskegee Airmen were patriots in the truest sense of the word. Their belief in themselves, and in the promise of America, gave them the strength to overcome incredible obstacles, and accomplish what was then considered impossible. Their courage inspired a generation, and their determination strengthened a nation.

The Tuskegee Airmen deserve an honor befitting their contribution to our country, so I respectfully urge my fellow colleagues to support this legislation.

IN CELEBRATION OF ARTS ADVOCACY DAY 2005

HON. STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 2005

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Arts Advocacy Day. As Congress considers the budget and appropriation bills for fiscal year 2006, the importance of the arts should be recognized for a number of reasons.

First, the arts contribute significantly to local and economic development. As of January 2005 in the Eleventh Congressional District of Ohio there were 1,212 arts-related businesses that employed 10,717 people. This data, from Dun & Bradstreet, indicates that between 2004 and 2005, arts-related businesses grew at a faster rate than total U.S. business growth. At the same time, as total U.S. jobs shrank by 1.9 percent, the decline in arts-related businesses was 0.8 percent, in other words less than half that rate. Arts-related businesses are clearly good for business and good for the economy. But the arts have greater effects than these.

An examination of SAT scores from the College Board in the period 2002 through 2004 instills evidence of better SAT scores for students that studied Art History, Dance, Drama, Music, Photography/Film, or Studio Art reflected higher Verbal and Math SAT scores than students that didn't study any of these subjects. To further quantify this effect, let me provide an example. Ohio students in music performance reflected a SAT score of 554 in 2004 and a Mean Math score of 552. In contrast, Ohio students not exposed to arts courses demonstrated a 2004 Mean Verbal SAT score of 497 and a Mean Math score of 511. This forty point differential benefit is very easy to understand. Nationally, similar effects were reflected in the test scores of students that studied a variety of arts disciplines: Art History, Dance, Drama, Photography/Film, or Studio Art.

As schools focus on raising test scores, the importance of arts cannot be overstated. But confidence and practices exist in Ohio’s schools. A 2000 survey by the Ohio Alliance For Arts Education reflected that more than 70 percent of those surveyed in Ohio’s public schools believed that music and visual arts are as important as other academic subjects. Yet, in practice over 11 years, public schools demonstrated overall reductions in arts and music education. Fewer private schools (than public schools) required achievement in the arts as a graduation requirement. But a higher percentage of private schools believed that creative writing, music, visual arts and drama are as important as other academic subjects. Here, theory and practice don’t match.

It is clear that the arts enhance student ability. During this time of enhanced accountability and high stakes academic testing, it would make sense to ensure that every child, kindergartner through twelfth grade, is provided an opportunity to participate in the arts. Many school districts are experiencing financial difficulty. To that end, instead of punishing schools for failing test scores, we should provide them with the resources needed to implement quality arts education programs which correlate with increased test scores. Arts education enhances literacy. And we should go further than haphazardly sticking in a few programs here and there. Quality matters. We must be concerned about the quality of subject matter as well as teacher training and development.

The No Child Left Behind Act, NCLB, has recognized the arts as a core academic subject, making arts programs eligible for inclusion in broad funding categories such as teacher training, school reform, and technology. In spite of this designation, NCLB has led to the erosion of arts education. Economically disadvantaged schools don’t have sufficient resources to cover enhanced intensive math and English studies, and quality arts education programs. A 2004 report by the Council for Basic Education found that “the greatest erosion and greatest threat in one curriculum has been historically most limited.” We
must do better. The arts impart discipline, improve literacy, and enhance cultural understanding. If we have determined that students and teachers need to be held accountable, we must also ensure that schools, particularly schools that serve disadvantaged students, have adequate resources to provide strong instruction in math and English, as well as the arts. Complex problems like student achievement require varied solutions and rich curricula.

Finally, as Congress considers the fiscal year 2006 appropriations bills, we should support increases in public funding. Each dollar of funding to the National Endowment for the Arts leverages at least $7 from other sources to support full time jobs. This returns revenue to the Federal Government in income taxes at a rate of nearly eight to one. That’s not a bad investment. Public spending on the humanities through programs such as the National Endowment for the Humanities initiative We The People, advances understanding of American history, culture, and values. Increasingly, we live in an interdependent world in which cultural understanding is a key aspect of cooperative efforts ranging from economic development to security cooperation.

I salute the arts industries and cultural organizations of the Eleventh District of Ohio as well as the individual artists, educators, and advocates. I thank the arts community for effectively conveying its importance on Arts Advocacy Day, and hope that we as a Congress continue to demonstrate a level of support that will enable the arts to thrive.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 17, 2005 may be found in the Daily Digest of today’s RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 4

2 p.m.
Armed Services
Strategic Forces Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine strategic forces and nuclear weapons issues in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2006; to be followed by a closed hearing in SR-232A.
SR-222

APRIL 6

10 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Charles F. Conner, of Indiana, to be Deputy Secretary of Agriculture.
SR-328A

APRIL 14

10 a.m.
Veterans’ Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans Affairs to examine the legislative presentations of the Military Officers Association of America, the National Association of State Director of Veterans Affairs, AMVETS, the American Ex-Prisoners of War, and Vietnam Veterans of America.
345 CHOB

APRIL 21

10 a.m.
Veterans’ Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans Affairs to examine the legislative presentations of the Fleet Reserve Association, the Air Force Sergeants Association, the Retired Enlisted Association, and the Gold Star Wives of America.
345 CHOB

SEPTEMBER 20

10 a.m.
Veterans’ Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the American Legion.
345 CHOB
HIGHLIGHTS


Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2759–S2874

Measures Introduced: Fourteen bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 632–645, S.J. Res. 10–11, and S. Res. 83.  

Measures Reported:

S. 161, to provide for a land exchange in the State of Arizona between the Secretary of Agriculture and Yavapai Ranch Limited Partnership. (S. Rept. No. 109–40)  

Concurrent Budget Resolution: Senate continued consideration of S. Con. Res. 18, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:  

Adopted:

By 96 yeas to 4 nays (Vote No. 54), Ensign Amendment No. 171, to increase veterans medical care by $410,000,000 in fiscal year 2006.  

By 63 yeas to 37 nays (Vote No. 56), Specter/Harkin Amendment No. 173, to increase discretionary health and education funding by $2,000,000,000.  

Rejected:

By 46 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 51), Byrd Amendment No. 158, to provide adequate funding of $1.4 billion in fiscal year 2006 to preserve a national intercity passenger rail system.  

By 49 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 52) Cantwell Amendment No. 168, to strike section 201(a)(4) relative to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.  

By 50 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 53), Feingold Amendment No. 186, to fully reinstate the pay-as-you-go requirement.  

By 47 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 55), Akaka Amendment No. 149, to increase veterans medical care by $2.8 billion in 2006.  

Pending:

Bingaman (for Smith) Amendment No. 204, to create a reserve fund for the establishment of a Bipartisan Medicaid Commission to consider and recommend appropriate reforms to the Medicaid program, and to strike Medicaid cuts to protect states and vulnerable populations.  

Carper Amendment No. 207, to provide for full consideration of tax cuts in the Senate under regular order.  

Snowe Amendment No. 214, to ensure that any savings associated with legislation that provides the Secretary of Health and Human Services with the authority to participate in the negotiation of contracts with manufacturers of covered part D drugs to achieve the best possible prices for such drugs under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, that requires the Secretary to negotiate contracts with manufacturers of such drugs for each fallback prescription drug plan, and that requires the Secretary to participate in the negotiation for a contract for any such drug upon request of a prescription drug plan or an MA-PD plan, is reserved for reducing expenditures under such part.  

Harkin Amendment No. 172, to restore the Perkins Vocational Education program and provide for deficit reduction paid for through the elimination of the phase out of the personal exemption limitation and itemized deduction limitation for high-income taxpayers now scheduled to start in 2006.  

Hutchison Amendment No. 218, to fully fund the level of Border Patrol Agents authorized by the National Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 and as recommended by the 9/11 Commission.  

Landrieu Amendment No. 219, to establish a reserve fund in the event that legislation is passed to...
provide a 50 percent tax credit to employers that continue to pay the salaries of Guard and Reserve employees who have been called to active duty.

Salazar/Conrad Amendment No. 215, to provide additional funding for rural education, rural health access, and rural health outreach programs.

Conrad (for Dorgan) Amendment No. 210, to repeal the tax subsidy for certain domestic companies which move manufacturing operations and American jobs offshore.

Collins (for Lieberman/Collins) Amendment No. 220, to protect the American people from terrorist attacks by restoring $565 million in cuts to vital first-responder programs in the Department of Homeland Security, including the State Homeland Security Grant program, by providing $150 million for port security grants and by providing $140 million for 1,000 new border patrol agents.

Vitter Amendment No. 223, to express the sense of the Senate that Congress should provide dedicated funding for port security enhancements.

Vitter Amendment No. 224, to restore funding for Corps of Engineers environmental programs to fiscal year 2005 levels.

Allen Modified Amendment No. 197, to increase by $1,582,700,000 over fiscal years 2006 through 2010 funding for Transportation (budget function 400) with the amount of the increase intended to be allocated to the Vehicle Systems account of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for subsonic and hypersonic aeronautics research.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the resolution at 9 a.m., on Thursday, March 17, 2005; that certain Senators be recognized to offer amendments; and that at approximately 1:20 p.m., Senate begin a series of votes on certain amendments.

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Ronald Rosenfeld, of Oklahoma, to be a Director of the Federal Housing Finance Board for the remainder of the term expiring February 27, 2009.

Raymond Thomas Wagner, Jr., of Missouri, to be a Member of the Internal Revenue Service Oversight Board for a term expiring September 14, 2009.

Routine lists in the Coast Guard, Foreign Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Messages From the House:

Executive Communications:

Executive Reports of Committees:

Additional Cosponsors:

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Additional Statements:

Amendments Submitted:

Authority for Committees to Meet:

Privilege of the Floor:

Record Votes: Six record votes were taken today. (Total—56)

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9 a.m., and adjourned at 9:48 p.m., until 9 a.m., on Thursday, March 17, 2005. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S2874.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: NAVY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2006 for the Navy, after receiving testimony from Gordon R. England, Secretary of the Navy, Admiral Vern Clark, USN, Chief of Naval Operations, and General Michael W. Hagee, Commandant of Marine Corps, all of the Department of Defense.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2006 for the Department of Health and Human Services, after receiving testimony from Michael O. Leavitt, Secretary of Health and Human Services.

APPROPRIATIONS: ARMY AND AIR FORCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2006 for the Army and Air Force, after receiving testimony from Geoffrey G. Prosch, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Installations and Environment, Major General Geoffrey D. Miller, Assistant Chief of Staff, Installation Management, Major General Walter F. Pudlowski, Special Assistant to the Director, Army National Guard, and Brigadier General Gary M. Profit, Deputy Chief, Army Reserve, all of the Department of the Army;
and Fred W. Kuhn, Acting Assistant Secretary for Installations, Logistics, and Environment, and Major General L. Dean Fox, The Air Force Civil Engineer, Deputy Chief of Staff for Installations and Logistics, both of the Department of the Air Force.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION: ARMY TRANSFORMATION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Airland concluded a hearing to examine Army Transformation and the Future Combat System in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2006, after receiving testimony from Claude M. Bolton, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology; General Richard A. Cody, USA, Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army; Paul L. Francis, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics); General Joseph L. Votel, USA, Director, Joint IED Task Force; Robert Buhrkuhi, Director, Joint Rapid Acquisition Cell, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics); and David R. Graham, Institute for Defense Analyses, Alexandria, Virginia; and Kenneth F. Boehm, National Security Legal and Policy Center, Falls Church, Virginia.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST: NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE POLICY

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine national security space policy and programs in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2006, after receiving testimony from Peter B. Teets, Acting Secretary of the Air Force; General James E. Cartwright, USMC, Commander, United States Strategic Command; General Lance W. Lord, USAF, Commander, United States Air Force Space Command; Lieutenant General Larry J. Dodgen, USA, Commanding General, United States Army Space and Missle Defense Command, and United States Army Forces Strategic Command; and Vice Admiral Joseph A. Sestak, Jr., USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Warfare Requirements and Programs.

IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICES

Committee on Armed Services: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on Improvised Explosive Devices (IED) and the evolving IED threat and the Department of Defense’s approach to addressing this issue from General Richard A. Cody, USA, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army, Brigadier General Joseph L. Votel, USA, Director, Joint IED Task Force, and Robert Buhrkuhi, Director, Joint Rapid Acquisition Cell, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics).

IDENTITY THEFT

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: On March 15, 2005, Committee concluded hearings to examine identity theft, focusing on recent developments involving the security of sensitive consumer information, after receiving testimony from Don McGuffey, ChoicePoint, Inc., Alexandria, Virginia; Evan Hendricks, Privacy Times, Cabin John, Maryland; and Barbara J. Desoer, Bank of America Corporate Center, Charlotte, North Carolina.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee held hearings to examine expiring tax provisions, focusing on the Administration’s proposals to extend expiring tax provisions, receiving testimony from Robert J. Carroll, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Analysis; Hy L. Dubowsky, New York State Department of Labor, Albany; Daniel L. Doctoroff, New York Deputy Mayor for Economic Development and Rebuilding, New York; Donald C. Alexander, Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer, and Feld LLP, Washington, D.C.; David E. Martin, M-CAM, Charlottesville, Virginia; David Hernandez, EDS, Plano, Texas, on behalf of the R&D Credit Coalition; and Dale Giovengo, Giant Eagle Markets, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Hearings recessed subject to the call of the Chair.

ARMS EMBARGO ON CHINA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the lifting of the European Union (EU) arms embargo on China, focusing on United States-EU-China relations, trans-Atlantic differences, the emergence of China as a more powerful global and regional player, Chinese military modernization, and the future security and stability in East Asia, after receiving testimony from Richard F. Grimmett, Specialist in National Defense, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Peter T.R. Brookes, Heritage Foundation, and Bates Gill,
Center for Strategic and International Studies, both of Washington, D.C.

OBSCENITY PROSECUTION AND THE CONSTITUTION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Property Rights concluded a hearing to examine obscenity prosecution and the constitution, focusing on prostitution, child prostitution, and human trafficking, after receiving testimony from Robert A. Destro, Catholic University of America Columbus School of Law, and Patrick A. Trueman, Family Research Council, both of Washington, D.C.; and Frederick Schauer, Harvard University John F. Kennedy School of Government, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Measures Introduced: 27 public bills, H.R. 1329–1355; and 9 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 100–102 and H. Res. 159–161, 164–166, were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors:

Reports Filed: Report were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 162, providing for consideration of H.R. 1334, to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the removal to Federal court of certain State court cases involving the rights of incapacitated persons (H. Rept. 109–20); and

H. Res. 163, waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to the same day consideration of certain resolutions reported by the Committee on Rules (H. Rept. 109–21).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Bradley to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Chaplain The prayer was offered today by Rev. James P. Campbell, Pastor, Christ Life Church in Woodstock, Illinois.

Journal: Agreed to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal by voice vote.

Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 147, electing the following Members to the following Committees: Joint Committee on Printing: Representatives Doolittle, Reynolds, Millender-McDonald, and Brady (PA); and Joint Committee on the Library: Representatives Ehlers, Miller (MI), Millender-McDonald, and Zoe Lofgren (CA).

Emergency Supplemental Wartime Appropriations Act: The House passed H.R. 1268, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, by a yea-and-nay vote of 388 yeas to 43 nays, Roll No. 77. The bill was also considered yesterday, March 15.

Rejected the Hooley motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 200 ayes to 229 noes, Roll No. 76.

Yesterday it was agreed by unanimous consent to limit further amendments offered and the time for debate on such amendments.

Agreed to:

Velázquez amendment (No. 8 printed in the Congressional Record of March 15) that prohibits the use of funds for any contract in contravention of section 15(g)(2) of the Small Business Act;

Markey amendment (debated yesterday, March 15) that reaffirms the U.S. commitment to the U.N. Convention Against Torture (by a recorded vote of 420 ayes to 2 noes and 3 voting “present”, Roll No. 75).

Withdrawn:

Obey amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prohibited the use of funds provided for national intelligence programs until the President submits a proposal on how to inform Congressional committees of clandestine military activities in terrorist-sponsored countries.

Point of Order sustained against:

Filner amendment that sought to guarantee that companies receiving contracts from the bill make every effort to hire veterans.

Pursuant to sec. 2 of the H. Res. 151, the text of H.R. 418, to establish and rapidly implement
regulations for State driver’s license and identification document security standards, to prevent terrorists from abusing the asylum laws of the United States, to unify terrorism-related grounds for inadmissibility and removal, and to ensure expeditious construction of the San Diego border fence, was appended to the engrossment of H.R. 1268; and the title of H.R. 1268 was conformed to reflect the addition of the text of H.R. 418. Conformed so as to be: making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, to establish and rapidly implement regulations for State driver’s license and identification document security standards, to prevent terrorists from abusing the asylum laws of the United States, to unify terrorism-related grounds for inadmissibility and removal, to ensure expeditious construction of the San Diego border fence.

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986: H.R. 1270, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund financing rate, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 431 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 80;

Pages H1526–27, H1545–46

Expressing concern regarding the recent passage of the anti-secession law in the People’s Republic of China: H. Con. Res. 98, expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the recent passage of the anti-secession law by the National People’s Congress of the People’s Republic of China, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 424 yeas to 4 nays, Roll No. 81; and

Pages H1527–29, H1546


Pages H1599–H1604

Suspensions—Proceedings Postponed: The House completed debate on the following measures under suspension of the rules. Further consideration of the measures will resume tomorrow, March 17:

Expressing concern regarding the continued violations of human rights and civil liberties of the Syrian and Lebanese people by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic: H. Con. Res. 18, amended, expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the continuing gross violations of human rights and civil liberties of the Syrian and Lebanese people by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic; and

Pages H1529–32

Expressing concern regarding the occupation of the Republic of Lebanon by the Syrian Arab Republic: H. Con. Res. 32, amended, expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the occupation of the Republic of Lebanon by the Syrian Arab Republic.

Pages H1532–36


Pages H1547–59, H1559–98

Agreed that during further consideration of the bill, the Hensarling amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 109–19) may be considered out of the specified order.

Began consideration of the Hensarling amendment in the nature of a substitute (Republican Study Committee) No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 109–19, that replaces the current 19 functional categories with four functions: Defense, Homeland Security, Non-Defense Discretionary and Mandatory Spending, and Interest; and accepts the Iraq Operations Reserve Fund and creates a new “rainy day” fund for non-military emergencies. Further consideration will resume tomorrow, March 17.

Pages H1587–98

H. Res. 154, the rule providing for consideration of the measure was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 ayes to 196 noes, Roll No. 79, after agreeing to order the previous question by a yea-and-nay vote of 230 yeas to 202 nays, Roll No. 78.

Pages H1536–45

Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 161, electing Representative Matsui to the Committee on Rules.

Pages H1547

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate appears on page H1511.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1518, H1524–25, H1525–26, H1544, H1545, H1545–46, and H1546. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 12 midnight.

Committee Meetings

U.S. AGRICULTURAL TRADE WITH CUBA

Committee on Agriculture: Held a hearing to Review United States Agricultural Trade with Cuba. Testimony was heard from Robert W. Werner, Director, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury; and public witnesses.
AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FDA, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agricultural, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs. Testimony was heard from William T. Hawks, Under Secretary, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, USDA.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Department of Energy—Nuclear Waste Disposal and Environmental Management. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Energy: Theodore J. Garrish, Deputy Director, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management; and Paul Golan, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Environmental Management.

The Subcommittee also held a hearing on the Department of Energy—Fossil Energy. Testimony was heard from Mark Maddox, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Fossil Energy, Department of Energy.

SCIENCE, THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Science, The Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies held a hearing on the DEA. Testimony was heard from Karen P. Tandy, Administrator, DEA, Department of Justice.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BUDGET REQUEST FISCAL YEAR 2006

Committee on Armed Services: Continued hearings on the Fiscal Year 2006 National Defense Authorization budget request. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Air Force: Pete Teets, Acting Secretary; and GEN John P. Jumper, USAF, Chief of Staff.

MILITARY RECRUITING/PERSOELNE NEEDS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing on Recruiting, Retention and Military Personnel Policy, and Benefits and Compensation Overview. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Charles S. Abell, Principal Deputy Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness; LTG F. L. Hagenbeck, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, G–1, Department of the Army; VADM Gerald Hoewing, USN, Chief of Naval Personnel, Department of the Navy; LTG Roger A. Brady, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, Department of the Air Force; LTG H. P. Osman, USMC, Deputy Commandant, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, U.S. Marine Corps.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BUDGET REQUEST FISCAL YEAR 2006

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2006 National Defense Authorization budget request—Future Combat Systems, Modularity, and Force Protection Initiatives. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the GAO: Paul L. Francis, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management; Sharon Pickup, Director, Defense Capabilities and Management; and Janet St. Laurent, Director, Defense Capabilities and Management; and the following officials of the Department of Defense: Claude M. Bolton, Jr., Assistant Secretary, Acquisition, Logistics and Technology, Department of the Army; LTG David F. Melcher, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff, Army G8 (Programming, Materiel Integration, and Management) LTG James J. Lovelace, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff, Army G3 (Operations and Requirements); and LTG James N. Mattis, USMC, Deputy Commandant, Combat Development, U.S. Marine Corps.

SMALL BUSINESS HEALTH FAIRNESS ACT

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Ordered reported H.R. 525, Small Business Health Fairness Act of 2005.

E-RATE PROBLEMS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on Problems with the E-rate Program: GAO Review of FCC Management and Oversight. Testimony was heard from Mark L. Goldstein, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, GAO; and the following officials of the FCC: Jeffrey Carlisle, Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau; and Thomas Bennett, Assistant Inspector General for USF Oversight.

INTERNET COMMUNICATIONS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet held a hearing entitled “How Internet Protocol-Enabled Services Are Changing the Face of Communications: A Look at the Voice Marketplace.” Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Ordered reported the following measures: H.R. 458, Military Personnel

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES; OVERSIGHT PLAN; GSA STREAMLINING

Committee on Government Reform: Ordered reported the following measures: H. Res 142, Supporting the goals and ideals of a “Rotary International Day” and celebrating and honoring Rotary International on the occasion of its centennial anniversary; and H. Res. 148, Supporting the goals and ideals of Financial Literacy Month.

The Committee also approved an Oversight Plan for the 109th Congress.

The Committee also held a hearing entitled “Service Oriented Streamlining: Rethinking the Way GSA Does Business.” Testimony was heard from the following officials of the GSA: Stephen A. Perry, Administrator; and Eugene Waszily, Assistant Inspector General, Auditing; Deidre Lee, Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—ENERGY DEMANDS

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Energy and Resources held an oversight hearing entitled “Energy Demands in the 21st Century: Are Congress and the Executive Branch Meeting the Challenge?” Testimony was heard from Jim Wells, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, GAO; Guy Caruso, Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy; and a public witness.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD TRAVEL REIMBURSEMENT PROCEDURES

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Management, Finance, and Accountability held a hearing entitled “Strengthening Travel Reimbursement Procedures for Army National Guard Soldiers.” Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Patrick T. Shine, Director, Military and Civilian Pay Services, Defense Finance and Accounting Service; Roy Wallace, Director, Plans and Resources, Department of the Army; and John Argodale, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Financial Operations, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller; and Gregory D. Kurtz, Director, Financial Management and Assurance, GAO.

COMMITTEE FUNDING

Committee on House Administration: Met to consider funding requests for the following Committees: Transportation and Infrastructure; Science; Veterans Affairs; Government Reform; House Administration; Homeland Security, Education and the Workforce; Energy and Commerce; Standards of Official Conduct; Ways and Means; Resources; and the Select Committee on Intelligence.

U.S. LIBYAN RELATIONS

Committee on International Relations: Held a hearing on Libya: Progress on the Path Toward Cautious Re-engagement. Testimony was heard from William J. Burns, Acting Under Secretary, Political Affairs, Department of State.

OVERSIGHT—NORTHERN IRELAND HUMAN RIGHTS

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Human Rights and International Operations held an oversight hearing on Northern Ireland Human Rights: Update on the Cory Collusion Inquiry Reports. Testimony was heard from Mitchell Reiss, Special Envoy of the President and The Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, Department of State; and public witnesses.

BANKRUPTCY REFORM; JEFF GANNON INVESTIGATION


The Committee adversely reported H. Res. 136, Directing the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution documents in the possession of those officials relating to the security investigations and background checks relating to granting access to the White House of James D. Guckert (also known as Jeff Gannon).

OVERSIGHT—U.S. ENERGY AND MINERAL NEEDS SECURITY AND POLICY

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES


PROTECTION OF INCAPACITATED PERSONS ACT OF 2005

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a closed rule providing one hour of debate in the House on H.R. 1354, Protection of Incapacitated Persons Act of 2005, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit.

SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule waiving clause 6(a) of rule XIII (requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Rules Committee) against certain resolutions reported from the Rules committee. The rule applies the waiver to any special rule reported on the legislative day of March 17, 2005, providing for consideration of a bill relating to the rights of an incapacitated person or persons.

FUTURE OF AERONAUTICS AT NASA

Committee on Science: Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics held a hearing on the Future of Aeronautics at NASA. Testimony was heard from J. Victor LeBacqz, Associate Administrator, Aeronautics Research Mission Directorate, NASA; and public witnesses.

REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY IMPROVEMENTS ACT

Committee on Small Business: Held a hearing entitled "The RFA at 25: Needed Improvements for Small Business Regulatory Relief." Testimony was heard from Thomas Sullivan, Chief Counsel for Advocacy, SBA; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—MEMBER PROJECTS REQUESTS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held an oversight hearing on Member Project Requests for the Water Resources Development Act of 2005. Testimony was heard from Representatives Kanjorski, Shays, Pallone, Rohrabacher, Castle, Foley, McGovern, Hinojosa, Allen, Wilson of New Mexico, Holt, Miller of Michigan, Carnahan, Westmoreland, Jindal and Stupak.

PRESIDENT’S FISCAL YEAR 2006 BUDGET FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Committee on Ways and Means: Held a hearing on the President's Fiscal Year 2006 Budget for the Department of Labor. Testimony was heard from Elaine Chao, Secretary of Labor.

BUDGET HEARING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to continue hearings on the Budget. Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2005

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine current and future worldwide threats to the national security of the United States; to be followed by a closed hearing in SH—219, 9:30 a.m., SD—106.

Subcommittee on SeaPower, to hold hearings to examine posture of the U.S. Transportation Command in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2006, 3 p.m., SR—232A.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: business meeting to markup The Federal Public Transportation Act of 2005, 11 a.m., SD—538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Oceans, Fisheries and Coast Guard, to hold hearings to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2006 for the Coast Guard Operational Readiness/Mission Balance, 10 a.m., SR—253.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Lester M. Crawford, of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services, 9:30 a.m., SD—430.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 9:30 a.m., SD—226.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the report entitled, "Back from the Battlefield: Are we providing the proper care for America’s Wounded Warriors?", 10 a.m., SR—418.
Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Appropriations, hearing on Appropriations, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, on Under Secretary for Rural Development, 9:30 a.m., 2362A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Defense, on Air Force Posture, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn, and executive, on Air Force Acquisition, 1:30 p.m., H–140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on The Department of Homeland Security, on Citizenship and Immigration Services, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on The Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, on Secretary of Labor, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies, on the Secretary of Labor, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, on Bureau of Indian Affairs, 2 p.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Science, The Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies, on SBA, 10 a.m., and on Federal Prison System, 2 p.m., H–309 Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, hearing on current operations and the political transition in Iraq, 9 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2006 National Defense Authorization budget request—United States Special Operations Command policy and programs, 3 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness and the Subcommittee on Select Education, joint hearing entitled “Tracking International Students in Higher Education: A Progress Report,” 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Setting the Path for Reauthorization: Improving Portfolio Management at the NIH,” 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.


Committee on Government Reform, hearing entitled “Restoring Faith in America’s Pastime: Evaluating Major League Baseball’s Efforts to Eradicate Steroid Use,” 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, oversight hearing on U.S. Counternarcotics Policy in Afghanistan: Time for Leadership, 11 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.


Subcommittee on International Terrorism and Non-proliferation, oversight hearing on the United Nations and the Fight Against Terrorism, 2:30 p.m., 2255 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, oversight hearing on The United Nations Oil-for-Food Program: The Cotecna and Saybolt Inspection Firms, 1:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution, oversight hearing on the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 9 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property, oversight hearing on Holmes Group, the Federal Circuit, and the State of Patent Appeals, 3:30 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, oversight hearing on Responding to Organized Crimes Against Manufacturers and Retailers; followed by mark up of H.R. 32, Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act, 1 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, oversight hearing on a measure to amend the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to restrict off-reservation gaming, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on National Parks, oversight hearing on the Fiscal Year 2006 National Park Service Budget, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.


Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Rural Enterprise, Agriculture and Technology, hearing entitled “The High Price of Natural Gas and its Impact on Small Businesses: Issues and Short Term Solutions,” 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management, oversight hearing on The Administration’s “Strengthening America’s Communities” Initiative and its impact on economic development, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on Managing the Use of Imaging Services, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, on hearing on Global Updates, 9 a.m., and executive, hearing on the Budget, 1:30 p.m., H–405 Capitol.
Next Meeting of the SENATE  
9 a.m., Thursday, March 17

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of S. Con. Res. 18, Concurrent Budget Resolution, certain Senators will offer amendments, and at approximately 1:20 p.m., the Senate will vote on, or in relation to, certain amendments.
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Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
10 a.m., Thursday, March 17

House Chamber

Rolled vote on Hensarling amendment to H. Con. Res. 95, Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2006.  
Rolled votes on Suspensions:  
(1) H. Con. Res. 18, amended, expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the continuing gross violations of human rights and civil liberties of the Syrian and Lebanese people by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic; and  
(2) H. Con. Res. 32, amended, expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the occupation of the Republic of Lebanon by the Syrian Arab Republic.