

Representative Nadler's amendments would read, "exempts a grandparent or adult sibling from the criminal and civil provisions of the bill," and is in fact the language the Committee on the Judiciary used to caption this amendment in past reports on this legislation, the caption in House Report 109-51 was instead, "Mr. Nadler offered an amendment that would have exempted sexual predators from prosecution under the bill if they were grandparents or adult siblings of a minor." (Similar problems occurred in describing amendments offered by Representatives Scott and Jackson-Lee);

Whereas, when Representative Sensenbrenner, the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, was asked about this language and given the opportunity to correct it, both in the Committee on Rules and on the House floor, he instead explained that it was his purpose and intention to include these derogatory and inaccurate captions in House Report 109-51;

Whereas, committee reports are official congressional documents to which American citizens will refer when seeking to interpret the bills they accompany;

Whereas, although the committee markup and reporting process gives Members ample opportunity to debate, characterize, and criticize each other's views, committees have a ministerial, institutional responsibility to accurately report the proceedings of committee activities;

Whereas the vote captions published in House Report 109-51 appear to be purposefully inaccurate and misleading, and therefore belittle the dignity of the House and undermine the integrity of the proceedings of the House; and

Whereas this unprecedented manipulation of a traditionally nonpartisan portion of a committee report constitutes an abuse of power by the majority of the Committee on the Judiciary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) finds that the Committee on the Judiciary purposefully and deliberately mischaracterized the above-mentioned votes in House Report 109-51; and

(2) directs the chairman of such committee to report to the House a supplement to House Report 109-51 that corrects the record by describing the five amendments with non-argumentative, objective captions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 513

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 513.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to return to Washington to vote on April 26, 2005 through April 28, 2005.

Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

- Roll No. 133, "yes";
- Roll No. 134, "yes";
- Roll No. 135, "yes";
- Roll No. 136, "yes";
- Roll No. 137, "yes";
- Roll No. 138, "no";
- Roll No. 139, "no";
- Roll No. 140, "yes";
- Roll No. 141, "yes";
- Roll No. 142, "yes";
- Roll No. 143, "yes";
- Roll No. 144, "no";
- Roll No. 145, "yes";
- Roll No. 146, "no".

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 248, I call up the conference report on 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 Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 248, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see prior proceedings of the House of today.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 9 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, before I begin with the opening, let me just thank our staff. We have to make a lot of decisions around here, and we put together the policy and make the votes, but the staff makes it all come together in the document that we review today, as well as the work of the Committee on the Budget. I thank Jim Bates who is the majority staff director, who has done an excellent job this year, and Tom Kahn on the minority side who has done a great job on behalf of the budget, the Senate staff in putting this together working with Chairman GREGG and the Senate Budget Committee, and our leadership staff that is here that works the floor and helps us put this all together. They do an excellent job. It is a big job putting together a budget.

But if there was ever a time that we needed a plan and we need a budget, this is the time. We have seen what it is like in years past when we do not have budgets, when we are not able to come together. And yes, the House has been able to manage the process. We have been able to keep the line on dis-

cretionary spending, but we need to do more this year. We need a fiscal blueprint. We have enormous and quickly growing sets of challenges, and we do not have infinite resources with which to meet them. We can and will meet those challenges with a fiscal blueprint, with a budget.

But in order to do that, we have to make some tough choices. We cannot say yes to everything. There is going to be a lot of debate today where Members say you did not say yes to this, you did not say yes to that, you did not give enough here, you did not give enough there, or you gave too much over here. That is the whole budget in a nutshell, is that no one is going to be perfectly satisfied with either how much you spend on one side or how much or how little you take from the other side of the ledger. No one will be satisfied, but it needs to be put in writing. It needs to be a fence around our process. We need a plan.

I am extremely pleased that we have brought our plan and our conference report here today. It was not easy to get to this position. I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTER); the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader; the members of my committee; the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), a member of the conference. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), my friend and colleague. He will remind us that he was not a party to this conference in the way that either one of us would have liked, but I would like to thank his partnership and the way we run the committee.

Mr. Speaker, we have work to do, and I believe it can continue in a very positive way today if we pass this resolution.

Last year we were able to reduce the deficit 20 percent. We need to continue that work. We need to continue the strength of this country. We need to continue the growth of our economy. We need to continue the restraint of spending for deficit reduction. These are our highest national priorities, and if these priorities are not met, none of the rest of the priorities will be met.

All of the programs, all of the areas of government, none of them can happen if our economy is not strong, if our Nation is not strong, if our freedom is not protected, and if we do not have a fiscal blueprint to surround us. These are our fiscal priorities as we move forward.

Let me talk about the conference report that we are bringing today. First, the budget fully accommodates the President's request for defense and homeland security. That is our number one job. None of the rest of the discussion matters if we do not protect the country. In addition, it provides for \$50 billion in emergency supplementals looking forward, recognizing that we have a continuing obligation in our global war on terror.

Second, the budget continues our successful economic policies, including

tax relief, spending restraint, and deficit reduction to ensure a strong, sustained economic growth and job creation dynamic. This is why we are doing it, so that people can continue to find the opportunities to earn the money to take care of themselves and their families and their communities first before the IRS and the Federal Government takes a portion of that out here for the national priorities. People have an obligation to manage their affairs first, and we allow that here.

Finally, the budget takes a critical, I think, next step, because we made the first step last year in reducing the unsustainable rate of Federal spending and our deficit. We take the next step this year to reduce that deficit.

Last year we wrote and passed in this House and actually stuck to a budget that for the first time in a long time called for a little restraint in our discretionary spending. When the books were closed at the end of the year, we saw the deficit go down. The deficit went down. In fact, the reduction of the deficit last year alone was 20 percent, still way too high, a deficit still way too high by my count, by the count of my colleagues, by the President, and by the other body. But during a war, during a time of new national priorities such as homeland security, it is not unusual that we made a determination to borrow some money in the short term to shore that up.

□ 1845

But we also have to continue the work that we started last year on reducing that deficit.

This year this budget takes the necessary steps to get our spending back on a sustainable path and to continue to reduce that deficit. On the discretionary side, this budget will actually reduce the overall amount of nonsecurity discretionary spending. The non-defense discretionary spending will actually be reduced, something we have not seen done on this floor or in this government since Ronald Reagan was in town, the last time that we had an actual reduction in the nondefense discretionary.

But more important than that, this budget begins the process of addressing the growth in the automatic spending, what we call mandatory spending, the spending that continues year after year unless we reform the programs that underlie that spending. And this year this is a reform budget. This is a budget that allows us to continue on the path that we need to head. Mandatory spending is growing out of control. We know it, Governors know it, the President knows it, the other body knows it, our committees know it. What we have not had is the mechanism to do something about it.

Let me show how mandatory spending is growing. If we look at this chart, we will see that back in 1995, the automatic spending was almost half of the budget. Now it is over half, about 55

percent of the budget. And if we do nothing, it will eventually take two thirds of the budget by 2015 alone, meaning mandatory spending will crowd out things like national defense, homeland security, education, transportation, the environment, health care. A number of important issues that we need to be focusing on will be enveloped by the mandatory spending side of the ledger without reform. And these programs in many instances are plainly not working.

I think of a senior citizen sitting in a hallway of a nursing home in Iowa and wondering whether or not that senior is getting the best quality care for the huge increases and the unsustainable growth that we find in Medicaid. And I do not see that being the case. Is the quality there? Is the program being delivered in the best possible way? And for that one instance and thousands of others that are out there we need to focus programs on doing a better job for the money that is put forth in order to meet the needs of some of our most vulnerable citizens; children who are poor, people with disabilities, seniors who are either locked in poverty or unable to meet their needs. We have got to handle the mandatory growth in this budget and do so in a way that provides the reform to make sure that the needs of the people that these programs were intended to meet, that those needs are met. And that is the reason that we bring this budget forth.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes and 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, basically, the budget before us is the President's budget sent to us a couple of months ago, subject to a few puts and takes. Unfortunately, neither the President nor the Republicans in the House nor the Republicans in the Senate have done what was done for years in good budget practice, and that is run their numbers out for 10 years. They simply give us a 5-year display of their numbers and that conveniently avoids showing the effect, the enormous effect, on the budget of having the renewal of the tax cuts after the year 2010.

But if Members want to see basically where this budget will take us, they can look in CBO's analysis done in the early part of March required by law of the President's budget because it basically is the same as the President's budget. They do not have to read past Page 2 in this analysis of the President's budget. And when they do, they will see that if we follow the path that the President is proposing, we will add \$5.135 trillion to the national debt to the United States between now and 2015, over the next 10 years.

But that calculation does not include anything for fixing the AMT, which CBO tells us will cost \$642 billion in revenues; and it includes nothing for deployment of our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan after 2005, which CBO calculates at \$384 billion; and it includes

nothing for partial privatization of Social Security even though the President estimates it will cost \$774 billion.

When we add all of those things in and calculate their effect on the budget, here is what happens. I have sat here for the last hour, heard Member after Member on the other side saying we have got a budget that will cut the deficit in half over the next 5 years. Here is what happens: take it from CBO, make these two or three non-controversial adjustments to their number, and see what happens. The deficit never gets below \$362 billion. At the end of the time frame, it is \$621 billion, \$7 trillion of additional debt. That is where we are headed. That is where this train will take us if we adopt this budget resolution today.

Do the Members believe me?

Let me show which side should be regarded as credible. Let us just look back at the recent past. When Bill Clinton came to office, the deficit was \$290 billion. Awaiting him was the biggest deficit in our Nation's peacetime history. We passed the Clinton budget, and every year thereafter the bottom line of the budget got better for 8 straight years until in the year 2000 we had a surplus, 5 years ago, of \$236 billion. Every year since, the bottom line of the budget has gotten worse.

And I have got a much simpler, more emphatic way to describe the effects of it. This chart right here shows us how much we have had to raise the statutory ceiling on the permissible amount of debt that the United States can incur, the debt ceiling, over the first Bush administration. And guess what. In this budget resolution too. Over the first Bush administration, in 4 years there were three increases in the debt ceiling that totaled \$2.234 trillion. It is a matter of record. That is where the budget took us over the last 4 years. And this budget, vote for this budget resolution and buried in it is a provision which will increase the debt ceiling of the United States by another \$781 billion. Members are voting for that if they vote for this resolution tonight, a total over 5 years of \$3.015 trillion increase in the national debt of the United States. Incredible.

But as I said, that is not all. Read chart two, Page 2 in the CBO report, and they will see it goes on and on and on. We stack debt on top of debt.

I have heard people come out here and say we are flush with revenues in the aftermath of these tax cuts, we have had a rejuvenation of revenues. Here is the truth if Members want a very simple back-of-the-envelope form: this is where the Bush administration told us we would be if we passed their tax cuts. We would have, in the year 2004, \$1.118 trillion in individual income taxes. And here is what the actual take was last year: \$811 billion. That \$300 billion shortfall in revenues accounts for three-fourths of the \$412 billion deficit last year.

People may ask, and I think it is fair for all of us to ask, how do we run a

\$427 billion deficit and still have room for additional tax cuts which the Republicans are pushing in this budget resolution, another \$106 billion of tax cuts pushed in this budget resolution? There is one short answer, a simple step: when we do not have the income taxes because we cut these taxes, we go to the Social Security trust fund, and there is a surplus there of \$160 billion. We reach into the surplus not this year but next year and every year for 10 years to come as far as the horizon can see, and this is what happens: every year this budget resolution will result in the consumption of the Social Security surplus. With the problems we have got in Social Security, surely we should have one rule until we finally find the grand solution, that is, do no harm. This bill does harm year after year after year because it raids the Social Security trust fund.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, which has jurisdiction over the Medicaid program.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the budget resolution that we are going to vote on here in about 30 or 45 minutes because we are a body about solutions. If we do not pass the budget, we have no opportunity to solve some of the problems that face our great Nation.

The committee that I chair does have jurisdiction over the Medicaid program and a large portion of the Medicare program, as well as telecommunications and energy. And in the instructions for reconciliation in this budget, we are asked to try to find savings of approximately \$20 billion over the next 5 years.

For those who are not familiar with the arcane process of reconciliation, it is very similar to what happens when a husband and wife have a spat and they get mad and they do not talk to each other for a while. Eventually they reconcile. They come back together. That is what we do here in this body. We do it between the Committee on Appropriations and the authorizing committees, and we also do it between the House and the Senate. We fight all year, but at the end of the year, we are going to have a reconciliation. We are going to come forward, hopefully on a bipartisan basis; and we are going to say we want some solutions to some of these problems.

The Medicaid program is a \$300 billion-a-year program. It is about 60 percent funded by the Federal taxpayers and about 40 percent funded by State taxpayers. Twenty-nine States in the last 3 years have frozen their Medicaid populations. The State of Tennessee, for example, has kicked 323,000 people off their Medicaid rolls because they just did not have the money.

There are a lot of good ideas out there in terms of things we could do to reform Medicaid. We are not talking about trying to do things to kick people off the rolls. We are talking about things like letting people stay at home instead of having to go to a nursing home to get long-term care. We are talking about giving the States the flexibility perhaps to decide how to price some of their pharmaceuticals. We are talking about commonsense things like people that have some assets, getting them to use reverse mortgages on their homes so they can stay and live at home and not have to hide that or sell that home and then go into a nursing home.

So I know it is difficult, but this is a budget about solutions. And I hope that we will pass it so that we can begin the reconciliation process at the appropriate time with the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this budget resolution. On March 17, this House voted 218 to 214 in support of a budget that instructed the Committee on Energy and Commerce to find \$20 billion in savings. Members at that time recognized the importance of reducing the rapid rate of growth in entitlement programs like Medicaid. As the House and Senate reconcile our two budgets, we need to continue to be diligent and stay on the path of fiscal responsibility.

Opponents of this resolution argue that any budget resolution that allows for Medicaid reforms will cause untold suffering for Medicaid beneficiaries. This argument ignores the fundamental truth that these beneficiaries are already suffering. In Tennessee and Missouri, over three hundred thousand beneficiaries are going to lose their health coverage, due to the out-of-control growth in Medicaid costs. Other States are imposing restrictions on benefits, including limits on the total number of prescriptions a beneficiary can receive per month and restricting access to other basic services.

Without Congressional action, these problems are just going to get worse. Mississippi's Medicaid program ran out of money last year, and they were almost unable to pay their providers. Unfortunately, the current Medicaid program traps beneficiaries in a second rate health program, where too often they cannot get access to quality care or manage their chronic conditions.

These problems stem in large part from the explosive growth in Medicaid spending. From 2000 to 2003 alone, Medicaid spending grew at an average rate of 10 percent each year. Neither the States nor the Federal Government can sustain these rates of spending growth. That is why Governor Mark Warner (D-VA) recently warned that "we are on our way to a meltdown" on Medicaid.

By including Medicaid reforms in the budget, we're attempting to save this important program. Our efforts will not cut Medicaid, but only slow its rate of growth. In 1993, Medicaid spending was approximately \$132 billion. By 2003, the program had more than doubled, and it is expected to cost \$5 trillion over the next 10 years. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) projects that Medicaid will "grow more rapidly than the economy over the next several decades and . . . add substantially to the overall budget deficit."

I take Medicaid reform extremely seriously. There are 46 million people out there who de-

pend on the Medicaid program, and I don't want to let them down. That is why I have been working with members of Congress, Secretary Mike Leavitt, and several key Governors to identify solutions to the problems that face Medicaid. Over the next few months, my Committee will hold several additional hearings on different aspects of Medicaid reform. Yesterday, we held our first Medicaid hearing this year on long-term care. These hearings and the additional work we are doing will lead to a reform proposal that can strengthen and improve the Medicaid program. The Energy & Commerce Committee is doing its job. I would urge Members of Congress to do theirs and vote against this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the distinguished chairman of the House Democratic Caucus.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's \$2.6 trillion budget was filed just over 3 hours ago, and we have not even had a chance to review it. But from press reports this budget adds more than \$4 trillion to the deficit in the next 10 years without even including the enormous costs that have been left out of the budget such as funding for continued military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

So let us be clear that when Members come to the floor representing their constituencies, they should understand that a vote for this budget resolution is a vote to increase the debt ceiling of the United States to \$8.6 trillion. This will ensure that our tax dollars do not go to Social Security and Medicare or to investing in our people, but to simply paying interest on this debt that Republicans continue to raise without any concern about future generations.

By not restoring the budget enforcement rules, the rules that say we have to pay for the expenditures of the Nation as we go, they continue to spend wildly, making tax cuts for the wealthy permanent, and driving us and the deficit into deeper debt, a debt that will not educate one child, provide life-saving health care to someone who needs it, or treat and care for those veterans that are returning from war.

This budget only guarantees that the middle class will be further squeezed. It does nothing to help these families provide quality affordable health care for them and their children nor make a college education more affordable nor ensure a secure retirement nor lower the prices of gasoline that have reached an all-time high. These are not the values we share.

Republican priorities are making the wealthy tax cuts permanent regardless of the damage that will be caused not only to the citizens and families of this country but to the Nation's economic well-being.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this conference report. It may be the last opportunity to preserve America's future and the intergenerational responsibility this Republican majority cares nothing about.

□ 1900

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), a conferee and a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and for all his hard work on this budget.

Mr. Speaker, there is no greater priority in this budget than ensuring America's strength and security. As 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 needed to protect and defend our Nation and support the needs of our troops. We have invested nearly \$2 trillion for the critical building, rebuilding and across-the-board updating necessary to provide for the defense and for homeland security, and this year's budget builds on the substantial progress we have already made.

Our national defense base budget continues the multiyear plan to enable the military both to fight the war against terrorism now and to transform our military to counter unconventional threats in the future.

This budget fully accommodates the President's request for the Department of Defense and increases discretionary spending by 4.8 percent. It also proposes a sustained average increase of 3 percent over the next 5 years, not including supplementals, following on the heels of a 35 percent increase between 2001 and 2005.

We have also included in our budget \$50 billion to provide for the ongoing war against terrorism. We provide for an increase of 8.6 percent in homeland security funding. About 55 percent of that will go to the Department of Homeland Security, with other homeland security-related funding going to the Department of Defense with 19 percent, Department of Health And Human Services with 9 percent, the Department of Justice with 6 percent, and the remaining being spread throughout the government.

These funds will work to meet the needs in three key strategic areas of our homeland security, including preventing attacks, reducing vulnerabilities and ensuring preparedness.

An increase in this year's budget, rather large, at the same time follows on the heels of truly massive increases in the past few years. Since 2001, we have increased homeland security spending an average of about 20 percent per year to get us to where we are now. And we have invested more than \$50 billion to create the Department of Homeland Security, reorganized 22 agencies consisting of 180,000 employees and their missions, and invested heavily to protect homeland security against threats such as bioterrorism.

Again, there is no higher priority in this budget, or certainly in the budgets

of the past years, than providing what is needed to protect and defend our Nation and support our troops.

I urge my colleagues to support this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Very frankly, I listened to the Republican comments about this budget, and I cannot decide whether it is George Orwell or Lewis Carroll who is writing their stuff: Up is down; down is up; black is white; huge deficits are really savings. My, my, my.

Mr. Speaker, it is very tempting to come to the House floor today and to focus solely on the numbers; to focus on the fact that in just 4 short years the Republican Party has turned a projected 10-year budget surplus of \$5.6 trillion in surplus into a projected deficit of \$4 trillion; to focus on the fact that this year OMB projects a record budget deficit of \$427 billion, and it will actually be over half a trillion dollars, the third record deficit in a row; to focus on the fact that since 2001, this Republican Party has added more than \$2.2 trillion to the national debt, now \$8.2 trillion, and that Republicans will increase the debt ceiling by another \$780 billion this year in this budget.

It is tempting, Mr. Speaker, to let this important debate revolve around numbers, but I think the American people want the big picture, and here is the unvarnished truth: This budget conference report is the absolute epitome of unfairness and irresponsibility.

At a time of exploding deficits and debt, this conference report calls for another \$70 billion in tax cuts, with nearly 75 percent of those tax breaks going to the wealthiest 3 percent of Americans. At the very same time, it calls for \$10 billion cut to Medicaid. I would presume that the 43 people plus the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) who signed this letter and said "don't cut Medicaid," I would presume all 44 of those Republicans will vote "no" on this budget. We will see.

It also calls for cuts to student loans, food stamps, pension benefits and other national priorities. I suggest to my friend the majority leader, who was concerned rightfully about the vulnerable, those, Mr. Leader, are the vulnerable. They are let down in this budget.

Furthermore, this conference report not only fails to arrest our exploding deficit, it makes it worse, increasing the deficit by some \$168 billion over the next 5 years. And while the Republican Party tries to convince the American people that Social Security faces an imminent crisis, the Republican conference report would spend every last nickel of the Social Security trust fund; every last nickel.

Now, let me refer the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) to comments I am sure that are emblazoned upon his

brain: "The Congress will protect 100 percent of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds. Period. No speculation. No supposition. No projections. Jim Nussle, July 11, 2001."

Mr. Speaker, let me remind my friends that the other side of the aisle on seven different times between 1999 and 2001, House Republicans voted to protect our Social Security surplus. They could do it because of the Clinton surpluses. They could do it because of the Clinton surpluses.

But over the last 4 years, when you controlled this House, the Presidency, and the Senate, you could not do it. You have not done it. You have spent every nickel and decimated the lockbox.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget boldly proclaimed in 2001 again, "We will not touch a nickel of Social Security." He touches every nickel tonight.

What the Nation has seen over the last 4 years is nothing short of full-scale retreat from fiscal responsibility and the imposition of Republican policies that will immorally force our children to pay our bills, because we are not paying for what we propose buying tonight. This conference report is the latest example of that irresponsibility.

I urge my colleagues in all good conscience, vote "no."

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, first I want to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on the Budget and every member of Committee on the Budget for doing a fantastic job under very difficult circumstances. Also I want to say it is a day of small miracles.

First, we hear that the Democrats all of a sudden have become fiscally responsible. I have been here 20 years. I have lived through their fiscal responsibility. On the one hand, they do not like tax relief to grow the economy; on the other hand, they do not like spending cuts. So, how in the world are you going to balance the budget?

Secondly, in eastern Arkansas, ornithologists are confirming the rediscovery of the Ivory-Billed Woodpecker, a species of birds long feared extinct. Meanwhile, here in Washington, the House and Senate have agreed on a resolution that will provide for reforms in Federal entitlement programs, a fiscal strategy whose prospects for survival critics said were not much better than the survival of the Ivory-Billed Woodpecker.

Now that the final details of the budget conference report have been negotiated, we can say for sure that this budget before us today is the best since the historic Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

I mentioned the mandatory spending reforms before, Mr. Speaker, but they merit further explanation. These entitlement programs deserve reform. The Medicaid system is antiquated and the

quality of care is not being brought to the people that need it. It needs to be reformed so that we can get that health care to them. These reforms are necessary in other programs that are at the same time popular but rife with waste. It is time to implement these reforms. These reforms are therefore necessary if we are going to get our arms around the deficit.

The needed belt-tightening this year will help build momentum toward more savings in the future as we slow the overall rate of growth of the Federal Government. That is how we balanced the budget in the 1990s, by holding down spending and growing the economy.

Just this week, we received more evidence of the fruit of our strategy. New home sales last month increased by 12.2 percent over last year, and the Commerce Department reports that the United States gross domestic product grew at 3.1 percent for the first quarter of 2005, marking the 14th consecutive quarter of real growth and the 8th straight above 3 percent.

Meanwhile, the budget agreement holds overall discretionary spending growth to 2 percent, that is including the war spending, and provides for a real cut, a real cut, in nonsecurity discretionary spending. That is what makes them squawk, because we are trying to hold down spending. And at the same time, it provides for continued pro-growth tax policies over the next 5 years.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that this budget meets all of our current needs, makes realistic assumptions about emerging challenges, takes real aim at waste and fraud and will cut the deficit in half in 5 years, all in a time of war.

This is the budget that the American people voted for when they returned a Republican House, a Republican Senate and a Republican White House last November. It is the next step in our long-term plan to reform government at every level to better serve the American people.

For 10 years, this Republican majority has built an historic record of economic and fiscal accomplishments, and the proof is in the pudding: 17 million new jobs, 14 million new homeowners, low inflation, a 24 percent increase in the GDP, the first balanced budget in a generation, smaller welfare rolls and fewer families living in poverty.

So looking at today's budget, Mr. Speaker, some might say that fiscal accountability is back in the Republican Congress, but as the evidence bears out, like that rediscovered woodpecker, it never left.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me time, and also, more importantly, for his very distinguished serv-

ice to our country through his leadership on issues relating to our budget and other matters of concern to working families in America. I thank him for his great leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this misguided budget resolution because it is a missed opportunity. Instead of strengthening Social Security, this budget spends 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, \$160 billion for this year alone, on tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans. Instead of being an engine of growth, this budget and its deficits will put the brake on job creation.

Do not take it from me. Chairman Greenspan said just recently, "The Federal budget deficit is on an unsustainable path in which large deficits result in rising interest rates and ever-growing interest payments that augment deficits in future years. Unless this trend is reversed, at some point these deficits would cause the economy to stagnate, or worse."

A missed opportunity, because instead of being a blueprint of positive initiatives for the future, this budget is an assault on our values. The budget calls for \$10 billion in Medicaid cuts, maybe more, despite the fact that both this House and the other body explicitly rejected such cuts. That is a cut that is deeper than was even originally proposed by the President.

Republicans must explain to the American people, who oppose Medicaid cuts by 4 to 1, why they insist on slashing funds for sick children, seniors in nursing homes and the disabled. Governors across the country, both Democrat and Republican, oppose these cuts, because they know the devastating impact they will have on Americans, more than 1 million of whom will likely lose their health coverage.

The reckless Republican budget does not stop with cuts in Medicaid and Social Security.

□ 1915

Its wrong priorities mean cuts in education, medicare, student loans, and changes in the pension guarantee program which will cause American workers to lose their pensions.

Democrats have a better idea. During the last years of President Clinton's administration, the entire Social Security trust fund surplus was saved, and we were on a budget path to continue saving that money. We were on a path of \$5.6 trillion in surplus. America would have been debt-free by 2008. Think of it: our country would have been debt-free by 2008. No more spending a big chunk of our budget on debt service interest payments which soon will be bigger than all of our domestic discretionary spending. But the Republicans have turned that \$5.6 trillion surplus into a \$4 trillion deficit; a \$10 trillion, I repeat, a \$10 trillion failure of leadership on the part of the Republicans.

This budget we are passing today will pass mountains of debt on to our chil-

dren and grandchildren, jeopardizing economic security by increasing our debt to China and Japan and other foreign investors. The Republican budget does not do justice, it does great harm, to our country. Instead of being a statement of our values, the Republican budget is an assault on our values.

I urge my colleagues to return to fiscal discipline, to honor our values, and to oppose this disgraceful Republican budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time. I also want to congratulate him on the great work he has done on this budget. The budget is always a hard thing for us to do because you can always find something in the budget that is not exactly what you would have wanted there. But, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Iowa and his committee and the conference committee have done a great job of bringing a budget that really reflects the values of our country.

We provide the resources for our men and women in uniform and for homeland security to protect America at this dangerous time. We do the things that grow the economy and create jobs by ensuring that taxes on job creation and on American families are not automatically raised over the next 5 years. We restrain government spending, and we reduce the deficit with the first reduction in nonsecurity discretionary spending since Reagan was President, and the first proposal for mandatory savings in 8 years. This budget sets the framework for the spending and tax policies we pursue this year.

For our friends on the other side who oppose this budget, really, what is the plan that they would have? Do we want fewer funds for the armed services and homeland security? Do we want tax increases on businesses and families, particularly on small businesses and families who have that 10 percent bracket, and other things we have added? Do we want even more government spending that will only increase the deficit?

This is a good budget, I say to my colleagues, for our country. We need to adopt this budget and set these priorities for America: create jobs, control spending, and support our Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage support of this conference report.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 15 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a minute is not a long time, but I want to spend it for thanking the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for building unanimity on this side of the House. I make that observation because, frankly, this is only the second time on a major vote this year that this side of the House will have been

united, and that is in large tribute to the gentleman's good work, but it speaks to something else.

To everyone in this caucus, to everyone in every corner of America who styles himself or herself as progressive, if you want to know if Democrats still stand together, if you want to know if we still have a common ground, I submit that you see it in the debate over this budget. The common ground that we occupy is in defense of 46,000 families in Mississippi who have been cut from the Medicaid rolls; 300,000 families in Tennessee who have been cut from the Medicaid rolls; 13.5 million children in this country who live below the poverty line who cannot stand to see subsistence programs cut further; millions of veterans who cannot stand to see their premiums rise; and it is a common ground for everyone who believes in a more generous, more responsible, more inclusive America.

So I thank the gentleman for building that unanimity, and I hope it stands for the whole country to see. As it is so often said by the leader on the other side, there are profound differences between these two parties. We stand for a fairer country. They stand for a narrower country and a narrower vision, and I hope the people will take note of that.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, we stand for growing the economy; and to speak about that, let me yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), a member of the committee.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, let me just say, over the last 4 years our economy has faced some pretty serious challenges; but, today, the consensus of both the private and public forecasters is that our economy is in a sustained expansion, with solid growth of real GDP and payroll jobs, unemployment rate at its lowest point in 4 years, and inflation remaining relatively in check.

Let me give some highlights of this economic success. Real GDP has increased for 14 consecutive quarters, including the first quarter of 2005 when it grew at 3.1 percent and, last year, the average growth was 4.4 percent, and that is the best it has done in 5 years. As my colleagues know, homeownership has continued to be at an all-time high, 69 percent. Housing construction continues at record paces. New home sales are up again in March, over 12 percent, another record high, and the unemployment rate is down to 5.2 percent. That is lower than the decade average in the 1970s, the 1980s, and the 1990s.

These figures are not just abstractions. They represent something real that is happening in our economy: real growth, real job creation. And this budget that we are going to pass today ensures that we are doing everything that we can do to support the sustained growth in job creation which is so critical to our Nation and its people.

This year's budget is not an easy budget, but the steps it takes to keep

taxes and spending down are critical to a strong economy and a better life for all Americans.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on the floor of the House a couple of days ago, the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) said the Nation's Governors support cuts in Medicaid funding. In fact, the Nation's Governors wrote a letter to all of us as House Members opposing those cuts.

Then 2 days ago, 348 House Members instructed House negotiators to keep Medicaid cuts out of the final budget resolution. The gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE), one of the House negotiators, joined the chorus and actually instructed himself to say no to the Medicaid cuts. Apparently, the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) changed his mind; he flip flopped and ignored our, his, all of our instructions, because he agreed to a budget resolution that includes at least \$10 billion, maybe as much as \$14 billion, in Medicaid cuts, significantly more than the President and a whole lot more than the Senate made a decision about.

Now it is time for the other 347 Members in this body to decide if they too will reverse their positions and flip flop and endorse the Medicaid cuts. After all, Mr. Speaker, no one really likes a flip flopper.

Now, the budget, Mr. Speaker, is a moral document which illustrates our values and demonstrates our priorities. Tonight, this House is about to cut medical services for 50 million of the most vulnerable Americans, at the same time giving multinational corporations and billionaires another \$106 billion in tax cuts. How can any Member of this body go home and tell our constituents, I took health care away from impoverished children and home care away from impoverished seniors, but do not worry, I gave Ken Lay another tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, we should begin this process by voting overwhelmingly to protect Medicaid, as we did 2 days ago.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), a member of the committee.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, as we are all aware, we have spent a great deal these past few years to secure our Nation in the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks. On 9/11, our priorities shifted because they had to, but we in Congress failed to make up for our enormous new fiscal responsibilities by reining in the growth in other parts of the budget. Over the last decade, we have increased our discretionary domestic spending programs almost across the board at double, triple, or even quadruple the rate of inflation. Even without 9/11, these rates were unsustainable.

Look at this chart. Overall discretionary spending growth since 1994, not including emergency spending, a very

steep line. On average, we have increased discretionary spending by just over 6 percent per year for a decade.

Let us look at two areas of specific discretionary spending. Education: in the past 5 years, the Republican Congress has increased education funding by an average of 9.1 percent per year. Over this same period, spending for the Department of Education has increased almost 60 percent. In fact, aside from the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Education has grown faster than any other agency during this period. Despite the rhetoric about irreparable harm to children, the Education Department is well funded.

Veterans: since 1995, when the Republicans took control of the Congress, total spending on veterans has increased from \$38 billion to almost \$68 billion. That is a 77 percent increase, compared with a 40 percent increase over the previous 10-year period. Since 1995, we have increased payments per individual veteran by an average of 103 percent.

The discretionary portion of this budget continues to recognize and fund our nonsecurity domestic priorities, but does so in a way by reducing domestic nonsecurity spending by eight-tenths of a percent. It recognizes the need to get our deficit under control. That is the right thing to do. We have to stop judging success by the amount of dollars going into the program. We have to pass this responsible budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to the gentleman.

This chart clearly shows, Mr. Speaker, where the increases in spending have come. They have been supported by the Bush administration and supported by both sides of the aisle because they have gone to national defense, homeland defense, and response to 9/11. Ninety to 95 percent of the spending increases in the discretionary accounts over and above current services have gone to these programs in these 4 fiscal years. You supported it, the President sought it, and we have done it because we had to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from South Carolina for yielding me this time. I rise in opposition to this economic blueprint which, for 3 years in a row, adds over \$400 billion each year to the Nation's deficit, running a structural, basically putting in place structural deficits that added up to \$2 trillion in over 4 years to our Nation's debt. All the while that we have added \$2 trillion to the Nation's debt, we have taken every penny out of the Social Security surplus; \$700 billion in 4 years. We have not left a single dime in there. Every penny we have taken out of Social Security.

And while we have taken that \$700 billion out of the Social Security surplus and have run up \$2 trillion to the

Nation's economy, to the debt, we have lost 2.7 million manufacturing jobs in 4 years; 43 million Americans are now without health care; and incomes are falling behind, in the last few years, behind inflation.

That is the economic record of this budget; and rather than change directions, rather than launching in a new way to help Americans, what are we doing? The same old same old that will get the same results. The one thing that will always be said about this economic blueprint and this economic strategy is that we will forever be in your debt, and that will be the record of this economic strategy. That is what you will leave us.

So while you produce a \$2.7 trillion budget, you did not even meet the President's request for college assistance and Pell grants for \$5.4 billion.

□ 1930

You cut \$10 billion from health care. And your economic strategy has left people without jobs, without health care, without the ability to pay for higher education, and their incomes are falling.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and a member of the committee.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I support this budget because it represents at least a small step in coming to grips with mandatory spending. As a member of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee, I have seen firsthand that we spend the vast majority of our time fighting over discretionary spending, those 11 appropriations bills which we must pass each year. But that type of spending makes up only one-third of our total spending.

Entitlement spending continues to grow with no restraint. We have allowed mandatory spending to be on autopilot, and now it consumes 55 percent of our total budget. It is time we wake up and take control of this spending.

Today our mandatory spending not only is growing at a rate far beyond what any of us could have imagined, it is also growing at a rate far beyond our means to sustain it.

Left unchecked, over 62 percent of our total budget will be mandatory spending by the year 2015 as this chart explains. This will place an unsustainable burden on our economy and eventually crowd out other priorities like education, transportation, and veterans programs.

This trend can easily be seen in some of our larger mandatory programs. Student loan growth is more than 10 percent a year. During the past decade, Medicare has grown by 88 percent. Medicaid has more than doubled.

These are popular and valuable programs, Mr. Speaker, but these growth rates cannot be sustained. We need to slow the growth rate so that we can save the programs.

Despite what Members have said tonight, this budget does not contain

cuts in mandatory spending. We are enacting commonsense reforms that slow the growth rate and improve care. Mandatory spending will continue to grow every year of this budget.

We cannot put off this program any longer. It is becoming more serious and difficult to control with each passing year. There is nothing more irresponsible than doing nothing.

Our budget makes the tough choice to begin dealing with this problem now. It takes the critical step in slowing the growth of spending by including reconciliation instructions to the authorizing committees to find a specified amount of savings in the mandatory programs under their jurisdiction. In total, these savings would slow the growth of our mandatory spending by about one-tenth of 1 percent over 5 years. That is all. And while that may not sound like much, it is a critical first step.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield a minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in rejection of this budget resolution because it continues to mortgage our children's future. A vote for this budget resolution tonight is a vote to continue the record budget deficits that we have seen over the last 4 years. A vote for this budget tonight is a vote that continuously raises the national debt automatically by a half a trillion dollars in this budget resolution for the fourth year in a row.

A vote for this budget continues the raid on the Social Security trust funds. And a vote for this budget continues our reliance on Japan and China being the largest purchaser of our government deficits today.

It also fails to invest in our students and our work force who need to compete in a 21st century global economy by cutting the education workforce by \$12.7 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we can do better for our children, for our students, for the workers of this country. Reject this budget resolution.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, President Bush sent to Capitol Hill earlier this year a strong conservative budget that represented a good start down the road toward fiscal discipline. And the House Budget Committee, under the skillful leadership of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), began a process not so much of writing a Federal budget, as of truly changing the way we spend the people's money.

Now, I would agree with my colleague who spoke just before me, that we can do better and we will do better. But this budget that we will adopt today is a good start. And most especially, from our perspective, it is important that we pass this budget be-

cause it includes not only new restraints, actual cuts in nondefense spending, actual savings in entitlements, but it gives Members of Congress the power to put our fiscal house in order by bringing with it today the new protection known as "point-of-order protection," that any Member of Congress can now go to the floor for major spending bills and raise a procedural point to enforce the budget that we are adopting today.

This budget is a good start, however modest, down the road toward fiscal discipline. And with the power to enforce it we are changing the way we spend the people's money.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, sadly, this partisan, fiscally irresponsible budget does not reflect the values of the American people. It locks in place massive deficits for as far as the eye can see, thus hurting our Nation's economic growth and harming Social Security.

This budget is neither compassionate nor conservative. And it is certainly not a faith-based initiative. No major religious faith would ask the most from those who have the least, while asking the least from those who have the most. Yet, that is what this budget does.

This budget will deny nursing home care to seniors and health care to children and the disabled. And this budget makes a mockery of the American principle of shared sacrifice during a time of war. How? By cutting veterans benefits by \$13.5 billion over the next 5 years.

Yet, at the same time it says to those making a million dollars a year in dividend income, you can still keep every dime of your \$220,000 a year tax break. Where is the fairness in that?

I guess we can welcome home our Iraqi war veterans with two signs. One says welcome home, and thanks for serving our country. The other says, by the way, we are going to be cutting your veterans health care benefits by \$13.5 billion over the next 5 years. What a welcome home.

This budget does not reflect the decency of American family values. Americans deserve better.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), the distinguished chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, this budget reflects our military values to ensure that health care for our service disabled, special needs and indigent veterans remain the highest priority of our Nation. With an increase of nearly \$1 billion in discretionary spending, this budget will fund care for our veterans, including those now serving from service in the war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, you asked us to examine the system that serves America's veterans. We are doing so. Yet, it is not

timely to carry out the mandatory savings that you originally had asked. There will be no increase in copays and no enrollment fees at this time. We must work with Secretary Nicholson and Senator CRAIG to develop a clear picture and craft a good legislative product to eliminate inefficiencies, waste and fraud in the VA for discretionary savings. And we will produce that product for you.

I am hopeful that the veterans service organizations will take part in this endeavor. After all, it was the VFW Commander in Chief John Furgess who told Congress last month that the VA must "start acting like a business and create a corporate culture of accountability that rewards success and penalizes failure."

With \$3 billion in uncollected debt in the VA, he is right. To ensure sustainable quality health care, we must make the best use of every technology enhancement, every sound management practice, every dollar entrusted to us by the taxpayer, and utilize every good example to find elsewhere in the health care and business sectors.

Mr. Speaker, we have a strong veterans budget from the President, and we have further strengthened that budget, and we have increased it over time.

If you can see this, since 1995, over 77 percent increase. And I am really proud of the work of the Budget Committee.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) to respond to the last speaker.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the last speaker, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. But the gentleman failed to point out this budget cuts veterans benefits by \$13.5 billion over the next 5 years.

Perhaps the Republicans and the Republican leadership in this House think that is a fair deal for veterans. I would be willing to bet that America's veterans would say it is a bad deal. It is an unfair deal for America's veterans.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Where does the gentleman get that number?

Mr. EDWARDS. It is in your budget.

Mr. BUYER. Where does the gentleman find the number?

Mr. EDWARDS. If the leadership had given us more than 3 hours to look at the bill before voting on it, perhaps we all could have seen that fact.

Mr. BUYER. The gentleman from Texas cannot make up numbers.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield a minute to the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report. The budget is a clear demonstration of misplaced priorities.

I believe the budget will cut taxes by some 70 to \$100 billion. Most of those tax cuts will go to the extremely wealthy in our society.

At the same time, the budget will cut Medicaid, which provides health care for the poorest in our society. And just who are the poor people that Medicaid helps: 28 million poor children, 16 million working parents, 6 million elderly, 9 million disabled.

Each of us represents a share of these people in our community. Their faces should be before us as we cast our vote this evening. This budget vote gives us a moral choice. We can keep cutting taxes that help mostly the well-off in our society, or we can ensure that the most vulnerable are provided with adequate health care. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this unfair budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to just point out, because there has been some question, so let us get the facts. The budget calls for veterans increases; fiscal year 2005 will be \$30 billion; fiscal year 2006, \$31.8 billion. It is an increase of almost a billion dollars, or a 3.2 percent increase. That is an increase. So there may be some other facts on the floor, but let us look at the facts in the budget.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) to respond.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the people who wrote this budget may not like it. I know America's veterans will not like it. But the fact is, the truth is that this budget cuts veterans health care benefits compared to today's benefits by \$13.5 billion once you take into account inflation. That is a reality. That is the truth. And that number does not even count the increasing number of veterans that need VA health care, which is 300,000 veterans this year, 300,000 veterans next year, so the real story is even worse than 13.5 billion in cuts.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds. This is veterans medical care before and after 1995, and that is what we are going to increase that beyond. I can understand when you want to put, you know, some kind of magical inflation number that you have just pulled out of the air and then make up a number. That is a different issue.

The budget has an increase for veterans. They deserve it, and that is what we are going to pass.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL).

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee that has jurisdiction over the issue of Medicaid, I would like to talk about that subject for just a minute, the most expensive health care program we have in this country, costing over \$300 billion last year alone.

The question is, where are the Governors on this issue? Sure, every Governor would like to have more Federal dollars. But the truth is that they are telling us they cannot really afford, in a matching program as Medicaid, the money that we are providing in many instances now. That is why a Democratic Governor of Tennessee is having to cut over 323,000 recipients off the Medicaid rolls. That is why the same pattern is being repeated in other States.

What would they rather have more than more money or a normal growth pattern? They want reform. The only way we are going to get reform of the Medicaid system is to pass this budget resolution.

Why does it need reform? Every State is now spending more on their contribution to Medicaid than they are spending on elementary education and on secondary education. It is on a road to disaster. The Comptroller General tells us that. Governors say it is something that is going to melt down and take all of their State budgets unless we have reform.

If you want to go home and explain to your Governor and to your people why you voted against an opportunity to reform the most expensive part of their State budget, then vote against the budget resolution.

If you want to vote for reforms that will include increasing personal responsibility which, when your hospitals tell you that over half of their emergency room visits are for non-emergency reasons, and that the majority of those are Medicaid recipients, simply because there is no personal responsibility built in the program, and you want that to be the status quo, then vote against the budget resolution.

If you want what every Governor is saying, on a Democrat and Republican basis together, if you want reform of this program, vote for the budget resolution.

□ 1945

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 9¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to myself.

Mr. Speaker, the numbers that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) was citing come from a document that we have prepared that compares the conference report with the Congressional Budget Office's current services baseline. And by that comparison, this conference report falls \$13.504 billion below current services over the next 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, in 2002 we passed a bipartisan farm bill that has been successful. In the first 3 years of the bill, we saved 40 percent below what we spent the 3 years of the last farm bill. We saved \$15 billion below what was projected to be in the farm bill. Yet, unbelievably, they are asking us to open this bill up and cut another \$3 billion out of the bill.

I do not think anybody can tell me any other part of the government that saves money during this period of time, and we were promised during that conference that we were not going to change this bill. Farmers made decisions based on the fact that the farm bill was going to be there for 5 years. So this is absolutely the wrong thing for us to do.

The Committee on Appropriations has already capped some of the programs in the farm bill in the last 2 go-arounds. We think this is unfair. This breaks a contract that we have with the American farmers. For those of you who represent farm country, I can tell you most of your farm groups are opposed to making these cuts to the farm program that are being proposed in this budget.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress, I have been struck by the majority party's spending policies. Under their watch, the Nation's debt has grown by \$2.2 trillion over the last 4 years. The annual deficit is averaging more than \$200 billion and this year's budget is no different, spending more than we are bringing in and increasing the Nation's debt. In fact, this budget will allow for \$412 billion in deficit spending, increasing the interest that we are paying on our Nation's debts, interest that already totals more than we are spending on education, the environment and veterans.

I was proud to join my Democratic colleagues in putting forward better ways to refocus our spending and investments on the priorities that matter to everyday lives of Americans: keeping and creating new jobs, lowering the cost of health care, and providing for a safe and secure homeland.

We put forward an alternative budget that would have balanced the Federal Government's checkbook by 2012, something the Republican budget fails to do, while meeting our basic obligations to hardworking Americans. These efforts were, unfortunately, rejected along party lines.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to lead not just with words, but in deeds. This means enacting a spending plan that will meet basic budgetary principles of meeting our obligations, working within our resources, and making smart investments. I urge a "no" vote on this resolution so we can

return to negotiations and return to fiscal discipline.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the resolution.

Two weeks ago, the House passed legislation aimed at promoting and encouraging personal financial responsibility. Yet, we are on the cusp of enacting a fiscal year 2006 budget that is fiscally-unsound.

It is a budget that prioritizes tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans and largest corporations at the expense of creating opportunities for hard-working Americans and helping people meet their responsibilities. It is a budget that puts political expediency over honest budgeting by failing to acknowledge future increases in the deficit and neglecting to live within available revenues. It is a budget that will allow the government to increase spending and implement new tax cuts without finding a way to pay for the associated costs.

Mr. Speaker, I supported the bankruptcy bill because I believe people who have the means available have an obligation to meet their financial obligations. However, just as we are asking individual Americans to take responsibility for their spending decisions, so must the Federal Government.

Since coming to Congress, I've been struck by the majority party's spending policies. Under their watch, the nation's debt has grown by \$2.2 trillion over the last four years, with annual deficits averaging more than \$200 billion. And this year's budget is no different; spending more that we are bringing in and increasing the Nation's debt. In fact, this budget will allow for \$412 billion in deficit spending. Increasing the interest we are paying on our Nation's debt; interest that already totals more than we are spending on education, the environment or our veterans.

My colleagues, our decisions have consequences, and the consequences of this budget will be felt by every American. Our first-responders will go without equipment needed to keep communities, and themselves, safe from harm. Our veterans will be subjected to health care fees or reduced benefits. Our best and brightest will continue to struggle to afford a college degree. And some of our Nation's disabled and sickest citizens will continue to go without needed medical care and services unless our State and local governments pick up the costs.

During committee consideration of the budget resolution, I was proud to join my Democratic colleagues in putting forward better ways to re-focus our spending and investments on the priorities that matter to the everyday lives of Americans—keeping and creating new jobs, lowering the costs of health care and providing for a safe and secure homeland. We put forward an alternative budget, one that would have balanced the Federal Government's checkbook by 2012—something the Republican budget fails to do—while better meeting our obligations to hard-working Americans. These efforts were, unfortunately, rejected along party lines.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to lead not just in words, but in deeds. That means enacting a spending plan that meets basic budgetary principles of meeting one's obligations, working within the resources you have and making smart investments that will ensure the Nation's current and future fiscal well-being.

I urge a "no" vote on this resolution so that we can return to the negotiating table and find

a better way; one that represents a true commitment to sound budgetary principles and fiscal responsibility. One that funds the right priorities, makes the right investments and in so doing builds a Nation that is strengthened rather than weakened by the decisions we make today.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me time and for his leadership.

I rise to oppose this budget conference report and support and remind you of the budget priorities which were identified in the Congressional Black Caucus budget alternative.

At a time when 48 million Americans, 7.5 million of these Americans are African Americans, mind you, they have no health insurance. The health care cuts in this budget will increase the number of the uninsured. At a time now when our inner cities are crumbling, and they are truly crumbling, this budget cuts funding for community and small business development.

At a time when we face the real threat of terrorism, this budget wastes billions of dollars on an unnecessary missile defense system while leaving likely targets like our Nation's ports defenseless.

The Congressional Black Caucus, if you remember, offered a fiscally responsible alternative. It addressed the health care disparities in our Nation. It provided funding for community and for small business development, and it provided for real national security that included economic security.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, this is a big day. Gas is at \$2.50 a gallon. The President's Social Security road show is a shambles. His numbers are falling in the polls. Iraq has more violence. The Japanese are loaning us \$450 billion to cover our loans on our deficit. And the Rubber Stamp Congress is back in shape. They are all here with their stamp to give the President exactly what he needs.

Now, in about 40 minutes he is going to come on TV. This tells you how bad it is. The President is in such terrible shape he has got to go on TV and start his magic act. He has got to try to convince the people that the gasoline is not \$2.50 a gallon or that we are not borrowing \$450 billion from the Japanese.

That is the problem you have got with this budget. And what are you doing? You are rubber-stamping cutting the safety net in shreds. You are going after the poor, the sick, the elderly, anybody who cannot fight back.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH).

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to convey my disappointment with the decision of the conferees to ignore the clear and bipartisan wishes of the vast majority of the Members of this body to restore crucial Medicaid funding to this budget.

Tuesday night I offered a motion that passed overwhelmingly to instruct the conferees to restore cuts to Medicaid and include a \$1.5 million reserve fund for the creation of a bipartisan Medicaid commission.

We know that Governors across the country are opposed to Medicaid cuts because these cuts will pass the burden directly on to States, to providers, and to the millions of Americans whose health care depends on Medicaid.

In a statement released this morning, the National Governors Association made clear its position has not changed. It states: "Medicaid reform must be driven by good policy and not the Federal budget process."

I want to be clear. No one is saying that we do not need to reform Medicaid. No one is saying we should not be trying to find savings or to make Medicaid more efficient. And, yes, let us find proposals to improve the program. But let us not let arbitrary budget cuts drive the reform. Let us not just cut the budget and call it reform. And let us not rashly and substantially decrease funding without adequate time to deliberate meaningful reform measures and without some time to implement those measures.

A majority of this body agrees, a majority of the Senate agrees, a majority of the Governors agree, and a majority of Americans agree. That is a pretty clear mandate. And for the conferees to ignore these clear majorities it is irresponsible.

I urge the 348 Members who voted in favor of the motion on Tuesday to vote against this conference report tonight.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, not that long ago, my colleague came to the House floor wearing a paper bag on his head because he was ashamed that House Members were spending more money than they had in their accounts down here in the House bank.

I would remind my colleague that since the President's budget of May 9, 2001, our Nation has spent \$2.135 trillion that we do not have.

I would also remind my colleagues that buried in this bill, on the very last page of the bill, the second to last paragraph reads: "If the joint resolution is enacted to raise the debt limit to the level contemplated by this conference agreement, the limit will be increased from \$8 trillion 184 billion to \$8 trillion 965 billion." An increase of \$781 billion of new debt.

Now, you have heard a lot of talk about cutting the budget. If we are cutting the budget and cutting the deficit, why does the chairman seek an increase in the debt limit?

I would welcome the chairman to respond to my question because I think it is something that is in the bill and it deserves answering.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons the majority does not allow us or Americans to read this bill before we vote on it is because there is some little nasty surprises in it. One of those little nasty surprises buried on page 30 is a provision that allows through congressional skulduggery getting around the rules to try to drill in the Arctic that could not pass the other Chamber on an up-or-down vote.

On page 30, they essentially try to work around on a midnight deal the right for checks and balances and a filibuster in the other Chamber that could not pass under regular rules in the United States Senate.

Those who believe that we have better options than drilling in the Arctic and destroying a provision set up by Ike Eisenhower and defended by every President since should vote "no" on this budget. No matter what you think of the fiscal issue, vote "no" tonight.

Take out this legislative flea on the back of this bill and preserve the Arctic. Vote "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is not a budget that follows the will of the House. That is the first problem with it.

The will was expressed 2 days ago. Two days ago, 348 Members voted emphatically against any Medicaid cuts. The conferees disdained that instruction and whacked \$10 billion out of Medicaid.

This is a budget that does contain spending cuts, but in this budget the spending cuts do not go to the bottom line and reduce the deficit dollar for dollar. Basically, what they do is offset partially the tax cuts that are also called for. Consequently, this budget is not a budget that will bring the deficit into balance. We have a deficit of \$427 billion this year.

I said earlier, do not take it from me. Take it from CBO. Read their analysis of the President's budget. This is basically the President's budget with some puts and takes. They project that over the next 10 years, if you follow that budget, we will incur \$5.130 trillion.

This budget resolution, if Members vote for it, includes an increase in the statutory debt ceiling of almost \$800 billion. That is the course we are on, stacking debt on top of debt.

Now, one would think with all the problems we have got we would do something about the deficit in this budget, but this budget does not make the deficit better. It adds \$167 billion to the CBO baseline deficit over the next 5 years and worse in the second 5 years. We are just kicking the can down the road, and this budget very conveniently avoids the huge mountains just over the crest of the horizon.

So if you want to vote for a balanced budget, vote down this budget resolution. If you want to vote against accumulating debt and leaving our children with mountains of debt, vote against this budget resolution. Send the budget conferees back to work with something that is respectable and deserving of our vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), a real leader on our side when it comes to Medicaid reform.

□ 2000

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the time.

We have heard references tonight to the financial condition of this country in the summer of 2001 and the fact that we have bigger deficits today. Most of us in this chamber were here on a cool September morning when the world changed. Any other country in the world would still be on its knees, but America is back on its feet, in part because of the leadership of this body, and all of us should be proud of that.

All of my colleagues in this chamber know that I was very concerned about Medicaid. It is the safety net for people in this country who are very vulnerable, and it is very important to the Americans who depend upon it. We have worked together, and I wanted to thank the chairman for allowing a budget that will put us on the path to reform which can drive the budget. Let policy drive the budget and not the other way around.

There are no reductions in the projected growth of Medicaid in fiscal year 2006, and this budget funds a commission, a bipartisan commission, to put us on the path for reform.

Annual increases in Medicaid are 7.1 percent over the next 5 years. But why does all this matter? All of us have stories from the people we have met who have touched our lives.

I was at a rehab hospital not too long ago in New Mexico and a doctor came up to me. He had been treating a patient that morning who was a diabetic, who was eligible for Medicaid. He had had both of his legs amputated, and he said: Mrs. Wilson, this morning I taught my patient how to use a glucometer to monitor his disease. Can you tell me why is it that we have a Federal Medicaid program that will pay \$28,000 to a hospital to cut a guy's

legs off but I need a waiver from the Federal rules to help him learn to monitor his disease? Today I am teaching how to go back home and live on his own, even though he is in a wheelchair.

We deserve Medicaid reform for the people who depend upon it. We deserve a system that is not prejudiced toward institutional care for our parents when we all know that they want to stay in their own homes for as long as they can.

We deserve a Medicaid system that does not encourage States to take foster children and put them into residential treatment centers and define them as mentally ill and that allows States to use that money to recruit and support foster parents, so that teenagers can have families, real forever families, instead of learning the new rules on the wall of their latest institutional placement.

That is why we need Medicaid reform. Our chairman has brought us a budget bill that protects our country, that supports our troops and puts us on the path toward real reform, and I would ask my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman NUSSLE and all the members of the Budget Committee for their tireless work. This budget agreement is a major accomplishment made possible by them.

Our nation is at a pivotal point. We are at war around the globe as our brave armed forces continue to root out unscrupulous terrorists. We have an economy, stymied after the September 11th attacks, now recovering and gaining strength, as long as we continue our pro-growth agenda. And we have decades-old entitlement programs that are overdue for some much-needed improvements and reforms.

House Republicans have demonstrated fiscal discipline and leadership, keeping America on course towards a strong economy. This budget agreement commits the Congress and the federal government to spend less while still addressing our nation's priorities. It ensures a safe and secure future for America's families by reforming and improving important programs like Medicaid, fully supporting our military at home and overseas, and protecting our homeland. It keeps our promise to reduce the deficit by half while providing tax relief for American families.

We should do everything within our power to make certain that the terrorist attacks of 2001 never happen again in this country. This budget keeps that commitment, but it also rightly calls for spending restraint in the rest of the budget. We no longer live in an era of surpluses. Our efforts to fight terrorism have left us with a big deficit. We need to spend less money, and this budget spends less money.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, by tradition, would argue that the solution is to tax families more so that the government has more to spend. I could not disagree more. Higher taxes kill jobs, hurt families and stifle growth. Those who would be hit hardest by the flawed policy of the other side are our small businesses. They make up 99 percent of all businesses in America. They're the mom and pop stores, the family business started out of the garage. They would suffer if this House picked up the tax-and-spend banner of the other side.

My friends, America's future growth depends on its ability to be stable, secure and economically prosperous. The budget agreement on the floor firmly places our nation on that path. Any other proposals move us backwards, towards bigger government, bigger tax burdens and a bigger fiscal mess.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for this conference report.

It not only is no better than the version of the budget resolution previously passed by the House, it is significantly worse in several ways.

In my opinion, it reflects only the priorities of the Republican leadership, not the right priorities for our country.

Over the last five years the federal budget has reversed a decade of progress that saw the budget go from the \$290 billion deficit when President Clinton took office to a surplus of \$236 billion in 2000, which was where things stood when the current President Bush came to office.

Since then, we have gone from projected surpluses to undeniable deficits. The toxic combination of recession, necessary spending for defense and homeland security, and excessive and unbalanced tax cuts have taken us to the largest deficits in our Nation's history—a \$375 billion deficit two years ago, a deficit of \$412 billion last year, and for this year, according to the Bush Administration itself, a deficit of \$427 billion.

That is three record-setting years in a row. And, regrettably, this conference report reflects neither a serious effort to reduce deficits nor an attempt to increase fairness.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, following the path suggested by the Bush Administration and this budget resolution will add \$5.135 trillion to our national debt over the next 10 years.

It is true that the Republican leadership claims this conference report will put us on the path to cut the deficit in half by 2009. But this bit of Enron bookkeeping rests on omitting enormous predictable costs—including the \$200 billion five-year cost of fixing the Alternative Minimum Tax and realistic five-year costs for military activities in Iraq.

And this conference report not only fails to recognize the deficit as a problem, it sets the stage for new tax cuts for selected beneficiaries. In all, these could amount to as much as \$106 billion over the next five years, and the tax-writing committees are instructed to report bills worth \$70 billion in the next few months.

Further, the conference report sets the stage for reducing the ability of States, local governments, and charities to provide essential services to the many thousands of families who are struggling to stay above water in this time of a sluggish recovery from recession. I do not think this is the right way to go.

I also have very serious concerns about other aspects of this conference report.

For one thing, it continues the pattern of spending 100 percent of the Social Security surplus—a total of \$2.6 trillion over the next 10 years. We cannot continue on this reckless and irresponsible fiscal path. That is why I supported an effort to require the Budget Committee to instead bring forward a conference report that would ensure that the Social Security surplus would not be spent for any purpose other than Social Security. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership opposed that effort, and it was not successful.

In addition, the conference report calls for \$34.7 billion in mandatory spending reductions, including \$10 billion in Medicaid cuts and billions in other cuts that could affect pension programs, student loans, and food stamps.

And further, on top of the cuts in social services, the conference report cuts discretionary spending on environmental and natural resource programs to the extent that over the next five years funding for these programs would be cut 21 percent below the level needed to maintain current status.

These punitive cuts threaten a wide range of programs that ensure the health of our communities and protect our natural resources. Among the programs that could be most severely affected are clean water infrastructure investments, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, oceans and coastal protection, and agricultural conservation.

Finally, the budget resolution clearly will pave the way for legislation as a part of the reconciliation process to open the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for oil drilling. I cannot support this.

When the House first debated this budget resolution, I supported an alternative that would have provided more resources for important priorities and would have laid the basis for more responsible tax policy. It was better fiscally and better in terms of the education of our children, the health care of our veterans, the development of our communities, and the quality of our environment.

Unfortunately, that alternative was not adopted—and this conference report not only does not resemble that alternative, in several respects it is even worse than the House-passed resolution. As a result, I must vote against it.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the 2006 budget conference report. I believe that the federal budget is a reflection of values and priorities, and that the spending choices made in the 2006 budget bring into focus where this administration and House of Representatives leadership's priorities lie. Frankly, this budget is a travesty, and it's going to cost the American people dearly, and seriously imperil our nation's economic and national security.

The budget makes tax cuts for the most affluent members of our society a top priority. By contrast, it shortchanges investments in our future and fails to honor past commitments to our veterans, seniors, and those in need.

Mr. Speaker, this budget is surely not what the American people bargained for. Given what we know about our America's financial situation—a national debt approaching \$8 trillion, interest payments of \$280 billion, weakening economy, growing health care needs, a weak dollar, and weakening economy—why would the Republican leadership continue to cut taxes for the wealthy? The House voted two weeks ago to eliminate the estate tax.

The conference report will take \$40 billion from programs for the poor, much of it in from Medicaid, yet it protects \$70 billion in new tax cuts for the wealthy. After the five year budget window, these tax cuts will balloon, costing \$1.5 trillion over the next 10 years. It's sad that we're debating how much to cut from Medicaid, TANF and other programs for the poor, yet few of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are criticizing the additional tax cuts in this budget.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, independent CBO projections show that the proposed budget would add another \$5.135 trillion to the national debt over the next 10 years, a more than 50 percent increase over the current total. If Congress passes the President's Social Security plan, then you can add several trillion more to that figure.

The Administration has cleverly (and dishonestly) hidden both the projected cost of the war in Iraq and the plan to take money out of Social Security from its budget documents. They have to know that the costs, in the long run, will be exceedingly high. Yet they stubbornly continue to cut taxes for high income tier individuals, shifting the burden on the already squeezed middle class and poor. These fiscal policies, I contend, are without precedent in their level of irresponsibility.

In an attempt to hide the full ramification of the budget, documents submitted by the White House and the resolution adopted by the House purposely withheld cost estimates of the war in Iraq and the President's Social Security privatization plan. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), when you combine the cost of the war with that of the plan to privatize Social Security and other unstated expenses such as relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax, you get a deficit that moves from \$427 billion in fiscal 2006 to \$621 billion in 2015.

When President Bush assumed office in 2001 we had a projected budget surplus of \$236 billion. Not only do I oppose these fiscally irresponsible policies that will produce growing deficits and debt, I object to the false claim that non-defense discretionary spending programs are responsible for the budget deficits. While these programs are the principal target of the proposed spending cuts, the total non-defense discretionary budget is at the lowest level in the past 30 years.

I urge a "no" vote on this sham conference report.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal 2006 budget resolution is based on false economies and false promises. This budget provides tax cuts for the rich while adding to our national deficit, cutting billions from critical programs such as Medicare and short-changing national priorities such as community development and housing, education, and environmental protection.

Cutting vital programs does nothing to solve our problems. Congressional leadership and the administration are simply not owning up to their responsibilities to the American public. I will not support any budget framework that pretends that we have more funding than we do while at the same time cutting programs that help our families and communities.

The administration's tax cuts give over \$70 million in benefits to those who need them the least. Yet nothing is being done to address the long-term costs of fixing the Alternative Minimum Tax—a tax that continues to force middle-income families to pay higher taxes. This budget will put our country deeper into debt, mortgaging the future for our children and grandchildren. This is wrong.

This budget resolution also sets the stage for drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, which would be a travesty. Not only is this policy incredibly shortsighted in terms of the real energy needs of this country, it is unconscionable that Congress is making a decision of this magnitude in a budget resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today being very disturbed with the direction that the Republican Party and this administration is taking our great Nation. The reason for my concern is the Budget Conference Report which stands before this body today. Sadly, this body has just now received a copy of the Budget Conference Report. It's truly tragic to think that this piece of legislation actually affects every single American and yet here we are in the 'people's house' and there is no real deliberation on this monumental bill. The Budget Conference Report clearly does not improve upon the severely flawed Republican budget, which barely passed in the House a little more than a month ago. 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 partisanship, but from a statement of the facts. I want to highlight a few areas in this Budget Conference Report 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 Conference Report 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 by \$530 million below 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 Budget Conference Report. I hear so much in this body from the majority party about the greatness of our Armed Forces, and their rights, but again it's 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 Party continues to turn a blind 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 Veteran's 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 vet-

erans 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 trouble telling them that not only will things continue to stay bad but if this Budget Conference Report passes this body things will only continue to get worse. That is not what our returning soldiers from Iraq and Afghanistan 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 make up only two areas where the Budget Conference Report fails Americans. 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 Party finds it necessary to cut so many fundamental programs. The answer is simple, yet disturbing; the majority party 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 Party continues its offensive 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 10-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, the Budget Conference Report before us omits the longer-term costs of either the war in Iraq or fixing the AMT, yet still tries to make claims of reducing the deficit. It is 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 Conference Report 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. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 95, the Republican Budget Conference Report. During House consideration of the budget last month, we had the opportunity to pass the Spratt Substitute, which contained thoughtful policies to balance the budget by 2012 without individual tax rate increases or harmful cuts to security, health care, education, veterans' benefits, and other programs that improve the quality of life for Rhode Island's working families. Unfortunately, these responsible ideas were cast aside in favor of the Republican values we have before us today: tax cuts for the wealthy paid for by slashing programs that Rhode Islanders depend on.

While the Republicans claim that budget cuts are needed to return to fiscal discipline, they forget their own policies caused today's financial problems. Without the tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans enacted since 2001, our nation's fiscal health would be much rosier, and the neediest and most vulnerable Americans would not be forced to sacrifice. Their fiscal year 2006 budget proposal continues to move in the wrong direction, and next year's deficit will likely be the largest in history, with more than \$400 billion added to the national credit card.

Unfortunately, the budget before us today lacks the vision needed to move our country forward. In addition to driving us further into debt, H. Con. Res. 95 also contains vast cuts to programs that benefit the working class. Most troubling is a \$10 billion cut to Medicaid, which will place an enormous burden on Rhode Island. My state has successfully leveraged federal Medicaid dollars and currently offers health care coverage to many vulnerable, low-income pregnant women, parents of young children, and other groups not included in the federal mandate. Without sufficient Medicaid funding, these people would likely join the increasing ranks of the uninsured.

In addition, this budget implements a multitude of other cuts proposed by the President. These cuts include reductions in law enforcement and firefighter funding, the elimination of 48 education programs, and new fees for veterans' health care. Clearly, these reductions are not the priorities of the American people.

The Republican blueprint does not make us safer or healthier, prepare children for the future, or honor veterans. By continuing failed tax policies while cutting effective programs that Rhode Islanders depend on, their proposal is a misguided and unjust starting point. As Democrats show, it is possible to create a realistic blueprint that is fiscally responsible and is built around the needs of the American people. I urge my colleagues to reject the Conference Report on H. Con. Res. 95.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Republican Budget Conference Report.

The Republican budget makes huge cuts to critical programs for the poor and the most vulnerable in our country in order to give away \$106 billion in tax cuts to the wealthiest in our society.

The Republican budget instructs the Energy and Commerce committee to cut \$14.7 billion, of which at least \$10 billion is supposed to be cut from the Medicaid program that serves nearly 50 million Americans. Medicaid provides health care not only to poor moms and kids, but also to the elderly and the disabled.

The Republicans will tell you that they have to cut Medicaid because we are in state of fiscal crisis. And it's true we are in the midst of crisis. But it is a manufactured crisis.

If you add up all the spending that Congress has approved since 2001, you will see that: 48 percent of all the spending has gone to tax cuts, 37 percent has gone to Defense and Homeland Security, and only 15% has gone to Domestic programs.

It is clear when you look at these numbers that the deficit did not balloon upward due to social programs, or even the war in Iraq. The deficit came from the Republican's irresponsible tax giveaways to help their fat cat friends get fatter and fatter and fatter.

This Republican budget asks the mothers and grandmothers in the nursing home, the

disabled children, the poor, those with Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease, to sacrifice their health and dignity in order to finance the tax cuts of the wealthiest 1 percent in this country.

It asks those who have nothing to sacrifice everything, and those who have everything to sacrifice nothing.

This budget is about giving \$106 billion away in tax cuts, cutting up to \$14.7 billion from the Medicaid program.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this shortsighted, fiscally irresponsible, and immoral budget.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Republican Budget Conference Report.

One of the most egregious offenses committed in the Republican Budget is the proposal to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas drilling.

Although a budget should have nothing to do with controversial environmental policy decisions, this budget would open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge through backdoor budget chicanery. In poll after poll, the American people have expressed their disapproval of using the budget to decide such a contentious issue. The Republican Majority knows that it cannot pass this measure as standalone legislation. By shoe-horning the Arctic Refuge into the budget, they are making an end-run around the legislative process, knowing that it cannot pass in the Senate any other way.

While the budget claims that oil leases from the Arctic Refuge will generate \$2.4 billion in revenue, this appears to be a case of gross deception and misinformation.

When the President's Office of Management and Budget was asked why it is assuming that the oil leases in the Refuge will sell for amounts that are hundreds of times greater than the average North Slope lease over the last 15 years, OMB passed the buck—they said, "Go ask Interior; we don't know."

Ladies and gentleman, we deserve more than such dodges and lame excuses. This Republican budget will destroy forever the wilderness quality of one of God's most magnificent ecological systems on the basis of illusory economic projections.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this shortsighted, fiscally irresponsible, and immoral budget.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. I rise in opposition to the resolution. It is punitive to low-income families. The conference agreement proposes cuts totaling \$10 billion in Medicaid. It also calls for significant cuts in domestic programs.

In addition to cuts in Medicaid services, the resolution also calls for cuts in education, including student loans, the Earned Income Tax Credit, and large tax cuts. At a time when we need to add jobs to the economy, the budget agreement cuts back on funding for adult and vocational education. Finally, the budget resolution conference report requires drastic increases in the premiums paid by employers to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC). These premium increases will drive many employers to exit the defined benefit pension system, thereby undermining the retirement security for millions of workers and retirees and ultimately weakening the PBGC.

The tax cuts called for in the resolution total \$100 billion over five years, but will balloon to \$1.4 trillion when stretched out over a 10-year

period through 2015. Despite all the domestic program cuts, the tax cuts will make the budget deficit picture worse, not better.

The \$2.56 trillion budget agreement cuts domestic spending below Fiscal Year 2005 levels. It does this without making any progress on reducing record level budget deficits. Supporters of the budget resolution, spin this document as a vehicle for bringing the budget deficit into check, but do not be persuaded by that argument. The Republican leadership have made the same argument in the last three budget cycles and look at their performance: more record budget deficits.

It took this country 204 years to run up a public debt of \$1 trillion. Under this administration, under this Republican Congress, we are adding \$1 trillion to the public debt every 18 months. Over the last four years, we have added \$2.2 trillion to the national debt.

What concerns me most about this budget is that it signals the call of retreat. It is a blue print for disinvesting in the programs that make our economy and our people competitive in the global marketplace. We cannot build a stronger economy and create good paying jobs if we cut programs for worker education and job training—critical programs that invest in our human capital resources—the future American workforce.

This budget does not represent the values of my district, nor does it represent the priorities of the American people. Is there any wonder that poll after poll has registered declining public confidence in the direction of our economy and the nation's spending priorities. The real test of this budget resolution will come when we attempt to pass the 10 appropriations bills later this year. I predict a tough time ahead because it will be difficult to obtain the consensus needed to pass the spending bills that will keep the government running.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote against this conference report.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 95.

The GOP budget resolution will leave Department of Veterans Affairs programs \$2 billion short of meeting the needs of our veterans. VA will not be able to make critical program enhancements for servicemembers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan and it is even deficient to maintain current services.

The Bush Administration's budget submission for FY 2006 requested less than half of a one-percent increase for its health care services. This budget offers us about a one to two-percent increase. VA has testified that it requires a 13- to 14-percent increase just to adjust for the growth in VA enrollment partly due to the rising tide of uninsured and underinsured Americans and medical inflation rates often approaching eight percent.

Mr. Chairman, I joined every Democrat on the Veterans Affairs Committee in asking our Budget Committee to add \$3.2 billion to our budget for America's veterans. Earlier measures offered by Mr. OBEY and Mr. SPRATT on the floor of this House would have supported increased amounts of funding for our veterans, but these efforts have been soundly rejected by Republicans in favor of tax cuts and the funding we must provide to our troops in Afghanistan and Iraq. Ironically, when the troops return from these deployments, they will find a health care system that is not adequately funded to address their needs.

The President's budget has proposals that are anathema to many veterans. In addition to

the increased copayments, new enrollment fees, and draconian reductions in long-term care programs, it would force VA to shoulder even greater "management efficiencies"—a myth which many in this Congress continue to believe. At this point, "management efficiencies" must be viewed as what they truly are—cuts in services to veterans, longer queues for care, and fewer points of access for care than veterans have been promised or deserve.

Republicans seem to have bought into many of these fantasies. Democrats have not been involved in the preparation of the conference package and are being forced to vote with little review of it. An \$872 million increase over the President's budget is a minimal increase in the total amount of funding available for veterans programs. This may only be enough to compensate VA for once again rejecting the proposals the President has sent up to increase copayments for pharmaceutical drugs and charge new enrollment fees.

It is not enough to restore long-term care services, to bolster mental health programs for our returning troops, or to better ensure that veterans' claims can be administered on a timely basis. It will not fill the deficits created from unspecified management efficiencies. It will not be adequate to allow for growth in medical inflation or veterans enrollment. It will not allow VA to make critical investments in its aging medical infrastructure.

The Senate has at least rejected House budget reconciliation instructions that would have forced Congress to make \$155 million in cuts to veterans' benefits in fiscal year 2006 and almost \$800 million in cuts by fiscal year 2011.

America's veterans deserve our eternal support and gratitude, and we should reflect this gratitude by providing adequate funds for the programs that serve them and help them readjust to their lives as civilians. This budget resolution fails our Nation's heroes and we should be ashamed if we pass it.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, as Congress moves toward passing the fiscal year (FY) 2006 budget, I would like to address my thoughts and concerns on two aspects of this proposal.

First, this budget will reduce the deficit. The resolution caps discretionary spending at \$843 billion and cuts the deficit in half over the next 5 years. We will reach our deficit reduction goals through a combination of policies that encourage economic growth and fiscal discipline that slows the growth of mandatory spending by 0.1 percent over five years. Without this restraint, the federal deficit would continue to grow.

I am very disappointed with one aspect of the budget agreement. The original House passed budget did not include language to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) for oil and gas exploration, while the Senate's budget did. The Concurrent Budget Resolution deleted the Senate language. Several weeks ago we debated the Energy Bill (H.R. 6). On April 20, 2005, the House considered the Markey amendment that would have protected ANWR from oil and gas drilling. I voted for the Markey amendment to protect the wilderness. When the amendment failed, I voted against the House Energy Bill. I will continue to oppose proposals to open the Refuge to drilling.

This Budget Resolution includes reconciliation instructions for the House Resources

Committee to find \$2.4 billion in savings from programs under their jurisdiction. The Resources Committee should find savings from programs outside the ANWR. They can do this and should not rely on the speculative revenues of oil yet to be discovered.

Since my election to Congress, I have voted consistently to protect ANWR from oil and gas exploration. I have voted to protect ANWR for two main reasons. First, ANWR is among the last untouched natural landscapes in the entire United States. Once ANWR is open for exploration, its natural landscape will be changed forever. Second, any oil found in ANWR will not put the United States on a path to energy independence or lower gas prices one cent. The United States Geological Survey estimates that the supply of oil in ANWR is totally inadequate to meet our nation's growing energy needs. More importantly for the current energy debate, oil from ANWR is more than 10 years away from hitting domestic markets. ANWR will not solve our domestic energy issues.

Mr. Speaker, the budget is not the forum for a debate on ANWR—its main purpose is to cut the deficit.

I will support the budget because it moves us toward a balanced budget by reducing spending by 1 percent. And I will continue to oppose legislation that opens ANWR to drilling.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this misguided resolution that represents a missed opportunity to address some of America's most pressing problems in a fair and equitable manner.

The budget is much more than just a government document; it is a statement of our nation's priorities and values. This budget fails the test of moral leadership by increasing the burdens on the poor, the middle class and those families struggling to get into the middle class. The American people deserve better.

I am tremendously proud that in my first term as the Second District's Representative, Congress and the President balanced the budget for the first time in a generation. Until just a few years ago, the budget remained balanced and the surpluses we produced were being used to pay down the national debt and strengthen the solvency of Social Security. But this Administration and its allies the Republican Congressional Leadership have squandered the budget surpluses on wasteful tax policies and are running record budget deficits as far as the eye can see. That's just plain wrong.

This budget resolution contains deep cuts in services to the most vulnerable in our society, including Medicaid, which provides medical care to 870,000 poor children in North Carolina. This budget resolution continues to short-change the No Child Left Behind education reform law, which is now \$39 billion below budget. This budget spends more than three times in taxpayer funds on interest on the national debt as we are investing in education on the federal level. Folks, cutting our investments in education is like eating our seedcorn. This budget resolution eliminates proven programs and cuts essential services like law enforcement and Border Patrol. And this budget resolution makes the deficit bigger not smaller while automatically raising the limit on the national debt which is increasingly held by foreign countries.

Instead of this wrongheaded budget resolution, Congress and the White House should

work together to balance the budget with real PAYGO enforcement rules, provide middle class families tax relief and make real investments in our nation's future through science, technology, agriculture and health care.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this budget resolution.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the Conference Report for the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006.

When I was elected to Congress last year I pledged to the people of Southwest Florida that I would work to help reduce the size and cost of the Federal Government while preserving the services that people need.

For years Congress allowed spending to grow uncontrollably—25 percent since 2001—creating a deficit of almost \$500 billion. That's wrong.

If our children and grandchildren are to inherit a free, secure, and prosperous Nation, we must restore fiscal discipline and responsibility.

As a member of the Budget Committee, I am proud to have had a seat at the table as we took a first step forward in this critical effort.

This budget begins to exercise fiscal restraint by slowing the growth of both mandatory and discretionary spending while allowing room to fund our national priorities.

It is the first budget since 1997 to include reconciliation instructions so that we can slow the rate of growth in rapidly expanding mandatory programs. It roughly freezes non-defense, non-homeland security discretionary spending. At the same time, it provides ample resources for our defense abroad and security at home.

I congratulate the Chairman and the Conference Committee for ensuring these elements remain in the budget, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to achieve a balanced budget that funds our national priorities without raising taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against this budget resolution. This budget provides \$105.7 billion in tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans, above the \$1.9 trillion already bestowed upon them since 2001. This additional fiscal irresponsibility in the face of huge deficits is ample reason to oppose the resolution.

But this resolution goes further—it takes from the poor to give to the rich by shredding our healthcare safety net. This resolution will result in \$10 billion in cuts to Medicaid, and possibly more because the instruction to the Committee on Energy and Commerce is for \$14.7 billion, and the Committee might cut even more.

I agree with many of my colleagues that we need to consider every dollar we spend in these times of high deficits. This is exactly why our scarce resources should go to the most vulnerable among us. Medicaid provides healthcare to more than 52 million of the sickest and poorest Americans, including 25 million children, 14 million low-income adults (the majority of whom work), five million low-income seniors, and eight million individuals with disabilities.

A bipartisan majority of both the House and Senate have called for no cuts to Medicaid. The National Governors Association opposes the cuts. And nearly 1,000 state organizations

and more than 800 national organizations have voiced opposition to these cuts.

Medicaid is not the problem. It has done a better job at holding down costs than private insurance by almost half. And Medicaid is absorbing the costs of care not covered by Medicare.

These reconciliation instructions will increase the number of uninsured, create job losses in the healthcare sector, and result in payment reductions to doctors and other healthcare providers who care for Medicaid patients. Such cuts will also undermine community health centers that depend so much on Medicaid to survive.

We must get our priorities straight. This budget resolution fails to do that. Two days ago, 348 Members said “no” to Medicaid cuts in a non-binding motion to instruct. I urge my colleagues to stick to their guns, and vote “no” on this budget resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 95 will be followed by a 5-minute vote ordered on H. Res. 210.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 211, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 149]

YEAS—214

Aderholt	Davis, Tom	Hobson
Akin	Deal (GA)	Hoekstra
Alexander	DeLay	Hostettler
Bachus	Dent	Hulshof
Baker	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hunter
Barrett (SC)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hyde
Bartlett (MD)	Doolittle	Inglis (SC)
Barton (TX)	Drake	Issa
Beauprez	Dreier	Istook
Biggart	Duncan	Jenkins
Bilirakis	Ehlers	Jindal
Bishop (UT)	Emerson	Johnson, Sam
Blackburn	English (PA)	Keller
Blunt	Everett	Kelly
Boehner	Feeney	Kennedy (MN)
Bonilla	Ferguson	King (IA)
Bonner	Fitzpatrick (PA)	King (NY)
Bono	Foley	Kingston
Boozman	Forbes	Kirk
Boustany	Fortenberry	Kline
Bradley (NH)	Fossella	Knollenberg
Brady (TX)	Fox	Kolbe
Brown (SC)	Franks (AZ)	Kuhl (NY)
Brown-Waite,	Frelinghuysen	LaHood
Ginny	Galleghy	Latham
Burgess	Garrett (NJ)	LaTourette
Burton (IN)	Gerlach	Lewis (CA)
Buyer	Gibbons	Lewis (KY)
Calvert	Gilchrest	Linder
Camp	Gillmor	Lucas
Cannon	Gingrey	Lungren, Daniel
Cantor	Gohmert	E.
Capito	Goodlatte	Mack
Carter	Granger	Manzullo
Chabot	Graves	Marchant
Chocola	Hall	McCaul (TX)
Coble	Harris	McCotter
Cole (OK)	Hart	McCreery
Conaway	Hastert	McHenry
Cox	Hastings (WA)	McHugh
Crenshaw	Hayes	McKeon
Cubin	Hayworth	McMorris
Culberson	Hefley	Mica
Davis (KY)	Hensarling	Miller (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann	Herger	Miller (MI)

Miller, Gary	Putnam
Moran (KS)	Radanovich
Murphy	Regula
Musgrave	Rehberg
Myrick	Reichert
Neugebauer	Renzi
Ney	Reynolds
Northup	Rogers (AL)
Norwood	Rogers (KY)
Nunes	Rogers (MI)
Nussle	Rohrabacher
Osborne	Ros-Lehtinen
Otter	Royce
Oxley	Ryan (WI)
Pearce	Ryun (KS)
Pence	Schwarz (MI)
Peterson (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Petri	Sessions
Pickering	Shadegg
Pitts	Shaw
Platts	Sherwood
Poe	Shimkus
Pombo	Shuster
Porter	Simpson
Portman	Smith (NJ)
Price (GA)	Smith (TX)
Pryce (OH)	Sodrel

NAYS—211

Abercrombie	Green, Al
Ackerman	Green, Gene
Allen	Grijalva
Andrews	Gutierrez
Baca	Gutknecht
Baird	Harman
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)
Barrow	Herseth
Bass	Higgins
Bean	Hinchey
Becerra	Hinojosa
Berkley	Holden
Berman	Holt
Berry	Honda
Bishop (GA)	Hooley
Bishop (NY)	Hoyer
Blumenauer	Inslee
Boehlert	Israel
Boren	Jackson (IL)
Boswell	Jackson-Lee
Boucher	(TX)
Boyd	Johnson (CT)
Brady (PA)	Johnson (IL)
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.
Brown, Corrine	Jones (NC)
Butterfield	Jones (OH)
Capps	Kanjorski
Capuano	Kaptur
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)
Cardoza	Kildee
Carnahan	Kilpatrick (MI)
Carson	Kind
Case	Kucinich
Castle	Langevin
Chandler	Lantos
Clay	Larsen (WA)
Cleaver	Larson (CT)
Conyers	Leach
Cooper	Lee
Costa	Levin
Costello	Lewis (GA)
Cramer	Lipinski
Crowley	LoBiondo
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe
Cummings	Lowe
Davis (AL)	Lynch
Davis (CA)	Maloney
Davis (FL)	Markey
Davis (IL)	Marshall
Davis (TN)	Matheson
DeFazio	Matsui
DeGette	McCarthy
DeLaunt	McCollum (MN)
DeLauro	McDermott
Dicks	McGovern
Dingell	McIntyre
Doyle	McKinney
Edwards	McNulty
Emanuel	Meehan
Engel	Meeke (FL)
Eshoo	Meeke (NY)
Etheridge	Melancon
Evans	Menendez
Farr	Michaud
Fattah	Millender-
Frank (MA)	McDonald
Gonzalez	Miller (NC)
Goode	Miller, George
Gordon	Mollohan
Green (WI)	Moore (KS)

Souder	Waxman
Stearns	Weiner
Sullivan	
Sweeney	
Tancredo	Clyburn
Taylor (NC)	Cunningham
Terry	Doggett
Thomas	Filner
Thornberry	
Tiberti	
Turner	
Upton	
Walden (OR)	
Walsh	
Wamp	
Weldon (FL)	
Weldon (PA)	
Weller	
Westmoreland	
Whitfield	
Wicker	
Wilson (NM)	
Wilson (SC)	
Wolf	
Young (AK)	
Young (FL)	

Wexler	Wu
Woolsey	Wynn

NOT VOTING—10

Clyburn	Flake	Rothman
Cunningham	Ford	Towns
Doggett	Jefferson	
Filner	Paul	

□ 2035

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall, No. 149, on H. Con Res. 95, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

SUPPORTING GOALS OF WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 210.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 210, 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 315, nays 0, not voting 119, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

YEAS—315

Abercrombie	Chabot	Fortenberry
Aderholt	Chocola	Fossella
Akin	Cleaver	Fox
Alexander	Coble	Frank (MA)
Andrews	Cole (OK)	Franks (AZ)
Bachus	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Baird	Conyers	Garrett (NJ)
Baldwin	Costa	Gerlach
Barrow	Costello	Gibbons
Bartlett (MD)	Cramer	Gilchrest
Barton (TX)	Crenshaw	Gillmor
Bean	Crowley	Gohmert
Beauprez	Cubin	Gonzalez
Berry	Cuellar	Goodlatte
Biggart	Culberson	Granger
Bilirakis	Cummings	Green (WI)
Bishop (UT)	Davis (AL)	Green, Al
Blackburn	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Blumenauer	Davis (IL)	Grijalva
Blunt	Davis (KY)	Gutierrez
Boehner	DeGette	Gutknecht
Bonilla	DeLauro	Hall
Bono	DeLay	Harman
Boozman	Dent	Harris
Boren	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hart
Boswell	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hastings (FL)
Boucher	Dingell	Hastings (WA)
Boustany	Doolittle	Hayworth
Bradley (NH)	Drake	Hefley
Brady (PA)	Dreier	Hensarling
Brady (TX)	Duncan	Herger
Brown, Corrine	Edwards	Herseth
Brown-Waite,	Ehlers	Higgins
Ginny	Emerson	Hinojosa
Burgess	Engel	Hobson
Calvert	English (PA)	Hoekstra
Camp	Eshoo	Holden
Cantor	Evans	Holt
Cardin	Farr	Hooley
Cardoza	Fattah	Hostettler
Carnahan	Feeney	Hoyer
Carson	Ferguson	Hulshof
Carter	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Hunter
Case	Foley	Hyde
Castle	Forbes	Inslee