

extraction. In so doing, my legislation does not interfere with the Forest Service's Forest Plan Amendment process. That process is allowing the Forest Service to exercise its expertise and listen to the people and thereby establish a long-term management plan for the Valle Vidal commensurate with its importance as a critical component of our natural and cultural heritage. In my view, which I know is shared by many of my constituents, the Valle Vidal's ecological health and integrity should be restored and protected and enjoyed to the utmost by current and future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues both in the New Mexico delegation as well as in the entire Congress to join me in passing this legislation and protecting the Valle Vidal permanently. This ecosystem is too valuable to the people of New Mexico and the nation, and the energy gains too miniscule to justify the potential damage to this pristine area. We must protect it.

VICENTE FOX, HURRICANE LOOTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, it seems tonight is the night for many of us to talk about the hurricane and the disastrous effects it has had on our country. I heard earlier a couple of my Democratic colleagues berating the majority leader about hurry up with money, hurry up and get it done.

We want to help our friends on the Gulf Coast, but it is also important that we do it sensibly and we pay some attention to the taxpayers here. Just yesterday, in Atlanta, one of the FEMA cards for \$2,000 was used to buy a handbag. I guess you need a handbag if you are in dire straits, but this one was a Louis Vuitton, which does not mean much to me, except it was an \$800 handbag. That is ludicrous. That is not what the American people expect for us to let happen.

□ 1830

We will be rebuilding the gulf coast States for years to come. We will do so with both public and private moneys, with cost estimates now running into the hundreds of billions of dollars. Estimates are that at least a half million Americans from the affected areas have permanently lost their jobs as their workplaces are totally destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, we do want to help these people. We must help these people. It makes perfect sense that we ought to employ as many of these folks as possible in the rebuilding effort of the gulf coast. It is for their personal good we do that, and it is for the good of the country.

Last week, the President approved a temporary waiver of Davis-Bacon labor rules for exactly that purpose, to allow many of these individuals to participate in federally funded reconstruction

projects as general labor helpers. They cannot do that under Davis-Bacon. We need to follow that up with providing whatever vocational training is necessary to allow displaced workers to gain the skills necessary to fully participate in these reconstruction efforts.

Let us do two things at once here.

We need a revival of the Civilian Conservation Corps from the 1930s for this unprecedented national emergency. We should offer every able-bodied displaced person an immediate training wage of \$10 an hour on top of whatever other Federal benefits they may be receiving, and full-time participation in this if they are receiving Federal benefits should be mandatory for all except the elderly or disabled. People who can work and yet will not help themselves should not ask other taxpayers to do it for them. There is good-paying work here for years for every able-bodied American who needs a job if we do the right thing. This has a great potential to build careers.

But there is already somebody else with an eye for these construction jobs, Mexican President Vicente Fox. "The reconstruction of that city," meaning New Orleans, "and of that region is going to require a lot of labor," Mr. Fox said of New Orleans, Mississippi, and Alabama. "And if there is anything Mexicans are good at, it is construction." That is a quote from the New York Times, September 5.

While we appreciate the disaster aid assistance Mexico is providing by sending a military convoy across our southern border, we cannot afford to pay them back with American jobs of our hurricane victims. Rebuilding our gulf coast with labor from Mexico would divert a large part of the estimated \$200 billion cost to rebuild, paid for by the American taxpayers, out of our economy and into "foreign remittances," the monies sent back to Mexico from the United States by illegal immigrants. These "remittances" have now surpassed oil revenues as the number one source of income for Mexico. This is drawn directly out of our economy.

We should not allow our national tragedy to become Mexico's gain.

The time for talk should be over. The time for pleas for the administration to simply enforce the law should be over. Every police and sheriff's department in this Nation should begin vigorously enforcing immigration law while in the course of their routine duties. For every illegal worker not employed to rebuild the gulf coast, there is a ready job for the hundreds of thousands of legal American residents who just lost their jobs in this tragedy.

The CLEAR Act that we just reintroduced has an excellent chance of passing this session; and, if it does, the Federal Government will be responsible for paying 100 percent of these local law enforcement costs for immigration law enforcement efforts.

Hardship has a way of bringing families together. If there is anything posi-

tive that can come from such an incomprehensible disaster as Hurricane Katrina, it could likely be in forcing us to come back together to help defend each other, instead of letting potential taxpayer-funded jobs for storm victims be looted by illegal immigrant labor cheered on by Mexican President Vicente Fox.

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2005 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2005 THROUGH FY 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2005 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act. This status report is current through September 2, 2005.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 95, the conference report on the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2005 because those years are not considered for enforcement of spending aggregates.

The second table compares, by authorizing committee, the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 95 for fiscal year 2005 and fiscal years 2005 through 2009. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2005 with the total of "section 302(b)" suballocations among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures reported by the Appropriations Committee that would breach its section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority.