Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Sullivan
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—64

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Baird
Baldwin
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capuano
Carson (OK)
Cooper
Costello
Crane
DeFazio
English
Everett
Filner
Gutknecht
Hart
Hefley
Hinchey
Holt
Hulshof
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kennedy (MN)
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Majette
Markey
Matheson
McDermott
McNulty
Miller, George
Moore
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Ramstad
Sabo
Shadegg
Slaughter
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Toomey
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Visclosky
Weller
Wicker
Wu

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—28

Burton (IN)
Clay
Cramer
Cubin
Dingell
Edwards
Fattah
Fletcher
Fossella
Gephardt
Gibbons
Goss
Gutierrez
Harman
Hyde
McGovern
Millender-McDonald
Murtha
Owens
Oxley
Paul
Peterson (PA)
Rangel
Towns
Walsh
Waters
Weldon (PA)
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1043

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REPORT ON H.R. 2691, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108–195) on the bill (H.R. 2691) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS AND INCLUDE EXTRANEOUS MATERIAL

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during debate on H.R. 2660, I may be allowed to revise and extend my remarks, and insert extraneous and tabular material in one instance immediately after my initial statement on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1045

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2660, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). Pursuant to House Resolution 312 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2660.

□ 1046

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2660) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 9, 2003, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

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

Many of my colleagues have asked, will we finish today, and I can only answer that by saying we can if everybody works at it, and if we do not get too many delays, I think we can get this bill done in good time.

The Constitution says that the objective of government, or at least this is what we interpret it to be, is twofold. One is to provide for the common defense, and we did that earlier this week; we provided for the common defense. The other is to provide for the common welfare of the people, 280 million Americans. Today, in this bill, we have a unique and, I think, very good opportunity to achieve that goal. Maybe not perfectly, but certainly a lot of very positive things are in this bill.

First of all, I want to say that the members of the subcommittee were all very cooperative, all very helpful. We worked together in the subcommittee listening to a lot of testimony. We tried to put together a bill that represents the aspirations of the American people, not totally to the satisfaction of everyone, but certainly I think one that covers a lot of very positive parts. I also want to commend the staff members of both the minority and the majority. We have an excellent staff on this subcommittee; and if it were not for their effort, we would not be here today.

I am pleased to present before the House today the fiscal year 2004 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies. When we reflect on that, we think of the broad jurisdiction and responsibility which that entails: Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

In crafting this bill, we have taken into consideration the priorities of the President, as well as the Members of the House. We have been attentive to the priorities of Congress as set by the budget resolution, and we are appreciative of the work of the leaders of the House and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), in

working with the administration to develop a workable allocation for this bill.

My colleagues on the subcommittee know that I call our subcommittee the Love Your Neighbor Committee, because it provides the funding that touches so many lives and provides a helping hand to those in need in this great country. There would not be one American that is not affected by what is in this bill in some part, whether it is education, whether it is health care, whether it is retraining for a new job—a whole host of good things that are done in this piece of legislation.

The bill provides $138 billion in discretionary budget authority. This represents a 2.7 percent increase over fiscal year 2003. We have tried to be restrained and yet meet the needs, and this is really probably a little lower than the rate of inflation. The level of growth in the bill is commensurate with the current level of growth in our economy. It is a responsible and balanced bill.

The bill focuses priority spending for education in three important areas, including Title I, education funding for disadvantaged children, special education, and reading programs. Education programs overall are increased by $2.3 billion over last year, for a total of $55.4 billion. I would point out that this means that in the last 8 years we have doubled what is being spent on education.

Funding for the Department of Health and Human Services totals $61.2 billion, including $4.55 billion for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and we all know from the news that this is a very important function; and $27.664 billion for the National Institutes of Health to continue our research into treatments for disease.

The Department of Labor is funded at $11.7 billion, which includes funding of $1.46 billion for dislocated worker assistance, and $1.5 billion for the Job Corps program. This is a very important program. I just testified before the International Trade Commission that in Ohio alone, we lost over 90,000 manufacturing jobs in the last couple of years, and that retraining becomes extremely important in the lives of those individuals. They do not want welfare; they want jobs. They want an opportunity to get a new skill.

Mr. Chairman, Federal education spending has more than doubled since fiscal year 1996 when our investment totaled $23 billion, to today with the Federal education funding reaching $55.4 billion. This funding is significant and we must be cautious in our funding priorities to ensure that these dollars go to programs most directly improving our children's education.

As my colleagues know, the bill provides the funding necessary to implement the historic No Child Left Behind Act, which passed this Chamber with strong bipartisan support. The law sets high goals for ensuring that every child in our Nation will know how to read by the third grade and establishes important programs to aid in achieving this goal. To carry out this mission, we have provided a $666 million increase in Title I funding for disadvantaged children, bringing the total funding of title I to $12.35 billion. Together with the funding we are providing today and the accountability provisions included in the No Child Left Behind Act, these dollars can make a real difference in the quality of education for every child.

I want to mention at this point that our Committee on Education and the Workforce is working hard to look at the laws to ensure that they are effective, that they work better prospectively. It is not just a matter of putting money into these various activities, but it is a matter of putting the money in and using it carefully. I think the Committee on Education and the Workforce deserves a lot of credit for trying to meet that goal.

In addition to the Title I program, the No Child Left Behind Act creates new reading programs to assist school districts in meeting the challenge of ensuring that every child can read through scientifically based methods. These programs will assist parents, teachers, and school districts in meeting the reading challenges of our children. We provide over $1 billion for these programs.

I would say one of the things that causes me concern is the dropout rate in our big cities. They do not start in the 9th grade or the 10th grade to drop out. If we are to lower the dropout rate, one of the elements of that is getting every child able to read. I think many times high school dropouts result from the fact that they have not been well grounded in reading, and we recognize that in our funding.

Many of my colleagues speak to me about the financial demands of special education programs in their local school districts. We also hear from parents about the need to support adequate special education funding to ensure that their special needs children may receive a quality education. It is a wonderful thing about America; we are concerned for everyone, and this bill reflects that. With the inclusion of an additional $1 billion for special education in this bill, the program is now funded at nearly $10 billion. This figure represents a nearly 300 percent increase in the program since fiscal year 1996, three times as much. Clearly, we are all committed to addressing the needs of our children with special education needs.

I am a believer that no child will be left behind if we can ensure that there is a quality teacher in every classroom in our Nation. Funding for Title II—Preparing, Training, and Recruiting High-Quality Teachers and Principals under the No Child Left Behind Act is a critical component to achieving this goal.

We provide the following funding to encourage people to enter the field of teaching and strengthen the skills of those already there. I am sure if I ask the Members, all of my colleagues have had a teacher or maybe two or three teachers who made a difference in their lives, and we want to be sure that every child has a good teacher in every classroom.

We include $2.93 billion for the State teacher-training block grant, giving the States money to improve their teacher-training programs; $90 million for the teacher-quality enhancement grants; $150 million for math and science partnerships that will allow universities and local education agencies to partner to improve the quality of their math and science programs, and this really is a very critical need; $49.4 million for the Transition to Teaching program to assist in recruiting mid-career professionals into the field of teaching. There are people out there who say, there must be more than what I am doing and they want to be teachers. They want to contribute. And we want to help them through this program.

Mr. Chairman, there is $20 million for the Troops to Teachers program. For those that are not familiar with this program, we encourage those people in the armed services that are leaving, maybe they are 42 or 43 years old, and we encourage them to go into teaching to help fill the gaps because they have travel experience, they have experience in managing people, and this program has proven very successful. I think last year the Teacher of the Year was an individual who had been brought into the field as a retired member of military. So we encourage that program. Many of my colleagues may already know that First Lady Laura Bush supports the Troops to Teachers program with visits to our military bases to inform our troops about the opportunity to enter the field of teaching upon the completion of their military service. With maturity, training in mathematics or science, and assistance in appropriate courses for teaching, members of our Armed Forces make outstanding classroom teachers in fields where we are currently experiencing a teacher shortage. I might say the First Lady is very important in this effort because having her, when she visits military bases, encourage individuals to consider this is a very effective part of the program.

We have restored funding to programs important to our Members, including the popular 21st Century Learning Communities program for after-school programs for students, which is funded at $1 billion, and for rural education at $170 million. In other words, it gives the young people an opportunity to acquire skills or to participate in athletics between the hours of 3 to 6 or 7 p.m., an opportunity to use this time usefully.

□ 1100

And we have strong support for this from YMCAs, Boys and Girls Clubs, a

whole host of these groups that do provide this kind of service. We have restored funding to programs important to our members.

Impact Aid provides funding to school districts that have Federal facilities, including military facilities, within their jurisdictions and is increased by $50 million to $1.238 billion. We have asked our troops, many of them leave their families to go overseas to protect American interests, and I think it is essential that we give their children a good educational opportunity. That is what we do with Impact Aid and that is why the increase.

Charter schools provide an alternative to students in failing schools, and we have included $220 million in charter school grants and $25.8 for the charter school facilities. We have funded the Head Start program at the President's budget request of $6.8 billion, an increase of $148 million. This funding level will provide for current service levels for the program and ensure that quality improvements and training elements are fully implemented. And, again, the Committee on Education and the Workforce is taking a look at this existing law with the thought of making it even better.

Students who have no experience in higher education benefit from the TRIO and GEAR UP programs. These programs assist students in preparing for higher education through proper course selection, mentoring and even tutoring services. TRIO receives $835 million and GEAR UP $300 million in the bill. What this means is that students who might not have thought about going on to higher education are encouraged to do so by others in the community. Many times volunteers will work in these programs. And, again, that is part of the American way of giving more opportunity.

College costs continue to rise and the cost of higher education today continues to be an impediment to many students. Pell grants play an important role in helping low-income students achieve their education goals. A larger-than-expected demand on these grants has occurred as a result of our slow economy, causing many people who have previously been in the workforce to seek additional training in an academic environment, which is a very positive thing. Therefore, the bill continues to support a maximum Pell grant level of $4,050 while also including funding of $12.250 billion, an increase of $885 million over last year to address the shortfall in addressing the funding needs of students.

There is a book that talks about how the GI Bill has made a very great impact on this Nation in terms of elevating educational opportunities and, again, this Pell grant has a similar impact. It gives students an opportunity who might not otherwise get a crack at a higher education. That does not have to be academic at the sense of a university college. It can be a trade school. It can be a vocational school, a technical institute; but it does provide opportunity for those at all levels of our economic scale.

Health and Human Services. There is little more precious to each of us than our good health. I believe that when you have good health you have it all or at least a good part of it. Unfortunately, this is not the case for many Americans, and it is through the agencies and programs of the Department of Health and Human Services that we assist others to improve their health. I wish all of you could sit in our hearings and see a row of wheelchairs with people with health problems and hear testimony from those who have various kinds of afflictions. It will make you realize how fortunate you are if you have good health and how important it is that we, as a society, try to ensure that everybody has this kind of opportunity, and that is one of the things this bill does.

In fiscal year 2003 we completed a 5-year effort to double the funding of the National Institutes of Health, and this was a bipartisan effort; but it made a vast improvement or vast opportunity for NIH to reach out much further than they would have otherwise. Through the work of NIH scientists and extramural scientists at universities across the country, we have been able to conduct important research to understand who we are through the Human Genome Project, how to treat once-deadly diseases and that many life-threatening diseases are actually preventable. After accounting for one-time costs for fiscal year 2003, NIH will have an additional $1.7 billion for medical research in this bill.

One of the pieces of testimony that really stuck with me was NIH said that every 5 years life expectancy goes up a year. That is an enormous achievement when you think about it. A baby born today will have a possible 10 or 15 years of additional life. We hope it is a quality life as a result of the commitment of this body, again, a bipartisan commitment, to do the research, to deal with these troubling diseases that afflict us. I was also struck when they testified that there are 6,000 identifiable diseases and medical conditions that can possibly afflict people. So you can see why it is so important that we continue the funding. And, basically, because we have funded building programs in the past, we have not had to do that so much in this bill so that the real increase is about 6 percent for the research programs.

All the information and advances we have gained from NIH, however, will be useless without a way to communicate this information to health care providers and individuals, those most directly responsible for their own health. Thus, the work of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is critical to improving our health. We call upon the CDC to put into practice medical advances through numerous conflicting disease and prevention programs. Further, we call upon the CDC and its infectious disease experts to act as our first line of defense, such as Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome, SARS, which you have heard a lot about lately, and West Nile Virus. In our changed world we must call upon CDC to protect us from diseases that may come to us intentionally through terrorist attacks—bioterrorism, radiological and chemical attacks. Given these tremendous demands on the CDC, we have provided the agency with $4.55 billion. That is a $57 million increase over last year.

Total CDC funding for the Global AIDS Initiative is $243 million. Within this level, we have been responsive to the President's request to fund his new Global HIV/AIDS Mother and Child Prevention Initiative at $100 million. Through this important initiative, thousands of children across the African continent may be protected against HIV transmission from their mothers. What a great contribution. The President, of course, is talking about this when he is in Africa this week.

The Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund was established following the tragic events of September 11. It is through this fund that we are attempting to build a seamless system for delivering important safety information and protecting the American people. The fund includes support to the CDC and through it our State and local health departments, as well as other agencies and the Department of Health and Human Services to ensure protections from all levels of government. This year we are providing over $1.7 billion to the funds.

I might say it is a goal of this subcommittee to make the health care preventative delivery system seamless so the Centers for Disease Control, the State health agencies, the local health agencies, city and county, are in complete communication and that the whole process is seamless. This is very important in terms of delivering services, and it is important in terms of our national security.

Funding for community health centers is $1.627 billion. This represents a $122.3 million increase over last year as we provide funding for the third year of the President's proposed expansion of health services to people who are underinsured or have no health benefits at all. And this is a very important element, again, of our communities, a lot of volunteers that participate. It frees up the emergency rooms because people have another alternative place to go, and it provides some measure of help to those who can ill afford to pay for a doctor or pay for health care services. I think these community health programs are extremely important, and we have reflected that in our funding, and I am sure many of you have those in your own community.

Children's hospitals across the Nation are the training grounds for our pediatricians. The bill provides $305 million to train these important care

givers. The Medicare system takes care of the education for the conventional MD programs but not for pediatricians or OB–GYNs. And what we do is give the children's hospitals financial assistance so they in turn too can provide the same level of education for the pediatricians. We all know that the early years are the most important in a child's life. And I think this is an extremely important program.

The Ryan White AIDS program is funded at $2 billion, an increase of $24 million. An important portion of this funding assists those who are infected with the virus in receiving vital medications through the Drug Assistance Program.

This year the administration sought congressional support for a new substance abuse treatment program called Access to Recovery through the use of a State voucher system. We have responded to this request with $100 million and are eager to work with the administration as they develop a program to serve people in great need. It will be another tool, but we want the administration to do a pilot project to work out how this can be done effectively. They have requested somewhat more money than that, but I think $100 million will go a long way. And if it proves as effective as we think it could, the next year will be another time to look at it.

Additional support of the President's initiatives in this bill include faith-based programs—the Compassion Capital Fund at $50 million, and the Mentoring of Children of Prisoners at $25 million, I suspect a somewhat forgotten group. But those children will be citizens tomorrow too, and we should give them a chance even though maybe one of their parents is incarcerated for some reason.

Programs to support abstinence programs for young people will receive $10 million increase for a total of $65 million in this bill.

LIHEAP is an important safety net providing financial assistance to low-income people who struggle with paying their heating and cooling bills. These funds are distributed to the States through the formula grant program, and we have retained the funding level for these grants at the fiscal year 2003 level of $1.7 billion. To assist people in the event of a particularly severe heating or cooling season, we provide $100 million in emergency funds. These funds may be released to the State at the discretion of the President.

The Department of Labor has jurisdiction over many important worker training and protection programs; therefore, we have restored funding to core job training and employment assistance programs to the fiscal year 2003 level. As a number of communities continue to experience plant closings and other layoffs, we understand the need to support dislocated worker-training programs that can assist workers to return to the workforce. Funding for this program is $1.155 billion, the same as in fiscal year 2003, an increase of $78 million over the budget request. This is one where we feel that this is so important that we want to add more than requested in the President's budget. And if you have ever been to one of these job opportunity locations in your district, you realize how vitally important this is to those that are laid off. It gives them hope, hope that there may be a new job available, hope that they can take care of their families, hope that they can get health care. It is vitally important.

The Job Corps program provides a second chance to young people to develop a skill for the 21st century workforce. As we all know, the mix is different than it used to be in the job market. Many people who enroll in Job Corps centers never completed their high school education, and many have other problems that make holding a job very difficult. A second chance. I like that, second chance. Everybody should have a second chance at training, giving hope to these workers; and it makes them productive members of our society. Funding for Job Corps is $1.5 billion. This is an increase of $28 million.

Worker protection programs, including OSHA and MSHA, are funded at the President's budget request.

□ 1115

Related agencies. While agencies such as the Social Security Administration and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS, receive their funding from the mandatory spending side, this bill provides the administrative costs for these agencies. Effective administration of these agencies ensures efficient service to recipients. We have included a 6.1 percent increase in the funding for the Social Security Administration to improve service delivery of benefits and accelerate the time it takes to process disability claims.

I am sure all of us have experienced a call from someone who has a disability claim and says, why can I not get this taken care of? We recognize that, and we are saying let us put more people so they can be handled promptly. Otherwise they are left without any means of providing a living. So we have given a 6.1 percent increase.

The Institute of Museum and Library Services provides funding to our Nation's public libraries and provides grants for library and museum projects. Funding totals $238 million, including funds for the second year of a program to recruit and educate librarians. Libraries are the windows to the world and a place of inspiration for many individuals.

Mr. Chairman, the programs and funding levels I have described represent the good neighbor in all of us as a Nation, as a people. We have tried to use our allocation to fund our highest priorities and to reduce the growth in this bill. It is fair, it is balanced, and I think it will serve the people well, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I will submit a detailed table of the bill into the RECORD.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF LABOR					
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION					
TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES					
Grants to States:					
Adult Training, current year	186,778	188,000	188,000	+1,222	---
Advance from prior year	(707,372)	(712,000)	(712,000)	(+4,628)	---
FY 2005	712,000	712,000	712,000	---	---
Adult Training	898,778	900,000	900,000	+1,222	---
Youth Training	994,459	1,000,965	1,000,965	+6,506	---
Dislocated Worker Assistance, current year	307,152	258,432	307,152	---	+48,720
Advance from prior year	(842,488)	(848,000)	(848,000)	(+5,512)	---
FY 2005	848,000	848,000	848,000	---	---
Dislocated Worker Assistance	1,155,152	1,106,432	1,155,152	---	+48,720
Federally Administered Programs:					
Dislocated Worker Assistance National Reserve:					
Current year	93,993	64,608	93,993	---	+29,385
Advance from prior year	(210,622)	(212,000)	(212,000)	(+1,378)	---
FY 2005	212,000	212,000	212,000	---	---
Dislocated Worker Assistance Nat'l Reserve	305,993	276,608	305,993	---	+29,385
Total, Dislocated Worker Assistance	1,461,145	1,383,040	1,461,145	---	+78,105
Native Americans	55,636	55,000	55,000	-636	---
Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers	76,823	---	59,600	-17,223	+59,600
Job Corps:					
Operations	794,800	844,667	820,000	+25,200	-24,667
Advance from prior year	(587,158)	(591,000)	(591,000)	(+3,842)	---
FY 2005	591,000	591,000	591,000	---	---
Construction and Renovation	27,371	30,216	30,216	+2,845	---
Advance from prior year	(99,350)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(+650)	---
FY 2005	100,000	100,000	100,000	---	---
Subtotal, Job Corps, program level	1,513,171	1,565,883	1,541,216	+28,045	-24,667
National Activities:					
Pilots, Demonstrations and Research	75,855	35,000	46,615	-29,240	+11,615
Responsible Reintegration of Youthful Offender	54,642	---	---	-54,642	---
Evaluation	9,039	9,098	9,098	+59	---
Youth Opportunity Grants	44,211	---	---	-44,211	---
Other	15,409	3,000	3,400	-12,009	+400
Subtotal, National activities	199,156	47,098	59,113	-140,043	+12,015
Subtotal, Federal activities	2,150,779	1,944,589	2,020,922	-129,857	+76,333
Current Year	1,247,779	1,041,589	1,117,922	-129,857	+76,333
FY 2005	903,000	903,000	903,000	---	---
Total, Workforce Investment Act	5,199,168	4,951,986	5,077,039	-122,129	+125,053
Current Year	2,736,168	2,488,986	2,614,039	-122,129	+125,053
FY 2005	2,463,000	2,463,000	2,463,000	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Women in Apprenticeship	993	---	---	-993	---
Subtotal, National activities, TES	200,149	47,098	59,113	-141,036	+12,015
Total, Training and Employment Services	5,200,161	4,951,986	5,077,039	-123,122	+125,053
Current Year	(2,737,161)	(2,488,986)	(2,614,039)	(-123,122)	(+125,053)
FY 2005	(2,463,000)	(2,463,000)	(2,463,000)	---	---
COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS	442,306	440,200	440,200	-2,106	---
FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES	972,200	1,338,200	1,338,200	+366,000	---
STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS					
Unemployment Compensation:					
State Operations	2,624,318	2,640,002	2,624,318	---	-15,684
National Activities	9,935	10,500	9,935	---	-565
Subtotal, Unemployment Compensation	2,634,253	2,650,502	2,634,253	---	-16,249
Employment Service:					
Allotments to States:					
Federal Funds	23,300	23,452	23,300	---	-152
Trust Funds	768,257	773,283	768,257	---	-5,026
Subtotal	791,557	796,735	791,557	---	-5,178
ES National Activities	50,351	78,546	70,351	+20,000	-8,195
Subtotal, Employment Service	841,908	875,281	861,908	+20,000	-13,373
Federal Funds	23,300	23,452	23,300	---	-152
Trust Funds	818,608	851,829	838,608	+20,000	-13,221
One-Stop Career Centers/Labor Market Information	99,350	101,000	99,350	---	-1,650
Work Incentives Grants	19,870	20,000	19,870	---	-130
Total, State Unemployment & Employment Srvcs	3,595,381	3,646,783	3,615,381	+20,000	-31,402
Federal Funds	142,520	144,452	142,520	---	-1,932
Trust Funds	3,452,861	3,502,331	3,472,861	+20,000	-29,470
ADVANCES TO THE UI AND OTHER TRUST FUNDS 1/	463,000	467,000	467,000	+4,000	---
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION					
Adult Employment and Training	42,326	38,700	38,700	-3,626	---
Trust Funds	4,243	6,854	6,854	+2,611	---
Youth Employment and Training	38,691	39,333	39,333	+642	---
Employment Security	6,009	5,997	5,997	-12	---
Trust Funds	47,596	58,634	47,596	---	-11,038
Apprenticeship Services	20,699	20,932	20,932	+233	---
Executive Direction	8,230	8,469	8,469	+239	---
Trust Funds	2,037	2,053	2,053	+16	---
Welfare to Work	4,680	2,393	2,393	-2,287	---
Total, Program Administration	174,511	183,365	172,327	-2,184	-11,038
Federal Funds	120,635	115,824	115,824	-4,811	---
Trust Funds	53,876	67,541	56,503	+2,627	-11,038
Total, Employment and Training Administration	10,847,559	11,027,534	11,110,147	+262,588	+82,613
Federal Funds	7,340,822	7,457,662	7,580,783	+239,961	+123,121
Current Year	(4,877,822)	(4,994,662)	(5,117,783)	(+239,961)	(+123,121)
FY 2005	(2,463,000)	(2,463,000)	(2,463,000)	---	---
Trust Funds	3,506,737	3,569,872	3,529,364	+22,627	-40,508

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
EMPLOYEE BENEFITS SECURITY ADMINISTRATION					
Enforcement and Compliance	91,526	106,679	106,679	+15,153	---
Policy, Regulation and Public Service	20,441	17,385	17,385	-3,056	---
Program Oversight	4,316	4,541	4,541	+225	---
Total, EBSA	116,283	128,605	128,605	+12,322	---
PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION					
Program Adm. subject to limitation (TF)	12,965	16,553	16,553	+3,588	---
Termination services not subject to limitation (NA)	(179,844)	(212,219)	(212,219)	(+32,375)	---
Total, PBGC	12,965	16,553	16,553	+3,588	---
Total, PBGC (Program level)	(192,809)	(228,772)	(228,772)	(+35,963)	---
EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION					
SALARIES AND EXPENSES					
Enforcement of Wage and Hour Standards	155,867	161,294	161,294	+5,427	---
Office of Labor-Management Standards	34,279	40,631	40,631	+6,352	---
Federal Contractor EEO Standards Enforcement	78,033	80,043	80,043	+2,010	---
Federal Programs for Workers' Compensation	96,692	98,161	98,161	+1,469	---
Trust Funds	2,016	2,056	2,056	+40	---
Program Direction and Support	14,226	15,568	15,568	+1,342	---
Total, ESA salaries and expenses	381,113	397,753	397,753	+16,640	---
Federal Funds	379,097	395,697	395,697	+16,600	---
Trust Funds	2,016	2,056	2,056	+40	---
SPECIAL BENEFITS					
Federal employees compensation benefits	160,000	160,000	160,000	---	---
Longshore and harbor workers' benefits	3,000	3,000	3,000	---	---
Total, Special Benefits	163,000	163,000	163,000	---	---
SPECIAL BENEFITS FOR DISABLED COAL MINERS 2/					
Benefit payments	402,089	390,848	390,848	-11,241	---
Administration	6,088	6,152	6,152	+64	---
Subtotal, Black Lung, FY 2004 program level	408,177	397,000	397,000	-11,177	---
Less funds advanced in prior year	-108,000	-97,000	-97,000	+11,000	---
Total, Black Lung, current request, FY04	300,177	300,000	300,000	-177	---
New advances, 1st quarter FY 2005	97,000	88,000	88,000	-9,000	---
Total, Special Benefits for Disabled Coal Miners	397,177	388,000	388,000	-9,177	---
ENERGY EMPLOYEES OCCUPATIONAL ILLNESS COMPENSATION FUND					
Program Benefits	(758,000)	(385,000)	(385,000)	(-373,000)	---
Administrative Expenses	104,867	55,074	55,074	-49,793	---
Total, Energy Emp Occupational Illness Comp Fund	104,867	55,074	55,074	-49,793	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
BLACK LUNG DISABILITY TRUST FUND					
Benefit payments and interest on advances	979,371	986,901	986,901	+7,530	---
Employment Standards Adm. S&E	31,987	32,004	32,004	+17	---
Departmental Management S&E	22,952	23,401	23,401	+449	---
Departmental Management, Inspector General	334	338	338	+4	---
Subtotal, Black Lung Disablty	1,034,644	1,042,644	1,042,644	+8,000	---
Treasury Adm. Costs	356	356	356	---	---
Total, Black Lung Disability Trust Fund	1,035,000	1,043,000	1,043,000	+8,000	---
Total, Employment Standards Administration	2,081,157	2,046,827	2,046,827	-34,330	---
Federal Funds	2,079,141	2,044,771	2,044,771	-34,370	---
Current year	1,982,141	1,956,771	1,956,771	-25,370	---
FY 2005	97,000	88,000	88,000	-9,000	---
Trust Funds	2,016	2,056	2,056	+40	---
OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION					
SALARIES AND EXPENSES					
Safety and Health Standards	16,014	14,497	14,497	-1,517	---
Federal Enforcement	162,973	165,281	165,281	+2,308	---
State Programs	90,547	91,747	91,747	+1,200	---
Technical Support	20,102	21,721	21,721	+1,619	---
Compliance Assistance:					
Federal Assistance	61,321	67,447	67,447	+6,126	---
State Consultation Grants	53,204	52,521	52,521	-683	---
Training Grants	11,102	4,000	4,000	-7,102	---
Subtotal, Compliance Assistance	125,627	123,968	123,968	-1,659	---
Safety and Health Statistics	25,894	22,369	22,369	-3,525	---
Executive Direction and Administration	9,153	10,425	10,425	+1,272	---
Total, OSHA	450,310	450,008	450,008	-302	---
MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION					
SALARIES AND EXPENSES					
Coal Enforcement	118,877	113,424	113,424	-5,453	---
Metal/Non-Metal Enforcement	63,495	66,377	66,377	+2,882	---
Standards Development	2,363	2,301	2,301	-62	---
Assessments	4,854	4,125	4,125	-729	---
Educational Policy and Development	27,733	30,536	30,536	+2,803	---
Technical Support	28,489	24,691	24,691	-3,798	---
Program evaluation and information resources (PEIR)	---	14,168	14,168	+14,168	---
Program Administration	17,210	11,145	11,145	-6,065	---
Mine Mapping	9,935	---	---	-9,935	---
Total, Mine Safety and Health Administration	272,956	266,767	266,767	-6,189	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS					
SALARIES AND EXPENSES					
Employment and Unemployment Statistics	147,330	149,605	149,605	+2,275	---
Labor Market Information (Trust Funds)	71,561	75,110	75,110	+3,549	---
Prices and Cost of Living	159,671	167,602	167,602	+7,931	---
Compensation and Working Conditions	75,925	80,169	80,169	+4,244	---
Productivity and Technology	9,860	10,404	10,404	+544	---
Executive Direction and Staff Services	27,886	29,372	29,372	+1,486	---
Total, Bureau of Labor Statistics	492,233	512,262	512,262	+20,029	---
Federal Funds	420,672	437,152	437,152	+16,480	---
Trust Funds	71,561	75,110	75,110	+3,549	---
OFFICE OF DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT POLICY					
Office of Disability Employment Policy	47,178	47,333	47,333	+155	---
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT					
SALARIES AND EXPENSES					
Executive Direction	26,296	28,260	28,260	+1,964	---
Departmental IT Crosscut	54,642	48,565	48,565	-6,077	---
Departmental Management Crosscut	---	23,500	---	---	-23,500
Legal Services	77,175	81,975	81,975	+4,800	---
Trust Funds	308	317	317	+9	---
International Labor Affairs	147,053	12,270	12,270	-134,783	---
Administration and Management	33,673	32,391	34,391	+718	+2,000
Adjudication	25,306	26,315	26,315	+1,009	---
Women's Bureau	9,608	8,626	9,608	---	+982
Civil Rights Activities	5,930	6,158	6,158	+228	---
Chief Financial Officer	7,850	5,159	5,159	-2,691	---
Total, Salaries and expenses	387,841	273,536	253,018	-134,823	-20,518
Federal Funds	387,533	273,219	252,701	-134,832	-20,518
Trust Funds	308	317	317	+9	---
VETERANS EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING					
State Administration:					
Grants	---	162,415	162,415	+162,415	---
Disabled Veterans Outreach Program	82,078	---	---	-82,078	---
Local Veterans Employment Program	77,744	---	---	-77,744	---
Subtotal, State Administration	159,822	162,415	162,415	+2,593	---
Federal Administration	27,489	29,028	29,028	+1,539	---
National Veterans Training Institute	---	2,000	2,000	+2,000	---
Homeless Veterans Program	18,131	19,000	19,000	+869	---
Veterans Workforce Investment Programs	7,377	7,550	7,550	+173	---
Total, Veterans Employment and Training	212,819	219,993	219,993	+7,174	---
Federal Funds	25,508	26,550	26,550	+1,042	---
Trust Funds	187,311	193,443	193,443	+6,132	---
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL					
Program Activities	56,291	60,896	60,896	+4,605	---
Trust Funds	5,561	5,899	5,899	+338	---
Total, Office of the Inspector General	61,852	66,795	66,795	+4,943	---
Federal funds	56,291	60,896	60,896	+4,605	---
Trust funds	5,561	5,899	5,899	+338	---
Total, Departmental Management	662,512	560,324	539,806	-122,706	-20,518
Federal Funds	469,332	360,665	340,147	-129,185	-20,518
Trust Funds	193,180	199,659	199,659	+6,479	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
WORKING CAPITAL FUND					
Working capital fund	---	20,000	18,000	+18,000	-2,000
Total, Title I, Department of Labor	14,983,153	15,076,213	15,136,308	+153,155	+60,095
Federal Funds	11,196,694	11,212,963	11,313,566	+116,872	+100,603
Current Year	(8,636,694)	(8,661,963)	(8,762,566)	(+125,872)	(+100,603)
FY 2005	(2,560,000)	(2,551,000)	(2,551,000)	(-9,000)	---
Trust Funds	3,786,459	3,863,250	3,822,742	+36,283	-40,508

Title I Footnotes:
1/ Two year availability.
2/ Transferred from SSA to DOL (P.L. 107-275).

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES					
Community health centers	1,504,806	1,627,164	1,627,164	+122,358	---
National Health Service Corps:					
Field placements	45,948	45,305	45,948	---	+643
Recruitment	125,140	167,542	125,140	---	-42,402
Subtotal, National Health Service Corps	171,088	212,847	171,088	---	-41,759
Health Professions					
Training for Diversity:					
Centers of excellence	34,088	---	29,718	-4,370	+29,718
Health careers opportunity program	36,152	---	31,548	-4,604	+31,548
Faculty loan repayment	1,321	---	1,171	-150	+1,171
Scholarships for disadvantaged students	47,795	9,900	42,374	-5,421	+32,474
Subtotal, Training for Diversity	119,356	9,900	104,811	-14,545	+94,911
Training in Primary Care Medicine and Dentistry	92,432	---	79,249	-13,183	+79,249
Interdisciplinary Community-Based Linkages:					
Area health education centers	33,141	---	29,382	-3,759	+29,382
Health education and training centers	4,371	---	3,875	-496	+3,875
Allied health and other disciplines	11,922	---	11,922	---	+11,922
Geriatric programs	27,818	---	32,000	+4,182	+32,000
Quentin N. Burdick pgm for rural training	6,954	---	6,165	-789	+6,165
Subtotal, Interdisciplinary Comm. Linkages	84,206	---	83,344	-862	+83,344
Health Professions Workforce Info & Analysis	819	1,000	726	-93	-274
Public Health Workforce Development:					
Public health, preventive med. & dental pgms	10,405	---	9,225	-1,180	+9,225
Health administration programs	1,222	---	1,085	-137	+1,085
Subtotal, Public Health Workforce Development	11,627	---	10,310	-1,317	+10,310
Nursing Programs:					
Advanced Education Nursing	50,174	26,548	50,174	---	+23,626
Nurse education, practice, and retention	26,824	24,202	26,824	---	+2,622
Nursing workforce diversity	9,935	20,564	9,935	---	-10,629
Loan repayment and scholarship program	19,870	26,900	19,870	---	-7,030
Comprehensive geriatric education	2,980	---	2,980	---	+2,980
Nursing faculty loan program	2,980	---	2,980	---	+2,980
Subtotal, Nursing programs	112,763	98,214	112,763	---	+14,549
Subtotal, Health Professions	421,203	109,114	391,203	-30,000	+282,089
Other HRSA Programs:					
Hansen's Disease Services	18,024	17,570	17,570	-454	---
Maternal & Child Health Block Grant	729,965	750,831	732,965	+3,000	-17,866
Abstinence Education	54,642	73,044	65,000	+10,358	-8,044
Healthy Start	98,346	98,729	98,346	---	-383
Universal Newborn Hearing	9,935	---	9,935	---	+9,935
Organ Transplantation	24,828	24,924	24,828	---	-96
Bone Marrow Program	21,891	22,013	22,891	+1,000	+878
Rural outreach grants	58,410	37,752	57,410	-1,000	+19,658
Rural Health Research	10,630	5,984	8,000	-2,630	+2,016
Telehealth	27,686	5,594	27,686	---	+22,092
Rural Hospital Flexibility Grants	39,740	29,921	39,740	---	+9,819
Rural Access to Emergency Devices	12,419	2,009	12,419	---	+10,410
State Offices of Rural Health	8,445	3,990	4,000	-4,445	+10
Denali Commission	27,321	---	---	-27,321	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Emergency medical services for children	19,373	---	19,373	---	+19,373
Poison control	22,354	---	22,354	---	+22,354
Traumatic Brain Injury	9,438	7,479	9,438	---	+1,959
Black lung clinics	5,961	6,000	5,961	---	-39
Trauma Care	3,476	---	3,476	---	+3,476
Payment to Hawaii, treatment of Hansen's	2,032	2,045	2,032	---	-13
Other HRSA programs - Current Year	1,204,916	1,087,885	1,183,424	-21,492	+95,539
Ryan White AIDS Programs:					
Emergency Assistance	618,693	618,881	618,693	---	-188
Comprehensive Care Programs	1,053,393	1,077,027	1,091,344	+37,951	+14,317
AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP) (NA)	(714,326)	(739,000)	(753,317)	(+38,991)	(+14,317)
Early Intervention Program	198,374	193,981	193,981	-4,393	---
Pediatric HIV/AIDS	73,551	70,917	70,917	-2,634	---
AIDS Dental Services	13,405	13,484	13,405	---	-79
Education and Training Centers	35,549	35,259	35,259	-290	---
Subtotal, Ryan White AIDS programs	1,992,965	2,009,549	2,023,599	+30,634	+14,050
Evaluation Tap Funding (NA)	(25,000)	---	---	(-25,000)	---
Subtotal, Ryan White AIDs program level	2,017,965	2,009,549	2,023,599	+5,634	+14,050
Family Planning	273,350	264,808	273,350	---	+8,542
Children's Hospitals Graduate Medical Educ	290,102	199,258	305,000	+14,898	+105,742
Health Care and Other Facilities	294,700	---	---	-294,700	---
Buildings and Facilities	248	250	248	---	-2
Radiation Exposure Compensation Act	1,987	4,006	1,987	---	-2,019
National Practitioner Data Bank	19,500	17,000	19,500	---	+2,500
User Fees	-19,500	-17,000	-19,500	---	-2,500
Health Care Integrity and Protection Data Bank	5,600	4,000	5,600	---	+1,600
User Fees	-5,600	-4,000	-5,600	---	-1,600
Community Access Program	104,317	---	104,317	---	+104,317
State Planning Grants for Health Care Access	14,902	---	14,902	---	+14,902
Program Management	155,974	151,115	155,974	---	+4,859
Total, Health resources and services	6,430,558	5,665,996	6,252,256	-178,302	+586,260
Total, Health resources & services program level	(6,455,558)	(5,665,996)	(6,252,256)	(-203,302)	(+586,260)
HEALTH EDUCATION ASSISTANCE LOANS (HEAL) PROGRAM:					
Liquidating account	(7,000)	(4,000)	(7,000)	---	(+3,000)
Program management	3,889	3,389	3,389	-500	---
Total, HEAL	3,889	3,389	3,389	-500	---
VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION PROGRAM TRUST FUND:					
Post-FY 1988 claims	85,918	66,000	66,000	-19,918	---
HRSA administration	2,972	2,991	3,472	+500	+481
Total, Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund	88,890	68,991	69,472	-19,418	+481
Total, Health Resources and Services Admin	6,523,337	5,738,376	6,325,117	-198,220	+586,741
Total, HRSA program level	(6,555,337)	(5,742,376)	(6,332,117)	(-223,220)	(+589,741)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL					
Birth Defects/Developmental Disabilities/Disability and Health	98,040	87,462	106,339	+8,299	+18,877
Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion	789,972	834,047	862,011	+72,039	+27,964
Environmental Health	182,829	150,227	184,829	+2,000	+34,602
Epidemic Services and Response	77,494	76,158	82,494	+5,000	+6,336
Health Statistics	---	72,639	112,673	+112,673	+40,034
Evaluation Tap Funding	(125,899)	(51,982)	(13,226)	(-112,673)	(-38,756)
Subtotal, Program level	125,899	124,621	125,899	---	+1,278
HIV/AIDS, STD and TB Prevention	1,186,388	1,281,176	1,247,388	+61,000	-33,788
Immunization	636,586	620,506	650,586	+14,000	+30,080
Evaluation Tap Funding	(14,000)	---	---	(-14,000)	---
Subtotal, Program level	650,586	620,506	650,586	---	+30,080
Infectious Disease Control	359,225	331,640	382,226	+23,001	+50,586
Injury Prevention and Control	148,414	144,796	152,414	+4,000	+7,618
Occupational Safety and Health 1/	231,485	246,329	273,385	+41,900	+27,056
Evaluation Tap Funding	(41,900)	---	---	(-41,900)	---
Subtotal, Program level	273,385	246,329	273,385	---	+27,056
Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant	134,089	134,966	134,089	---	-877
Public Health Improvement	124,434	113,677	144,530	+20,096	+30,853
Evaluation Tap Funding	(28,600)	---	---	(-28,600)	---
Subtotal, Program level	153,034	113,677	144,530	-8,504	+30,853
Buildings and Facilities	266,258	114,000	206,000	-60,258	+92,000
Office of the Director	49,426	59,707	49,707	+281	-10,000
Total, Centers for Disease Control	4,284,640	4,267,330	4,588,671	+304,031	+321,341
Evaluation Tap Funding (NA)	(210,399)	(51,982)	(13,226)	(-197,173)	(-38,756)
Total, Centers for Disease Control program level	(4,495,039)	(4,319,312)	(4,601,897)	(+106,858)	(+282,585)
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH					
National Cancer Institute	4,592,348	4,770,519	4,770,519	+178,171	---
National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute	2,793,733	2,867,995	2,867,995	+74,262	---
National Institute of Dental & Craniofacial Research	371,636	382,396	382,396	+10,760	---
National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases	1,622,730	1,670,007	1,670,007	+47,277	---
Juvenile diabetes	(100,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(+50,000)	---
Subtotal, NIDDK	1,722,730	1,820,007	1,820,007	+97,277	---
National Institute of Neurological Disorders & Stroke	1,456,476	1,468,926	1,468,926	+12,450	---
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases	3,606,139	4,235,255	4,235,255	+629,116	---
Global HIV/AIDS Fund Transfer 2/	100,000	100,000	100,000	---	---
Subtotal, NIAID	3,706,139	4,335,255	4,335,255	+629,116	---
National Institute of General Medical Sciences	1,847,000	1,923,133	1,923,133	+76,133	---
National Institute of Child Health & Human Development	1,205,927	1,245,371	1,245,371	+39,444	---
National Eye Institute	633,148	648,299	648,299	+15,151	---
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	614,239	630,774	630,774	+16,535	---
National Institute on Aging	993,598	994,411	994,411	+813	---
National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases	486,143	502,778	502,778	+16,635	---
National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders	370,382	380,377	380,377	+9,995	---
National Institute of Nursing Research	130,584	134,579	134,579	+3,995	---
National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism	416,051	430,121	430,121	+14,070	---
National Institute on Drug Abuse	961,721	995,614	995,614	+33,893	---
National Institute of Mental Health	1,341,014	1,382,114	1,382,114	+41,100	---
National Human Genome Research Institute	464,995	478,072	478,072	+13,077	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering	278,279	282,109	282,109	+3,830	---
National Center for Research Resources	1,138,821	1,053,926	1,053,926	-84,895	---
National Center for Complementary and Alternative Medicine	113,407	116,202	116,202	+2,795	---
National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities	185,714	192,724	192,724	+7,010	---
John E. Fogarty International Center	63,465	64,266	64,266	+801	---
National Library of Medicine	300,135	316,040	316,040	+15,905	---
Evaluation Tap Funding	(8,200)	---	---	(-8,200)	---
Subtotal, NLM	308,335	316,040	316,040	+7,705	---
Office of the Director	266,232	317,983	317,983	+51,751	---
Buildings and Facilities	628,687	80,000	80,000	-548,687	---
Total, N.I.H. appropriations	26,982,604	27,663,991	27,663,991	+681,387	---
Global HIV/AIDS Fund Transfer	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	---	---
Evaluation Tap Funding	(8,200)	---	---	(-8,200)	---
Total, N.I.H., Program Level	(26,890,804)	(27,563,991)	(27,563,991)	(+673,187)	---
SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES					
Mental Health:					
Programs of Regional and National Significance	244,443	211,757	237,000	-7,443	+25,243
Mental Health Performance Partnership	437,140	433,000	435,000	-2,140	+2,000
Children's Mental Health	98,052	106,694	108,000	+9,948	+1,306
Grants to States for the Homeless (PATH)	43,073	50,055	50,055	+6,982	---
Protection and Advocacy	33,779	32,500	33,870	+91	+1,370
Subtotal, Mental Health	856,487	834,006	863,925	+7,438	+29,919
Substance Abuse Treatment:					
Programs of Regional and National Significance	317,278	556,816	417,278	+100,000	-139,538
Substance Abuse Performance Partnership	1,691,732	1,785,000	1,774,538	+82,806	-10,462
Evaluation Tap Funding	(62,200)	---	---	(-62,200)	---
Subtotal, Substance Abuse Treatment	2,009,010	2,341,816	2,191,816	+182,806	-150,000
Subtotal, Program level	2,071,210	2,341,816	2,191,816	+120,606	-150,000
Substance Abuse Prevention:					
Programs of Regional and National Significance	197,111	148,186	198,000	+889	+49,814
Program Management and Buildings and Facilities	73,983	69,307	75,259	+1,276	+5,952
Evaluation Tap funding (NA)	(12,000)	(16,000)	(16,000)	(+4,000)	---
Subtotal, Program level	85,983	85,307	91,259	+5,276	+5,952
St. Elizabeths	949	---	---	-949	---
Total, Substance Abuse and Mental Health	3,137,540	3,393,315	3,329,000	+191,460	-64,315
Evaluation Tap funding	(74,200)	(16,000)	(16,000)	(-58,200)	---
Total, SAMHS program level	(3,211,740)	(3,409,315)	(3,345,000)	(+133,260)	(-64,315)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
AGENCY FOR HEALTHCARE RESEARCH AND QUALITY					
Research on Health Costs, Quality, and Outcomes:					
Federal Funds	---	---	---	---	---
Evaluation Tap funding (NA)	(247,695)	(221,000)	(245,695)	(-2,000)	(+24,695)
Health Coverage Data Improvement (CPS)	---	(10,000)	---	---	(-10,000)
Portion for reducing medical errors (non-add)	(55,000)	(84,000)	(75,000)	(+20,000)	(-9,000)
Subtotal including Evaluation Tap funds	(247,695)	(221,000)	(245,695)	(-2,000)	(+24,695)
Health Insurance and Expenditure Surveys:					
Federal Funds	---	---	---	---	---
Evaluation Tap funding (NA)	(53,300)	(55,300)	(55,300)	(+2,000)	---
Program Support	---	---	---	---	---
Evaluation Tap funding (NA)	(2,700)	(2,700)	(2,700)	---	---
Total, AHRQ	(303,695)	(279,000)	(303,695)	---	(+24,695)
Federal Funds	---	---	---	---	---
Evaluation Tap funding (NA)	(303,695)	(279,000)	(303,695)	---	(+24,695)
Total, Public Health Service appropriation	40,928,121	41,063,012	41,906,779	+978,658	+843,767
Total, Public Health Service program level	(41,456,615)	(41,313,994)	(42,146,700)	(+690,085)	(+832,706)
CENTER FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES					
GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAID					
Medicaid current law benefits	148,726,168	166,706,067	172,706,067	+23,979,899	+6,000,000
State and local administration	9,142,049	9,067,320	9,067,320	-74,729	---
Vaccines for Children	823,938	980,196	980,196	+156,258	---
Subtotal, Medicaid program level	158,692,155	176,753,583	182,753,583	+24,061,428	+6,000,000
Less funds advanced in prior year	-46,601,937	-51,861,386	-51,861,386	-5,259,449	---
Total, Grants to States for medicaid	112,090,218	124,892,197	130,892,197	+18,801,979	+6,000,000
New advance, 1st quarter	51,861,386	58,416,275	58,416,275	+6,554,889	---
PAYMENTS TO HEALTH CARE TRUST FUNDS					
Supplemental medical insurance	80,905,000	94,518,000	94,518,000	+13,613,000	---
Hospital insurance for the uninsured	225,000	197,000	197,000	-28,000	---
Federal uninsured payment	168,000	168,000	168,000	---	---
Program management	164,700	201,100	201,100	+36,400	---
Total, Payments to Trust Funds, current law	81,462,700	95,084,100	95,084,100	+13,621,400	---
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT					
Research, Demonstration, Evaluation:					
Regular Program	73,712	63,400	27,918	-45,794	-35,482
Medicare Operations	1,866,680	1,776,889	1,776,889	+110,209	---
H.R. 3103 funding (NA)	(720,000)	(720,000)	(720,000)	---	---
Subtotal, Medicare Operations program level	(2,386,680)	(2,496,889)	(2,496,889)	(+110,209)	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Revitalization plan	---	65,000	65,000	+65,000	---
State Survey and Certification	252,743	247,647	247,647	-5,096	---
Federal Administration	571,756	580,571	580,571	+8,815	---
Total, Program management, Limitation on new BA.	2,564,891	2,733,507	2,698,025	+133,134	-35,482
Total, Program management, program level	(3,284,891)	(3,453,507)	(3,418,025)	(+133,134)	(-35,482)
Total, Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services	247,979,195	281,126,079	287,090,597	+39,111,402	+5,964,518
Federal funds	245,414,304	278,392,572	284,392,572	+38,978,268	+6,000,000
Current year	(193,552,918)	(219,976,297)	(225,976,297)	(+32,423,379)	(+6,000,000)
New advance, 1st quarter, FY 2005	(51,861,386)	(58,416,275)	(58,416,275)	(+6,554,889)	---
Trust Funds	2,564,891	2,733,507	2,698,025	+133,134	-35,482
ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES					
FAMILY SUPPORT PAYMENTS TO STATES					
Payments to territories	23,000	23,000	23,000	---	---
Repatriation	1,000	1,000	1,000	---	---
Subtotal, Welfare payments	24,000	24,000	24,000	---	---
Child Support Enforcement:					
State and local administration	3,541,800	4,035,270	4,035,270	+493,470	---
Federal incentive payments	461,000	454,000	454,000	-7,000	---
Hold Harmless payments	---	---	---	---	---
Access and visitation	10,000	12,000	12,000	+2,000	---
Subtotal, Child Support Enforcement	4,012,800	4,501,270	4,501,270	+488,470	---
Total, Payments, FY 2004 program level	4,036,800	4,525,270	4,525,270	+488,470	---
Less funds advanced in previous years	-1,100,000	-1,100,000	-1,100,000	---	---
Total, Payments, current request	2,936,800	3,425,270	3,425,270	+488,470	---
Plus New advance, 1st quarter, FY 2005	1,100,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	+100,000	---
Total, Payments	4,036,800	4,625,270	4,625,270	+588,470	---
LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE					
Formula grants	1,688,950	1,700,000	1,700,000	+11,050	---
Emergency allocation:					
Non-emergency funding	---	300,000	100,000	+100,000	-200,000
Contingent emergency funding	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Low income home energy assistance	1,688,950	2,000,000	1,800,000	+111,050	-200,000
	---	---	---	---	---
REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE					
Transitional and Medical Services	219,853	200,193	200,193	-19,660	---
Victims of Trafficking	9,935	10,000	10,000	+65	---
Social Services	150,139	153,121	153,121	+2,982	---
Preventive Health	4,804	4,835	4,835	+31	---
Targeted Assistance	49,155	49,477	49,477	+322	---
Unaccompanied minors	34,227	34,000	34,227	---	+227
Victims of Torture	9,935	10,000	10,000	+65	---
Total, Refugee and entrant assistance	478,048	461,626	461,853	-16,195	+227
CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT	2,086,344	2,099,729	2,099,729	+13,385	---
SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT (TITLE XX)	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	---	---
DISABLED VOTER SERVICES	15,000	---	15,000	---	+15,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SERVICES PROGRAMS					
Programs for Children, Youth and Families:					
Head Start, current funded	5,267,533	5,415,570	5,415,570	+148,037	---
Advance from prior year	(1,400,000)	(1,400,000)	(1,400,000)	---	---
FY 2005	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	---	---
Subtotal, Head Start, program level	6,667,533	6,815,570	6,815,570	+148,037	---
Consolidated Runaway, Homeless Youth Prog	89,978	88,043	88,043	-1,935	---
Maternity Group Homes	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
Prevention grants to reduce abuse of runaway youth	15,399	14,999	14,999	-400	---
Child Abuse State Grants	21,870	22,013	22,013	+143	---
Child Abuse Discretionary Activities	33,845	26,301	26,301	-7,544	---
Abandoned Infants Assistance	12,126	12,086	12,086	-40	---
Child Welfare Services	290,088	291,986	291,986	+1,898	---
Child Welfare Training	7,449	7,470	7,470	+21	---
Adoption Opportunities	27,227	27,343	27,343	+116	---
Adoption Incentive (no cap adjustment)	42,720	43,000	43,000	+280	---
Adoption Awareness	12,822	12,906	12,906	+84	---
Compassion Capital Fund	34,772	100,000	50,000	+15,228	-50,000
Social Services and Income Maintenance Research	28,749	5,982	5,982	-22,767	---
Evaluation tap funding	(6,000)	---	---	(-6,000)	---
Subtotal, Program level	34,749	5,982	5,982	-28,767	---
Community Based Resource Centers	33,200	33,403	33,403	+203	---
Developmental Disabilities Program:					
State Councils	71,135	69,800	71,500	+365	+1,700
Protection and Advocacy	36,263	35,000	36,500	+237	+1,500
Developmental Disabilities Special Projects	12,403	11,642	12,500	+97	+858
Developmental Disabilities University Affiliated	24,962	24,000	25,000	+38	+1,000
Subtotal, Developmental disabilities	144,763	140,442	145,500	+737	+5,058
Native American Programs	45,457	45,119	45,119	-338	---
Community Services:					
Grants to States for Community Services	645,762	494,964	494,964	-150,798	---
Community Initiative Program:					
Economic Development	32,546	32,436	32,436	-110	---
Individual Development Account Initiative	24,828	24,912	24,912	+84	---
Rural Community Facilities	7,203	---	7,250	+47	+7,250
Subtotal, Community Initiative Program	64,577	57,348	64,598	+21	+7,250
National Youth Sports	16,889	---	18,000	+1,111	+18,000
Community Food and Nutrition	7,281	---	---	-7,281	---
Subtotal, Community Services	734,509	552,312	577,562	-156,947	+25,250
Domestic Violence Hotline	2,562	3,000	3,000	+438	---
Battered Women's Shelters	126,403	124,423	126,403	---	+1,980
Early Learning Fund	33,779	---	---	-33,779	---
Faith-Based Center	1,490	1,400	1,400	-90	---
Mentoring Children of Prisoners	9,935	50,000	25,000	+15,065	-25,000
Independent Living Training Vouchers	41,727	60,000	45,000	+3,273	-15,000
Promoting Responsible Fatherhood	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
Program Direction	171,873	179,584	179,584	+7,711	---
Total, Children and Families Services Programs	8,630,276	8,687,382	8,599,670	-30,606	-87,712
Current Year	(7,230,276)	(7,287,382)	(7,199,670)	(-30,606)	(-87,712)
FY 2005	(1,400,000)	(1,400,000)	(1,400,000)	---	---
Evaluation Tap funding	(6,000)	---	---	(-6,000)	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
PROMOTING SAFE AND STABLE FAMILIES	305,000	305,000	305,000	---	---
Discretionary Funds	99,350	199,978	100,000	+650	-99,978
PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION					
Foster Care	4,884,500	4,974,200	4,974,200	+89,700	---
Adoption Assistance	1,584,500	1,699,700	1,699,700	+115,200	---
Independent living	140,000	140,000	140,000	---	---
Total, Payments to States	6,609,000	6,813,900	6,813,900	+204,900	---
Less Advances from Prior Year	-1,754,000	-1,745,600	-1,745,600	+8,400	---
Total, payments, current request	4,855,000	5,068,300	5,068,300	+213,300	---
New Advance, 1st quarter	1,745,600	1,767,700	1,767,700	+22,100	---
Total, Administration for Children & Families	25,640,368	26,914,985	26,542,522	+902,154	-372,463
Current year	(21,394,768)	(22,547,285)	(22,174,822)	(+780,054)	(-372,463)
FY 2005	(4,245,600)	(4,367,700)	(4,367,700)	(+122,100)	---
ADMINISTRATION ON AGING					
Grants to States:					
Supportive Services and Centers	355,673	357,000	357,000	+1,327	---
Preventive Health	21,919	21,562	21,919	---	+357
Title VII	18,559	17,681	18,559	---	+878
Family Caregivers	149,025	141,500	162,000	+12,975	+20,500
Native American Caregivers Support	6,209	---	6,500	+291	+6,500
Subtotal, Caregivers	155,234	141,500	168,500	+13,266	+27,000
Nutrition:					
Congregate Meals	384,592	390,000	390,000	+5,408	---
Home Delivered Meals	180,985	178,500	180,985	---	+2,485
Nutrition Services Incentive Program	148,697	149,670	149,670	+973	---
Subtotal, Nutrition	714,274	718,170	720,655	+6,381	+2,485
Subtotal, Grants to States	1,265,659	1,255,913	1,286,633	+20,974	+30,720
Grants to Native Americans	27,495	25,729	25,729	-1,766	---
Aging Research, Training and Special Projects	40,258	27,837	30,837	-9,421	+3,000
Aging Network Support Activities	2,364	2,379	2,379	+15	---
Alzheimer's Initiative	13,412	11,500	11,500	-1,912	---
White House Conference on Aging	---	2,842	2,842	+2,842	---
Program Administration	17,869	17,501	17,501	-368	---
Total, Administration on Aging	1,367,057	1,343,701	1,377,421	+10,364	+33,720
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
GENERAL DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT:					
Federal Funds	159,811	172,541	167,300	+7,489	-5,241
Trust Funds	5,813	5,851	5,813	---	-38
Subtotal	(165,624)	(178,392)	(173,113)	(+7,489)	(-5,279)
Evaluation tap funding (ASPE) (NA)	(21,552)	(21,552)	(21,552)	---	---
Adolescent Family Life (Title XX)	30,922	31,241	30,922	---	-319
Minority health	56,224	47,010	48,329	-7,895	+1,319
Office of women's health	28,658	28,908	28,658	---	-250
Minority HIV/AIDS	49,675	50,000	49,675	---	-325
IT Security and Innovation Fund	19,870	18,400	18,400	-1,470	---
Total, General Departmental Management	350,973	353,951	349,097	-1,876	-4,854
Federal Funds	345,160	348,100	343,284	-1,876	-4,816
Trust Funds	5,813	5,851	5,813	---	-38

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
	---	---	---	---	---
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL:					
Federal Funds	36,808	39,497	39,497	+2,689	---
HIPAA funding (NA)	(160,000)	(160,000)	(160,000)	---	---
Total, Inspector General program level	(196,808)	(199,497)	(199,497)	(+2,689)	---
OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS:					
Federal Funds	30,131	30,936	30,936	+805	---
Trust Funds	3,292	3,314	3,314	+22	---
Total, Office for Civil Rights	33,423	34,250	34,250	+827	---
POLICY RESEARCH:					
Federal Funds	2,483	2,499	2,483	---	-16
Evaluation Tap funding (NA)	(18,000)	(21,000)	(18,000)	---	(-3,000)
Total, Policy Research	20,483	23,499	20,483	---	-3,016
MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS					
Retirement payments	218,984	234,000	234,000	+15,016	---
Survivors benefits	14,102	15,001	15,001	+899	---
Dependents' medical care	76,931	54,391	80,867	+3,936	+26,476
Military services credits	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Medical benefits for Com Officers (indef)	310,017	303,392	329,868	+19,851	+26,476
Comm. Corps Medicare Elig. Healthcare Accrual	---	12,973	---	---	-12,973
Total, Medical benefits for comm. officers	310,017	316,365	329,868	+19,851	+13,503
PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICE EMERGENCY FUND					
HRSA Homeland security activities	584,451	618,173	545,870	-38,581	-72,303
CDC Homeland security activities	1,235,424	1,116,156	1,116,156	-119,268	---
AHRQ Homeland security activities	4,967	---	---	-4,967	---
Office of the Secretary Homeland sercurity activities	62,405	61,820	64,820	+2,415	+3,000
Other PHSSEF Homeland security activities	---	100,000	50,000	+50,000	-50,000
Total, PHSSEF	1,887,247	1,896,149	1,776,846	-110,401	-119,303
Total, Office of the Secretary	2,620,951	2,642,711	2,532,041	-88,910	-110,670
Federal Funds	2,611,846	2,633,546	2,522,914	-88,932	-110,632
Trust Funds	9,105	9,165	9,127	+22	-38
Total, Title II, Dept of Health & Human Services	318,535,692	353,090,488	359,449,360	+40,913,668	+6,358,872
Federal Funds	315,961,696	350,347,816	356,742,208	+40,780,512	+6,394,392
Current year	(259,854,710)	(287,563,841)	(293,958,233)	(+34,103,523)	(+6,394,392)
FY 2005	(56,106,986)	(62,783,975)	(62,783,975)	(+6,676,989)	---
Trust Funds	2,573,996	2,742,672	2,707,152	+133,156	-35,520

Title II Footnotes:

1/ Includes Mine Safety and Health.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION					
EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED					
Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)					
Basic Grants					
Advance from prior year 1/	(4,011,272)	(4,255,272)	(2,011,272)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,244,000)
Forward funded	2,848,533	5,158,199	5,158,199	+2,309,666	---
Current funded	3,477	3,500	3,500	+23	---
Subtotal, Basic grants current year approp.	2,852,010	5,161,699	5,161,699	+2,309,689	---
Subtotal, Basic grants total funds available	(6,863,282)	(9,416,971)	(7,172,971)	(+309,689)	(-2,244,000)
Basic Grants FY 2005 Advance	4,255,272	2,011,272	2,011,272	-2,244,000	---
Subtotal, Basic grants, program level	7,107,282	7,172,971	7,172,971	+65,689	---
Concentration Grants					
Advance from prior year	(1,365,031)	(1,365,031)	(1,365,031)	---	---
FY 2005 Advance	1,365,031	1,365,031	1,365,031	---	---
Subtotal, Concentration Grants program level	1,365,031	1,365,031	1,365,031	---	---
Targeted Grants					
Advance from prior year	(1,018,499)	(1,670,239)	(1,670,239)	(+651,740)	---
FY 2005 Advance	1,670,239	3,018,499	3,018,499	+1,348,260	---
Subtotal, Targeted Grants program level	1,670,239	3,018,499	3,018,499	+1,348,260	---
Education Finance Incentive Grants					
Advance from prior year	(793,499)	(1,541,759)	(1,541,759)	(+748,260)	---
FY 2005 Advance	1,541,759	793,499	793,499	-748,260	---
Subtotal, Education Finance Incentive Grants	1,541,759	793,499	793,499	-748,260	---
Subtotal, Grants to LEAs, program level	11,684,311	12,350,000	12,350,000	+665,689	---
Even Start	248,375	175,000	250,000	+1,625	+75,000
Reading First:					
State Grants (forward funded)	798,500	855,000	855,000	+56,500	---
Advance from prior year	(195,000)	(195,000)	(195,000)	---	---
FY 2005 Advance	195,000	195,000	195,000	---	---
Subtotal, Reading First State Grants	993,500	1,050,000	1,050,000	+56,500	---
Early Reading First	74,512	100,000	100,000	+25,488	---
Literacy through School Libraries	12,419	27,500	27,500	+15,081	---
State Agency Programs:					
Migrant	395,413	396,000	396,000	+587	---
Neglected and Delinquent/High Risk Youth	48,682	48,000	49,000	+318	+1,000
Subtotal, State Agency programs	444,095	444,000	445,000	+905	+1,000
Evaluation	8,842	9,500	9,500	+658	---
Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration	233,473	---	235,000	+1,527	+235,000
Migrant Education:					
High School Equivalency Program	23,347	13,000	24,000	+653	+11,000
College Assistance Migrant Program	15,399	15,000	16,000	+601	+1,000
Subtotal, Migrant Education	38,746	28,000	40,000	+1,254	+12,000
Total, Education for the disadvantaged	13,738,273	14,184,000	14,507,000	+768,727	+323,000
Current Year	(4,710,972)	(6,800,699)	(7,123,699)	(+2,412,727)	(+323,000)
FY 2005	(9,027,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(-1,644,000)	---
Subtotal, forward funded	(4,572,976)	(6,632,199)	(6,943,199)	(+2,370,223)	(+311,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
IMPACT AID					
Basic Support Payments	1,025,292	867,500	1,073,000	+47,708	+205,500
Payments for Children with Disabilities	50,668	40,000	50,668	---	+10,668
Facilities Maintenance (Sec. 8008)	7,948	8,000	7,948	---	-52
Construction (Sec. 8007)	44,708	45,000	44,708	---	-292
Payments for Federal Property (Sec. 8002)	59,610	55,000	62,000	+2,390	+7,000
Total, Impact aid	1,188,226	1,015,500	1,238,324	+50,098	+222,824
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS					
State Grants for Improving Teacher Quality	1,780,825	1,700,000	1,780,825	---	+80,825
Advance from prior year	(1,150,000)	(1,150,000)	(1,150,000)	---	---
FY 2005	1,150,000	1,150,000	1,150,000	---	---
Subtotal, State Grants for Improving Teacher Quality, program level	2,930,825	2,850,000	2,930,825	---	+80,825
Early Childhood Educator Professional Development	14,902	15,000	14,902	---	-98
Mathematics and Science Partnerships	100,344	12,500	150,000	+49,656	+137,500
State Grants for Innovative Education (Education Block Grant)	97,498	100,000	50,000	-47,498	-50,000
Advance from prior year	(285,000)	(285,000)	(285,000)	---	---
FY 2005	285,000	285,000	285,000	---	---
Subtotal, Education Block Grant, program level	382,498	385,000	335,000	-47,498	-50,000
Educational Technology:					
Educational Technology State Grants	695,947	700,500	695,947	---	-4,553
Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology	62,094	---	---	-62,094	---
Subtotal, Educational Technology	758,041	700,500	695,947	-62,094	-4,553
21st Century Community Learning Centers	993,500	600,000	1,000,000	+6,500	+400,000
State Assessments/Enhanced Assessment Instruments	384,484	390,000	390,000	+5,516	---
Javits gifted talented education	11,177	---	11,177	---	+11,177
Foreign language assistance	16,144	---	---	-16,144	---
Education for Homeless Children & Youth	54,642	50,000	60,000	+5,358	+10,000
Training and Advisory Services (Civil Rights)	7,286	7,334	7,286	---	-48
Education for Native Hawaiians	30,798	18,300	18,300	-12,498	---
Alaska Native Education Equity	30,798	14,200	14,200	-16,598	---
Rural Education	167,653	---	170,000	+2,347	+170,000
Total, School improvement programs	5,883,092	5,042,834	5,797,637	-85,455	+754,803
Current Year	(4,448,092)	(3,607,834)	(4,362,637)	(-85,455)	(+754,803)
FY 2005	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	---	---
Subtotal, forward funded	(4,274,893)	(3,553,000)	(4,296,772)	(+21,879)	(+743,772)
INDIAN EDUCATION					
Grants to Local Educational Agencies	96,502	97,133	96,502	---	-631
Federal Programs:					
Special Programs for Indian Children	19,870	20,000	19,870	---	-130
National Activities	5,201	5,235	5,201	---	-34
Subtotal, Federal Programs	25,071	25,235	25,071	---	-164
Total, Indian Education	121,573	122,368	121,573	---	-795
INOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT					
Troops-to-Teachers	28,812	25,000	20,000	-8,812	-5,000
Transition to Teaching	41,727	49,400	49,400	+7,673	---
National Writing Project	16,890	---	16,890	---	+16,890
Teaching of Traditional American History	99,350	100,000	50,000	-49,350	-50,000
School Leadership	12,419	---	12,419	---	+12,419
Advanced Credentialing	9,935	---	16,500	+6,565	+16,500

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Charter Schools Grants	198,700	220,000	220,000	+21,300	---
Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities	24,838	100,000	75,000	+50,162	-25,000
Voluntary Public School Choice	25,831	25,000	25,831	---	+831
Magnet Schools Assistance	109,285	110,000	109,285	---	-715
Choice Incentive Fund	---	75,000	---	---	-75,000
Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE):					
Current funded	398,133	59,000	91,284	-306,849	+32,284
Forward funded	74,513	---	74,513	---	+74,513
Subtotal, FIE	472,646	59,000	165,797	-306,849	+106,797
Ready to Learn	22,850	22,000	22,000	-850	---
Dropout Prevention Programs	10,929	---	---	-10,929	---
Ellender Fellowships/Close Up	1,490	---	1,490	---	+1,490
Advanced Placement Fees	23,347	22,000	23,347	---	+1,347
Total, Innovation and Improvement	1,099,049	807,400	807,959	-291,090	+559
Current Year	(1,099,049)	(807,400)	(807,959)	(-291,090)	(+559)
FY 2005	---	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, forward funded	(74,513)	---	(74,513)	---	(+74,513)
SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION					
Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities:					
State Grants, current funded	138,949	92,017	138,949	---	+46,932
Advance from prior year	(330,000)	(330,000)	(330,000)	---	---
FY 2005	330,000	330,000	330,000	---	---
State Grants, program level	468,949	422,017	468,949	---	+46,932
National Programs	155,180	172,233	155,180	---	-17,053
Community Service for Expelled or Susp'd Students	49,675	---	---	-49,675	---
Alcohol Abuse Reduction	24,838	---	---	-24,838	---
Mentoring Programs	17,386	100,000	50,000	+32,614	-50,000
Character education	24,838	25,000	24,838	---	-162
Elementary and Secondary School Counseling	32,289	---	32,289	---	+32,289
Carol E. White Physical Education for Progress	59,610	---	60,000	+390	+60,000
Civic Education	28,812	27,000	28,812	---	+1,812
State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders	23,348	---	---	-23,348	---
Physical Education Initiative	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
Total, Safe Schools and Citizenship Education	884,925	756,250	820,068	-64,857	+63,818
Current Year	(554,925)	(426,250)	(490,068)	(-64,857)	(+63,818)
FY 2005	(330,000)	(330,000)	(330,000)	---	---
Subtotal, forward funded	(188,624)	(92,017)	(138,949)	(-49,675)	(+46,932)
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION					
Current funded	194,726	665,000	124,972	-69,754	-540,028
Forward funded	490,789	---	560,543	+69,754	+560,543
Total, English Language Acquisition	685,515	665,000	685,515	---	+20,515
SPECIAL EDUCATION					
State Grants:					
Grants to States Part B advance funded	5,672,000	5,072,000	5,072,000	-600,000	---
Part B advance from prior year	(5,072,000)	(5,672,000)	(5,672,000)	(+600,000)	---
Grants to States Part B current year	3,202,398	4,456,533	4,802,398	+1,600,000	+345,865
Subtotal, Grants to States, program level	8,874,398	9,528,533	9,874,398	+1,000,000	+345,865
Preschool Grants	387,465	390,000	390,000	+2,535	---
Grants for Infants and Families	434,159	447,000	447,000	+12,841	---
Subtotal, State grants, program level	9,696,022	10,365,533	10,711,398	+1,015,376	+345,865

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
IDEA National Activities (current funded):					
State Program Improvement Grants	51,364	44,000	51,364	---	+7,364
Research and Innovation	77,210	78,380	77,210	---	-1,170
Technical Assistance and Dissemination	53,133	53,481	53,481	+348	---
Personnel Preparation	91,899	90,000	91,899	---	+1,899
Parent Information Centers	26,328	26,000	26,328	---	+328
Technology and Media Services	37,961	32,710	38,110	+149	+5,400
Subtotal, IDEA special programs	337,895	324,571	338,392	+497	+13,821
Total, Special education	10,033,917	10,690,104	11,049,790	+1,015,873	+359,686
Current Year	(4,361,917)	(5,618,104)	(5,977,790)	(+1,615,873)	(+359,686)
FY 2005	(5,672,000)	(5,072,000)	(5,072,000)	(-600,000)	---
Subtotal, Forward funded	(4,075,386)	(5,337,533)	(5,690,762)	(+1,615,376)	(+353,229)
REHABILITATION SERVICES AND DISABILITY RESEARCH					
Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants	2,533,492	2,584,162	2,584,162	+50,670	---
Vocational Rehabilitation Incentive Grants	---	84,490	---	---	-84,490
Client Assistance State grants	12,068	11,897	12,068	---	+171
Training	39,371	42,629	39,371	---	-3,258
Demonstration and training programs	20,895	24,492	20,895	---	-3,597
Migrant and seasonal farmworkers	2,335	---	2,335	---	+2,335
Recreational programs	2,579	---	2,579	---	+2,579
Protection and advocacy of individual rights (PAIR)	16,890	17,880	16,890	---	-990
Projects with industry	21,928	---	21,928	---	+21,928
Supported employment State grants	37,904	---	37,904	---	+37,904
Independent living:					
State grants	22,151	22,296	22,296	+145	---
Centers	69,545	69,500	75,000	+5,455	+5,500
Services for older blind individuals	27,818	25,000	32,000	+4,182	+7,000
Subtotal, Independent living	119,514	116,796	129,296	+9,782	+12,500
Program Improvement	894	850	894	---	+44
Evaluation	994	1,000	994	---	-6
Helen Keller National Center for Deaf/Blind	8,660	8,717	8,717	+57	---
National Inst. Disability and Rehab. Research (NIDRR)	109,285	110,000	110,000	+715	---
Assistive Technology	26,824	---	11,132	-15,692	+11,132
Subtotal, discretionary programs	420,141	418,751	415,003	-5,138	-3,748
Total, Rehabilitation services	2,953,633	3,002,913	2,999,165	+45,532	-3,748
SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES					
AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND	15,399	14,000	16,500	+1,101	+2,500
NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF (NTID:					
Operations	52,109	49,414	53,500	+1,391	+4,086
Endowment	---	1,000	---	---	-1,000
Construction	1,590	367	367	-1,223	---
Total, NTID	53,699	50,781	53,867	+168	+3,086
GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY					
Operations	97,798	93,446	100,600	+2,802	+7,154
Endowment	---	1,000	---	---	-1,000
Total, Gallaudet University	97,798	94,446	100,600	+2,802	+6,154
Total, Special Institutions for Persons with Disabilities	166,896	159,227	170,967	+4,071	+11,740

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION					
Vocational Education:					
Basic State Grants/Secondary & Technical Education					
State Grants, current funded 2/	401,200	209,000	409,000	+7,800	+200,000
Advance from prior year	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)	---	---
FY 2005	791,000	791,000	791,000	---	---
Subtotal, Basic State Grants, program level	1,192,200	1,000,000	1,200,000	+7,800	+200,000
Tech-Prep Education State Grants	107,298	---	107,298	---	+107,298
National Programs	11,922	---	11,922	---	+11,922
Tech-Prep Education Demonstration	4,968	---	---	-4,968	---
Occupational and Employment Information Program	9,438	---	---	-9,438	---
Subtotal, Vocational Education	1,325,826	1,000,000	1,319,220	-6,606	+319,220
Adult Education:					
State Grants/Adult basic and literacy education:					
State Grants, current funded 2/	571,262	584,300	584,300	+13,038	---
National Programs					
National Leadership Activities	9,438	---	9,438	---	+9,438
National Institute for Literacy	6,517	6,732	6,517	---	-215
Subtotal, National programs	15,955	6,732	15,955	---	+9,223
Subtotal, Adult education	587,217	591,032	600,255	+13,038	+9,223
Smaller Learning Communities, current funded	8,047	---	8,750	+703	+8,750
Smaller Learning Communities, forward funded	152,900	---	166,250	+13,350	+166,250
Community Technology Centers	32,264	---	---	-32,264	---
Total, Vocational and adult education	2,106,254	1,591,032	2,094,475	-11,779	+503,443
Current Year	(1,315,254)	(800,032)	(1,303,475)	(-11,779)	(+503,443)
FY 2005	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)	---	---
Subtotal, forward funded	(1,274,943)	(800,032)	(1,294,725)	(+19,782)	(+494,693)
STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE					
Pell Grants -- maximum grant (NA)	(4,050)	(4,000)	(4,050)	---	(+50)
Pell Grants -- Regular Program	11,364,646	12,715,000	12,250,000	+885,354	-465,000
Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants	760,028	725,000	760,028	---	+35,028
Federal Work Study	1,004,428	1,011,000	1,004,428	---	-6,572

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Federal Perkins Loans:					
Capital Contributions	99,350	---	99,350	---	+99,350
Loan Cancellations	67,061	67,500	67,061	---	-439
Subtotal, Federal Perkins loans	166,411	67,500	166,411	---	+98,911
LEAP program	66,565	---	66,565	---	+66,565
Loan Forgiveness for Child Care	994	---	---	-994	---
Total, Student Financial Assistance	13,363,072	14,518,500	14,247,432	+884,360	-271,068
STUDENT AID ADMINISTRATION					
Administrative Costs	104,703	947,010	120,010	+15,307	-827,000
Fed Direct Student Loan Reclassification (Leg prop)	---	-795,000	---	---	+795,000
HIGHER EDUCATION					
Aid for Institutional Development:					
Strengthening Institutions	81,467	76,275	81,467	---	+5,192
Hispanic Serving Institutions	92,396	93,551	93,551	+1,155	---
Strengthening Historically Black Colleges (HBCUs)	214,015	224,086	224,086	+10,071	---
Strengthening historically black graduate insts	53,415	53,302	53,415	---	+113
Strengthening Alaska & Hawaiian-Serving Insts	8,180	4,048	8,180	---	+4,132
Strengthening Tribal Colleges	22,850	19,037	22,850	---	+3,813
Subtotal, Aid for Institutional development	472,323	470,299	483,549	+11,226	+13,250
International Education and Foreign Language:					
Domestic Programs	93,240	88,000	93,240	---	+5,240
Overseas Programs	12,916	13,000	12,916	---	-84
Institute for International Public Policy	1,639	1,500	1,639	---	+139
Subtotal, International Education & Foreign Lang	107,795	102,500	107,795	---	+5,295
Fund for the Improvement of Postsec. Ed. (FIPSE)	171,064	39,138	39,138	-131,926	---
Minority Science and Engineering Improvement	8,942	8,500	8,942	---	+442
Interest Subsidy Grants	2,980	2,000	2,000	-980	---
Tribally Controlled Postsec Voc/Tech Institutions	6,955	6,500	6,955	---	+455
Federal TRIO Programs	827,089	802,500	835,000	+7,911	+32,500
GEAR UP	293,082	285,000	300,000	+6,918	+15,000
Byrd Honors Scholarships	40,734	41,001	40,734	---	-267
Javits Fellowships	9,935	10,000	9,935	---	-65
Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need	30,798	31,000	30,798	---	-202
Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants	89,415	90,000	90,000	+585	---
Child Care Access Means Parents in School	16,194	15,000	15,000	-1,194	---
Demonstration in Disabilities / Higher Education	6,954	---	6,954	---	+6,954
Underground Railroad Program	2,235	---	2,235	---	+2,235
GPRA data/HEA program evaluation	994	1,000	994	---	-6
Thurgood Marshall Scholarships	4,968	---	4,968	---	+4,968
B.J. Stupak Olympic Scholarships	994	---	994	---	+994
Total, Higher education	2,093,451	1,904,438	1,985,991	-107,460	+81,553
NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION TRUST FUND 3/	---	8,000	---	---	-8,000
HOWARD UNIVERSITY					
Academic Program	204,690	207,100	208,170	+3,480	+1,070
Endowment Program	3,573	---	3,600	+27	+3,600
Howard University Hospital	30,177	30,374	31,000	+823	+626
Total, Howard University	238,440	237,474	242,770	+4,330	+5,296

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
College Housing and Academic Facilities Loans Program: (CHAFL)	757	774	774	+17	---
HBCU Capital Financing Program -- Federal Adm	207	210	210	+3	---
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES					
Research and Statistics:					
Research	139,090	185,000	185,000	+45,910	---
Regional Educational Laboratories	67,061	---	67,061	---	+67,061
Statistics	89,415	95,000	95,000	+5,585	---
Assessment:					
National Assessment	90,235	90,825	90,825	+590	---
National Assessment Governing Board	4,532	5,090	5,090	+558	---
Subtotal, Assessment	94,767	95,915	95,915	+1,148	---
Subtotal, Research and statistics	390,333	375,915	442,976	+52,643	+67,061
Multi-year Grants and Contracts	57,623	---	57,623	---	+57,623
Total, IES	447,956	375,915	500,599	+52,643	+124,684
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT					
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	409,863	434,494	434,494	+24,631	---
OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS	85,715	91,275	91,275	+5,560	---
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	40,734	48,137	48,137	+7,403	---
Total, Departmental management	536,312	573,906	573,906	+37,594	---
Total: Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs	23,793,864	22,593,352	24,153,076	+359,212	+1,559,724
Total, Title III, Department of Education	55,646,251	55,807,855	57,964,165	+2,317,914	+2,156,310
Current Year	(38,390,950)	(40,796,554)	(42,952,864)	(+4,561,914)	(+2,156,310)
FY 2005	(17,255,301)	(15,011,301)	(15,011,301)	(-2,244,000)	---

Title III Footnotes:
1/ Reclassification of advance appropriations.
2/ FY 04 request assumes passage of proposed legislation renaming these State grant programs.
3/ In fiscal years 2002 and 2003, $8 million provided for this program in Defense Appropriations Acts.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE IV - RELATED AGENCIES					
ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME					
Operations and Maintenance	61,839	63,296	63,296	+1,457	---
Capital Program	5,732	1,983	1,983	-3,749	---
Total, AFRH	67,571	65,279	65,279	-2,292	---
CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE 1/					
Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA)	93,674	94,287	93,674	---	-613
Volunteers in Homeland Security	9,935	20,000	5,000	-4,935	-15,000
National Senior Volunteer Corps:					
Foster Grandparents Program	110,775	106,700	110,775	---	+4,075
Senior Companion Program	46,260	46,563	46,260	---	-303
Retired Senior Volunteer Program	58,501	58,884	58,501	---	-383
Senior Demonstration Program	397	---	397	---	+397
Subtotal, Senior Volunteers	215,933	212,147	215,933	---	+3,786
Program Administration	34,346	38,229	38,229	+3,883	---
Total, Domestic Volunteer Service Programs	353,888	364,663	352,836	-1,052	-11,827
CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING:					
FY 2006 (current) with FY 2005 comparable	390,000	---	330,000	-60,000	+330,000
FY 2005 advance with FY 2004 comparable (NA)	(380,000)	(390,000)	(390,000)	(+10,000)	---
FY 2004 advance with FY 2003 comparable (NA)	(362,627)	(380,000)	(380,000)	(+17,373)	---
Digitalization program, current funded	48,427	---	---	-48,427	---
Funds provided in P.L. 107-116	---	(80,000)	(80,000)	(+80,000)	---
Interconnection, current funded	---	---	---	---	---
Funds provided in P.L. 107-116	---	(20,000)	(20,000)	(+20,000)	---
Subtotal, FY 2004 appropriation	48,427	---	---	-48,427	---
Subtotal, FY 2004 comparable	(48,427)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(+51,573)	---
FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE	41,156	42,885	43,385	+2,229	+500
FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION	7,131	7,774	7,774	+643	---
INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES	243,889	242,024	238,126	-5,763	-3,898
MEDICARE PAYMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION	8,529	9,000	9,000	+471	---
NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFO SCIENCE	1,003	1,000	1,000	-3	---
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY	2,839	2,830	2,830	-9	---
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD	237,429	243,073	239,429	+2,000	-3,644
NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD	11,241	11,421	11,421	+180	---
OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION	9,610	10,115	10,115	+505	---
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD					
Dual Benefits Payments Account	131,142	127,000	119,000	-12,142	-8,000
Less Income Tax Receipts on Dual Benefits	-7,948	-8,000	-8,000	-52	---
Subtotal, Dual Benefits	123,194	119,000	111,000	-12,194	-8,000
Federal Payment to the RR Retirement Account	150	150	150	---	---
Limitation on Administration	99,350	99,820	101,300	+1,950	+1,480
Inspector General	6,322	6,600	6,600	+278	---
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION					
Payments to Social Security Trust Funds	20,400	21,658	21,658	+1,258	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME					
Federal benefit payments	31,795,664	34,198,000	34,198,000	+2,402,336	---
Beneficiary services	45,728	100,000	100,000	+54,272	---
Research and demonstration	38,000	30,000	30,000	-8,000	---
Administration	2,825,000	3,034,000	2,973,300	+148,300	-60,700
Subtotal, SSI program level	34,704,392	37,362,000	37,301,300	+2,596,908	-60,700
Less funds advanced in prior year	-10,790,000	-11,080,000	-11,080,000	-290,000	---
Subtotal, regular SSI current year	23,914,392	26,282,000	26,221,300	+2,306,908	-60,700
Plus User Fee Activities	111,000	120,000	120,000	+9,000	---
Total, SSI, current request	24,025,392	26,402,000	26,341,300	+2,315,908	-60,700
New advance, 1st quarter, FY 2005	11,080,000	12,590,000	12,590,000	+1,510,000	---
Total, SSI, current request	35,105,392	38,992,000	38,931,300	+3,825,908	-60,700
LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES					
OASDI Trust Funds	3,736,783	4,192,200	4,108,300	+371,517	-83,900
HI/SMI Trust Funds	1,210,554	1,182,000	1,158,400	-52,154	-23,600
Social Security Advisory Board	1,800	1,800	1,800	---	---
SSI	2,825,000	3,034,000	2,973,300	+148,300	-60,700
Subtotal, regular LAE	7,774,137	8,410,000	8,241,800	+467,663	-168,200
User Fee Activities (SSI)	111,000	120,000	120,000	+9,000	---
Total, Limitation on Administrative Expenses	7,885,137	8,530,000	8,361,800	+476,663	-168,200
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL					
Federal Funds	20,863	25,000	24,500	+3,637	-500
Trust Funds	61,597	65,000	63,700	+2,103	-1,300
Total, Office of Inspector General	82,460	90,000	88,200	+5,740	-1,800
Adjustment: Trust fund transfers from general revenues	-2,936,000	-3,154,000	-3,093,300	-157,300	+60,700
Total, Social Security Administration	40,157,389	44,479,658	44,309,658	+4,152,269	-170,000
Federal funds	35,146,655	39,038,658	38,977,458	+3,830,803	-61,200
Current year	(24,066,655)	(26,448,658)	(26,387,458)	(+2,320,803)	(-61,200)
New advances, 1st quarter	(11,080,000)	(12,590,000)	(12,590,000)	(+1,510,000)	---
Trust funds	5,010,734	5,441,000	5,332,200	+321,466	-108,800
UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE	16,256	17,200	17,200	+944	---
Total, Title IV, Related Agencies	41,825,374	45,722,492	45,857,103	+4,031,729	+134,611
Federal Funds	36,700,439	40,166,072	40,408,003	+3,707,564	+241,931
Current Year	(25,230,439)	(27,576,072)	(27,488,003)	(+2,257,564)	(-88,069)
FY 2005 Advance	(11,080,000)	(12,590,000)	(12,590,000)	(+1,510,000)	---
FY 2006 Advance	(390,000)	---	(330,000)	(-60,000)	(+330,000)
Trust Funds	5,124,935	5,556,420	5,449,100	+324,165	-107,320

Title IV Footnotes:

1/ Appropriations for Americorps are provided in the VA-HUD bill.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
SUMMARY					
Federal Funds	419,505,080	457,534,706	466,427,942	+46,922,862	+8,893,236
Current year	(332,112,793)	(364,598,430)	(373,161,666)	(+41,048,873)	(+8,563,236)
2005 advance	(87,002,287)	(92,936,276)	(92,936,276)	(+5,933,989)	---
2006 advance	(390,000)	---	(330,000)	(-60,000)	(+330,000)
Trust Funds	11,485,390	12,162,342	11,978,994	+493,604	-183,348
Grand Total	430,990,470	469,697,048	478,406,936	+47,416,466	+8,709,888
BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT RECAP					
Mandatory, total in bill	296,311,317	334,126,478	340,152,954	+43,841,637	+6,026,476
Less advances for subsequent years	-65,883,986	-74,061,975	-74,061,975	-8,177,989	---
Plus advances provided in prior years	60,353,937	65,883,986	65,883,986	+5,530,049	---
Total, mandatory, current year	290,781,268	325,948,489	331,974,965	+41,193,697	+6,026,476
Discretionary, total in bill	134,679,153	135,570,570	138,253,982	+3,574,829	+2,683,412
Less advances for subsequent years	-21,508,301	-18,874,301	-19,204,301	+2,304,000	-330,000
Plus advances provided in prior years	19,220,918	21,498,301	19,254,301	+33,383	-2,244,000
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
SSA User Fee Collection	-111,000	-120,000	-120,000	-9,000	---
Repatriation, change in statutory cap	5,000	---	---	-5,000	---
AWIU contingency	70,000	---	---	-70,000	---
Adjustment-OMB Mandatory scoring in Voc Rehab.	---	-84,490	---	---	+84,490
CMS User Fees	---	---	-98,000	-98,000	-98,000
CDC Management/IT Savings	---	---	-49,982	-49,982	-49,982
Rescission of CPB FY 2003 Advance	---	---	---	---	---
CPB FY 2003 S&E adjustment	182	---	---	-182	---
Total, discretionary	132,355,952	137,990,080	138,036,000	+5,680,048	+45,920
Adjustment to balance with 2003 enacted	-70,000	---	---	+70,000	---
Total, discretionary (FY 2003 enacted)	132,285,952	137,990,080	138,036,000	+5,750,048	+45,920
Grand total, current year (incl FY 2003 comparable)	423,137,220	463,938,569	470,010,965	+46,873,745	+6,072,396
Grand total, current year (incl FY 2003 enacted)	423,067,220	463,938,569	470,010,965	+46,943,745	+6,072,396

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2660)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
302(b) General Purposes Allocation	131,399,000	---	138,036,000	+6,637,000	+138,036,000
Permissible Cap Adjustment	---	---	---	---	---
Total Anticipated 302(b) Allocation	131,399,000	---	138,036,000	+6,637,000	+138,036,000
Total: Discretionary, current year	132,355,952	137,990,080	138,036,000	+5,680,048	+45,920
Anticipated 302(b) allocation	131,399,000	---	138,036,000	+6,637,000	+138,036,000
Amount over(+)/under (-) 302(b) allocation	956,952	137,990,080	---	-956,952	-137,990,080

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the last 2 years the Republican majority has pushed $2 trillion in tax cuts through this House. A huge percentage of those cuts have been focused on the top 1 percent of earners in this country who make over 100,000 bucks a year. For those 2 years, the Republican Party has pretended that there are no costs associated with those tax cuts. Well, there are, and on this bill is where those costs become evident. This is where the chickens come home to roost.

Cost number one is $26 billion a year in additional interest payments that our taxpayers will have to pay next year because every single dollar of the tax cut that was passed was paid for with borrowed money.

The second cost that is incurred is that because all of the dollars have been put into tax cuts, ''ain't no more money left'' for Medicare fix-ups, ''ain't no more money left'' to do a real as opposed to a ''let's pretend'' prescription drug program, and there isn't nearly enough money left to make the necessary investments that American families depend upon in the education and health care and worker protection area, and this is where those consequences show up on this bill.

Now, what are the deficiencies? First of all, the Republican budget, which was the enabling legislation which enabled the tax cuts to come to this floor, the Republican budget resolution promised Republican moderates, in return for their votes on the budget resolution, they promised that Title I, which is the main education program that we use to help kids who need some help to stay abreast, they promised that Title I would be funded at $1 billion above last year. This bill contains the broken promise because this bill funds Title I $340 million below the amount promised in the Republican's own budget resolution.

Special education. Both parties compete with each other and claim how much they are in love with special education programs. Well, the Republican majority promised $2.2 billion in additional funding for special education if those moderates would just vote for that bill. Now, you bring the actual bill to the floor, and I said yesterday it is apparent the check is not in the mail because this bill is $1.2 billion short of the Republican promise in the budget resolution on that score. That is broken promise number two.

There is another way to measure it. The President, when he came into office, said, ''Oh, he was not going to spend any more money on education until we reformed the programs.'' So we reformed the programs in the No Child Left Behind Act, all kinds of promises to the States and the local school districts, all kinds of mandates. That bill was the mother of all mandates, and yet today, if you take a look at how this bill or those programs compares to the funding schedule in that bill, this bill is $8 billion short, $8 billion short.

Then if you take a look at some of the details, after-school programs, now I know my good friend from Ohio is a strong supporter of those programs, but this bill is $750 million short of the No Child Left Behind promise for after-school programs.

Student aid: Pell grants, the principal program by which we help families send their kids to college, in 1975 Pell grants paid for 84 percent of the cost of a public education on average. This year it is down to 38 percent because this bill freezes Pell grants. In addition to that, the administration cuts the ability of Pell grant recipients to use their full State and local tax deduction in determining their eligibility for Pell grants. So that is another chiseling away at benefits we provide families to go to college.

Now move to the health care front. For 5 years we have almost doubled funding at NIH, the institute which provides for most of the medical research in this country, but this bill puts the brake on that 5-year progress. The result? Grants for new programs and competitive renewal of existing or of expiring grants will go up by only two-tenths of 1 percent for a grand total of 21 grants, the smallest increase in 15 years.

I invite Members of this House, tell the 1.3 million people who are going to get cancer this year, tell the 1 million people who are going to find out they have diabetes, tell the 60,000 people who are going to get Parkinson's, tell them that it is more important to give an $88,000 tax cut to somebody who makes $1 million a year than it is to continue our efforts to attack those diseases at full throttle.

We hear this nonsense about how NIH needs some breathing time in order to absorb the money that we have already given them. Baloney. Less than 35 percent of all of the grants that are approved as being quality science are ever funded. Tell me there is not a need.

Or if you want to move on, the nursing, the new nursing act that passed last year, every politician in this House wrote to every nurse in their district and said, ''we love you, we are all for this program.'' Where is the money to make it reality? No new money in this bill for that program.

Then if you take a look at community service block grant, money that we provide that is used to help families that are poor and near poor, cut by 150 million bucks.

Low-income heating assistance program: I started that program with Ed Muskie back in the 1970s, and we had a lot of help from a lot of Republicans, including Silvio Conte. What has happened to that bill today? We have been told, on one hand, we have been told by the Republican members of our committee, correctly so, that we are going to have a big increase in natural gas prices. How does the committee respond? By cutting the low-income heating assistance program by 200 million bucks. I do not think that is a very smart thing to do.

So basically, these are just a few areas in which this bill is deficient. So what we are going to try to do, despite the fact that the rule turned us down, we are going to try to offer two amendments on this side of the aisle.

We are going to try to add $2.8 billion in additional education funding, to add $340 million more for Title I, $1.2 billion for special education. We are going to try to raise Pell grant, the maximum grants, by $150. In the health care area, we are going to add some money to the rural health program. We are going to add some funding to our chem/bio response capability. We are going to try to double the rate of increased funding for NIH so that we can have a 6 percent increase in new and competing grants. We are going to fund that nursing act. We are going to try to provide $450 million in increased funding for low-income heating assistance. We are going to restore the $150 million cut for the CSBG program. We are going to put $82 million back in the older Americans bill so that we do not have to cut out 3 million congregate meals for senior citizens this year, and so that we do not have to cut out 4 million meals for the Meals on Wheels program.

How are we going to pay for it? We are going to pay for it by cutting the tax cut that people who earn more than a million bucks a year would get from $88,000 that they are now scheduled to get to a mere $60,000. My goodness me, they are going to be stuck on a starvation diet this year, poor folks.

Then we are going to try a second amendment which will raise the matching rate for Medicaid for each State so that we can prevent every State in the Union from knocking kids off the Medicaid or the SCHIP rolls.

Mr. Chairman, we ought to be ashamed of ourselves that we are making kids pay for tax cuts for millionaires by giving up their eligibility for health care. That is an outrageous set of priorities, but it is one which is enforced on this country by the majority party actions in ramming those giant-size tax cuts for high-income people through this House.

We are not saying that those who make $1 million a year should not get a tax cut like everybody else. We are saying that we ought to limit, through the action of our first amendment and the second amendment, all we are saying is when you put those two together, we simply want to limit the size of their tax cut to $44,000 on average instead of $88,000. And I will bet you that if you ask 90 percent of those people, they will say that they would much prefer that we provide the money for these kids and provide the money for their education rather than give them a supersize tax cut.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is what we are going to try to do today because this budget process has been handled in such a way that the majority party has tried to obscure, at every opportunity they have tried to obscure the linkage between their actions on taxes and the resulting actions on education, health care and other needed services for the citizens of this country.

What our amendments will try to do is to reestablish those linkages so that people understand there are consequences to the choices that we make, and those consequences fall most heavily on the people who most need our help.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield so much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the Chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, and I want to say he did a wonderful job in getting us a very substantial allocation to meet these needs.

□ 1130

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for yielding me this time, and I want to compliment and congratulate him and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), as the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee, for doing a really good job in allocating the money that was available. As Chairman REGULA has said, there is an increase in the 302(b) allocation for this bill over last year. The gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Ohio have worked extremely hard to try to balance the funding so that we meet the responsibilities in this bill.

I support the bill. I think it is a good bill. I know that there are a lot of things that Members would like to do and there are a lot of other items that they would like to see funded. But there is a limitation on the amount of money. As everyone knows, we have a budget resolution that did not make our job easy, but it is still the budget resolution, like it or not.

I know that there are many Members who would like to add additional money, because for the 13 appropriation bills, I have received requests from Members that totaled more than $50 billion to add over and above the allocated amount that was provided in the budget resolution. However, we cannot do all of the requests, and we have to do the best we can with what we have. I think the committee has done a really outstanding job. I have been a member of this committee for a long, long time; and I know the members of this subcommittee are diligent and very respectful of their responsibilities.

One thing this bill is not: this bill is not a tax bill. I understand that my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), has made this case strongly and he feels very strongly about it. But the fact of the matter is that this is not a tax bill. We do not do taxes in the Committee on Appropriations. That is a Ways and Means responsibility. So I think we have worked together very well to produce this bill. I think we have worked together very well to reach an agreement on the process for this bill.

I believe that sometime today we will have a unanimous consent request that will accommodate Members to have our work concluded by 5 p.m., hopefully. And again I appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) very much and Chairman REGULA for working together on this.

Now, if I can just take a minute, I want to give the Members an update on where we are in the appropriations process. As usual, we got off to a slow start because there were some budget decisions that had to be made, that should have been made prior to voting on the budget resolution; but that was not done. However, I want to report that of the 13 appropriation bills, 10 have already been marked up in subcommittee. The 11th will be marked up tomorrow.

We have already marked up seven of these bills in full committee. We have already concluded in the House the Homeland bill, the Military Construction bill, the Defense bill, the Legislative bill, and today we will finish the Labor-HHS bill. So a lot of the heavy lifting has already been done.

By the time we break for the August recess, if we are allowed to maintain the schedule that we have set, we will have passed 11 of the 13 appropriation bills, which is much better than we did last year because of some other budgetary problems. The remaining two bills will be out of the full committee by August recess, but there will not be time to schedule them for floor action, so we will take those up early in September. Senator STEVENS has advised me that we are going to move quickly in the conferences, so we should have our work done in a reasonable timeframe.

Again, I want to express my support for this bill. I want to express my appreciation for everyone who worked so hard to make this bill happen. This is not an easy bill. The defense bill is about half of the total discretionary funds. This bill is about one third of the remaining discretionary funds after defense, and so it is a big bill. The committee has done a good job, and I have tremendous respect for the committee and the subcommittee and the staff for the good job that they have done, understanding that a lot of people would like to have a lot more money, but there was only so much money to go around.

Anyway, I thank the gentleman, I appreciate his yielding time to me, and I support the bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I forgot, but I want to state here and now that I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and certainly the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). And I know that the gentleman from Ohio, as chairman of this subcommittee, if more money would have been available, would have put the money in the right places. His heart is in the right place. I understand that.

My problem is that the policy of the majority party has prevented Chairman REGULA from being Chairman REGULA. The problem is that we are told as a result of the tax cuts that we can somehow afford $2 trillion in tax cuts over the next decade, over 40 percent of which are targeted at the wealthiest 1 percent of the people in this country, but somehow we cannot afford $3 billion, not trillion, but $3 billion more to educate our kids, or $3 billion more to help see to it that kids do not lose their health coverage in a time of national economic problems. I think that is a sad, sad commentary on the priorities of this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and let me start, as so many of us do on the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, by saying how much respect we have, affection we have for the chairman of our committee. No committee has a fairer chairman. No committee has a chairman any more committed to the welfare of the American people than the Committee on Appropriations. As we are blessed to have the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) as the chairman of our committee, we are fortunate as well to have the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) as the chairman of this subcommittee.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has said, both of these gentlemen care deeply about this country and care deeply about the people of this country. I have served on this committee, as Chairman YOUNG said, with him for a long, long time. I do not believe this is the bill of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). I do not believe it is the bill of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA). It is, however, their response to the realities that confront them, and the gentleman from Ohio pointed that out.

But, Mr. Chairman, on January 8, 2002, on a stage in Hamilton, Ohio, President Bush signed the bipartisan No Child Left Behind Act. Surrounded by Members from both sides of the aisle, including chairman of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), and the ranking member of that committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), as well as Senators KENNEDY and

GREGG, the President recognized that the landmark legislation essentially was a contract with the American people. The No Child Left Behind Act demanded greater accountability and expectations in our education system; and in return, it promised, it contracted with States, with teachers, with parents, with America to provide educators greater resources to accomplish our shared goals and responsibilities.

Let me quote: ''A fourth principle of this act,'' the President said, ''is that we are going to spend more money, more resources, but they will be directed at methods that work.'' So we asked Maryland, we asked Ohio, and we asked Florida to perform certain responsibilities; but we said in the process that we would provide them the resources to accomplish those responsibilities.

Well, today, my colleagues, the Republican Party in this House of Representatives has decided, very frankly, that they will break its contract, the GOP's promise with the American people. This Labor-HHS-Education appropriation bill is an unflinching betrayal of the No Child Left Behind Act and a betrayal of children and parents and educators all over this country. While educators and local school districts all across this Nation have begun implementing the new accountability measures under this act, this bill falls $8 billion short of the promise that was made.

Our Republican friends undoubtedly will get up on this floor and say that they are increasing education funding. But here is what they will not say. The funding in this bill, after inflation, is tantamount to a funding freeze. Yes, my colleagues can provide $162 billion in estate tax cuts for the wealthiest families in America, a tax cut that will cost an estimated $750 billion in the decade after 2013, but they cannot keep their promise in funding the No Child Left Behind Act.

Two months ago, in the conference report on the budget resolution, this Republican majority promised, promised a $3 billion increase for the Department of Education. Today, it would underfund that commitment by $700 million, the smallest percentage increase in 8 years. Two months ago, this Republican majority promised an increase in IDEA funding, that is for the disabled children he spoke to, by $2.2 billion. Today, it would provide less than half that promised increase. Two months ago, this Republican majority promised an increase in title I funding by $1 billion. Today, it falls a third of a billion dollars short of that promise.

Furthermore, it cuts LIHEAP, low-income assistance. If Silvio Conte were here, a Republican from Massachusetts, he would be on the warpath saying how irresponsible that was. Even the Bush administration, in a statement of administration policy issued yesterday, and my distinguished chairman said some people say we are not spending enough money, well, ''some people'' includes George Bush, the President of the United States. He said he was disappointed that the LIHEAP funding level is $200 million less than he asked for. Not Democrats; that the President asked for.

In addition, this bill unravels our bipartisan commitment to increased funding for scientific and medical research. It slashes unemployment programs at a time when the unemployment picture is worse than it has been in a decade and where we have produced the least number of jobs of any administration in half a century. It fails to meet our commitment to address the nursing shortage, which the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) spoke to as well.

Finally, I want to urge my colleagues to support the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that would bar the Labor Department from spending money on regulations that undermine the 40-hour workweek once again. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Let me say in closing to my distinguished chairman that when he said we are not the Committee on Ways and Means, he is absolutely correct. But, my colleagues, we cannot, like Pontius Pilate, wash our hands of the responsibility of leaving children behind.

Vote against this bill. Vote for the Obey amendments to add the dollars necessary to fund what the President says we ought to do.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just comment and again point out that we have doubled education funding in the last 8 years. We have tripled the amount that goes to special needs children. We have a 2.7 percent increase in this bill over last year, and I think a lot of people in the United States will be happy to get a 2.7 percent pay raise. I am just saying we are doing the best we can with the resources that are available.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is correct. And I said that at the beginning, that I think the chairman is doing the best with what he has been given. Our only argument is that he has not been given enough to meet the commitments made in the Republicans' budget and the President's request and the legislation we passed to leave no child behind.

But I think the gentleman is accurate, he has done the best he could with the resources he was given.

Mr. REGULA. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would add one more comment. We have a different situation as a result of 9–11. We have responsibilities that have absorbed funds that otherwise might be available here.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), a very valued member of our subcommittee.

□ 1145

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and compliment him on a good process in tough times.

I have listened to the discussion so far this morning, and I find there are two different schools of thought here on the floor. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) I think believe from my long years of friendship with them, and I consider them friends, they believe that our future in this country depends on what we spend here.

I do not agree with that. I believe our future depends on the opportunities we provide to have good jobs for people to be self-sufficient, to be employed, and to pay taxes. All the programs we provide here help those who cannot participate in that and help them get the education they need and the health care they need.

We keep hearing about these horrible, huge tax cuts. A huge number of the taxpayers they keep talking about are employers. They are people who provide our children and our grandchildren jobs. They are the growth part of this country. They are individual family businesses who, through subchapter S corporations, pay the individual tax rate.

Now I have been in government quite awhile. I have been in business and government about the same length of time. I was in local government, State government and now in Washington. There is a rule that I believe in: If you want less of something, tax it. If you want less, tax it again. The more you tax something, the less you will have of it. If you want something to prosper, tax it less. The theory is the individual family businesses that pay that individual rate, they are the ones that are growing this country, not the global corporations, not these huge companies that we talk about. It is those family businesses. The more we tax them, the less their business can grow because as they make profits, and I know businesses that have poured all of their profits back into the company, buying machines, putting more people to work because they did not have to pay it in taxes.

We cannot have it both ways. The more we prevent them from growing, the more programs we are going to need to support the people that do not have jobs. So the tax cuts Members rail against are the hope of our young people, and I will debate that issue with Members any time.

We heard that in education title I, a $666 million increase was categorized as a $340 million cut. In IDEA, a $1 billion increase was characterized as a $1.2 billion shortfall, but let us talk about IDEA a minute. When I came here, we

were at 5–6 percent of the 40 percent that we had promised. We are now at 20 percent. That is a wonderful, huge increase that did not happen when the other party was in control.

NIH, we doubled their budget and they are now at $27.7 billion. This year they will have an additional $1.7 billion in new research funding. We can play with those numbers and some of last year's money went into construction of buildings and things, but in reality they will have a $1.7 billion increase in research funding.

To conclude my comments, yes, we stand for helping people have a job, and to help people have a job, we help businesses grow by cutting the individual tax rate that prevents them from putting that money back into their business. The big taxpayers in this country, the bulk of them are businesses that are putting our people to work. I am for growing them so that our social programs will be less needed.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe opportunity is the key, but I think it is very difficult to have opportunity if you do not have an education. It is very difficult to have opportunity if you do not have decent health.

The only choice before us is what we think is more important: Using $6 billion to provide better education for our kids and making sure that kids are not knocked off health care rolls around the country, or whether to use that $6 billion to make sure that people who make more than $1 million a year get an $88,000 tax cut rather than a $44,000 tax cut. That is the only issue before us here today.

I am highly amused when I hear Republicans come to the floor and talk about how much they have done for education. I want to show what the record shows because I negotiated every one of the education budgets for the last 10 years. I was one of the four people in the room when the numbers were decided.

Here is what happened. In fiscal year 1995, the Republican House majority tried to cut $1.7 billion from the previous education budget. They tried to abolish the Department of Education, and they even shut down the government to try to force President Clinton to swallow those priorities. They lost.

In fiscal year 1996, the House Republicans tried to cut $3.6 billion from the previous year's education funding. They lost.

In 1997, the House Republicans tried to cut $2.8 billion from the Clinton budget for education. They failed.

In 1998, the House Republicans tried to cut $660 million from the Clinton education budget. They failed.

In fiscal year 2000, the House Republicans tried to cut $1.4 billion from the Clinton budget, they failed.

In 2001, they tried to cut $3 billion out of the Clinton budget for education. They failed.

Now they are trying to take credit for their failures. I find that interesting; I find that fascinating. I would call it near-Enron accounting. By all means if they want to climb on board and claim that they were funding that they tried to stop, be my guest. The country knows otherwise. Nobody believes them. All I can say is that in Washington the worse thing that can happen to a politician is when they believe their own baloney, and we have heard a lot of it here today.

THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN RECORD ON EDUCATION FUNDING

Lately, the Republican Majority has attempted to claim credit for education funding increases, and to reinvent their record on education. Just a few years ago, however, Republicans were calling for the demise of the Department of Education and billions in education cuts.

If the House Republican position on education had prevailed over a 9-year period, House Republicans would have spent $20 billion less on education.

One of the first actions of the new House Republican majority in the spring of 1995 was to rescind $1.7 billion ($1.635 billion in HR 1158 and $65 million in HR 889) in FY 1995 education funding. Democrats succeeded in reducing the final rescissions to less than $600 million.

House Republicans then led an attack on education in the FY 1996 Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill when they proposed only $20.8 billion for the Department of Education—a cut of $3.6 billion below the already-reduced FY 1995 level and $5.0 billion below President Clinton's education request. The House Republican LHHS bill was $2.0 billion below the final conference version of the LHHS bill supported by Democrats, which restored the majority of the Republican cuts.

House Republicans passed a FY 1997 LHHS-Education appropriations bill that provided $22.8 billion for education, a cut of $2.8 billion below the request and $3.6 billion below the final conference level for education. Democrats and President Clinton were successful not only in reversing these Republican-led cuts, but increasing education funding in real terms, to the funding levels approved in the last Democratic Congress.

Following the 1997 bipartisan budget agreement, the FY 1998 LHHS-Education appropriations bill included a bipartisan agreement to provide $29.3 billion for education. Democrats secured an additional $410 million in the final conference version of the bill.

House Republicans were back to their old tricks in FY 1999. They could not even pass their FY 1999 LHHS bill—it was so mired in controversy. The Republican LHHS bill reported by the Appropriations Committee included $30.5 billion for education, $2.6 billion less than the $33.1 billion provided in the final conference agreement on LHHS.

In the House of Republican FY 2000 Labor-HHS-Education bill reported by the Committee—a bill that never saw the light of day on the House floor—$33.3 billion was included for education, nearly $2.4 billion less than the $35.7 billion included in the final conference agreement.

In FY 2001, House Republicans included $37.1 billion in the House-passed Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations bill. This amount was a stunning $.9 billion below the amount secured by the Clinton White House and Congressional Democrats for education in the final conference agreement ultimately reached in December 2000.

In FY 2002, House Democrats succeeded in obtaining a commitment from President Bush to support another $4 billion for the FY 2002 LHHS 302(b) allocation. As a result, the House-passed LHHS bill provided $49.3 billion for education, an increase of $4.7 billion over the Bush request. The House level was scaled back slightly (by $336 million) in the final conference agreement.

In FY 2003, House Republicans punted on the Bush education budget, which would have cut No Child Left Behind programs by $90 million—until after the elections. Although they failed to hold a subcommittee or committee mark up, House Republicans introduced a LHHS bill that provided the President's request of $50.3 billion. This Republican LHHS bill was $2.8 billion below the final level agreed to in the FY 2003 omnibus bill.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—GOP EDUCATION CUTS

[Discretionary budget authority, program level, millions of dollars]

	Request	GOP House	Conference	GOP House compared to request	GOP House compared to conference
FY 1996	25,804	20,797	22,812	−5,007	−2,016
FY 1997	25,561	22,756	26,324	−2,805	−3,568
FY 1998	29,522	29,331	29,741	−191	−410
FY 1999	31,185	30,523	33,149	−662	−2,625
FY 2000	34,712	33,321	35,703	−1,391	−2,383
FY 2001	40,095	37,142	42,092	−2,953	−4,949
FY 2002	44,541	49,268	48,932	4,727	336
FY 2003	50,310	50,310	53,113	0	−2,803
FY 1996 to FY 2001	186,879	173,870	189,820	−13,009	−15,951
FY 1996 to FY 2003	281,730	273,448	291,865	−8,282	−18,418
FY 2004	53,139	55,380	na	2,241	na

Notes.—House level is the level in the House-passed bill or the House Appropriations Committee-reported bill in those years in which the House did not pass a LHHS bill, except in FY 2003 where the House level is the level in H.R. 246, a LHHS bill introduced by Chairman Regula. Shaded areas are years in which there was a bipartisan agreement on the House-passed Labor, HHS, Education Appropriations Bill. Figures reflect CBO scoring which may differ from OMB scoring in certain years.

In FY 1995, the House GOP proposed $1.7 billion in rescissions, of which $577 million were enacted.

REPUBLICAN RECORD ON TITLE 1

If House Republicans had had their way, funding for Title 1 would have been cut between FY 1996 and FY 2003 by a net total of $3.4 billion below the final levels that were enacted into law.

House Republicans led an attack on education in the FY 1996 Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill when they proposed only $5.6 billion for Title 1—slashing Title 1 funding by $1.14 billion below the previous year's level. The House Republican bill was $1.18 billion below the final conference version of the LHHS bill which rejected the Republican cuts.

In FY 1997, House Republicans included $6.8 billion for Title 1 grants in the FY 1997 LHHS-Education appropriations bill, a cut of $414 million below the request and $443 million below the final conference level for education.

Following the 1997 bipartisan budget agreement, the House-passed FY 1998 LHHS-Education appropriations bill included a bipartisan agreement to provide $7.7 billion for Title 1, an increase of $150 million over the request. This amount was scaled back slightly in conference to $7.5 billion.

House Republicans were back to their old tricks in FY 1999. They could not even pass their FY 1999 LHHS bill—it was so mired in controversy. The Republican LHHS bill reported by the Appropriations Committee included $7.4 billion for Title 1, $421 million less than the $7.7 billion provided in the final conference agreement on LHHS.

In the House Republican FY 2000 Labor-HHS-Education bill reported by the Committee—a bill that never saw the light of day on the House floor—Republicans proposed to freeze title 1 funding at $7.7 billion—$209 million less than the $7.9 billion included in the final conference agreement.

In FY 2001, House Republicans again proposed to freeze Title 1 grants at $7.9 billion in the House-passed Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations bill. this amount was $660 million below the amount secured by the Clinton White House and Congressional Democrats for education in the final conference agreement ultimately reached in December 2000.

In FY 2002, House Democrats succeeded in obtaining a commitment from President Bush to support another $4 billion for the FY 2002 LHHS 302(b) allocation. As a result, the bipartisan House-passed LHHS bill provided $10.5 billion for Title 1, a $1.7 billion increase that was the largest increase in the program's history. This amount was slightly scaled back (by $150 million) in the final conference agreement to $10.35 billion.

In FY 2003, House Republicans punted on the Bush education budget, which would have cut No Child Left Behind programs by $90 million—until after the elections. Although they failed to hold a subcommittee or committee mark up, House Republicans introduced a LHHS bill that included $10.85 billion for Title 1, cutting the President's request by $500 million. This Republican LHHS bill was $834 million below the final $11.7 billion included for Title 1 in the FY 2003 omnibus bill.

TITLE 1 GRANTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

[Discretionary budget authority program level, millions of dollars]

	Request	GOP House	Conference	GOP House compared to request	GOP House compared to conference
FY 1996	7,000	5,555	6,730	−1,445	−1,175
FY 1997	7,165	6,751	7,194	−414	−443
FY 1998 [1]	7,541	7,691	7,495	150	195
FY 1999	7,767	7,375	7,796	−392	−421
FY 2000	7,996	7,732	7,941	−264	−209
FY 2001	8,358	7,941	8,602	−416	−660
FY 2002 [1]	9,062	10,500	10,350	1,438	150
FY 2003	11,350	10,850	11,684	−500	−834
FY 1996–2003				−1,842	−3,397
FY 2004	12,350	12,350	na	0	na

Notes.—House level is the level in the House-passed bill or the House Appropriations Committee-reported bill in those years in which the House did not pass a LHHS bill, except in FY 2003 where the House level is the level in HR 246, a LHHS bill introduced by Chairman Regula.

[1] Years in which there was a bipartisan agreement on the House-passed Labor, HHS, Education Appropriations Bill.

REPUBLICAN RECORD ON IDEA PART B STATE GRANTS

If House Republicans had had their way, funding for IDEA Part B State Grants—which finance the federal contribution toward excess special education costs—would have been cut between FY 1996 and FY 2003 by a net total of $2.8 billion below the final levels that were enacted into law.

In FY 1996, the House Republican LHHS bill proposed to freeze IDEA Part B state grants at $2.3 billion, and the final conference level was $2.3 billion. This was a $88 million cut below President Clinton's request of $2.4 billion.

In FY 1997, the House Republican LHHS bill would have frozen IDEA Part B state grants funding at $2.3 billion—a level $279 million below President Clinton's request of $2.6 billion and $784 million below the final conference level of $3.1 billion.

In FY 1998—a bipartisan year in which Democrats supported the LHHS bill—the LHHS bill adopted by the House provided $3.4 billion for the IDEA Part B state grants, $185 million more than the request. Democrats secured an additional $375 million in conference above the House level for a final appropriation of $3.8 billion.

In FY 1999, the House Republican LHHS bill provided $4.3 billion for IDEA Part B state grants and this level was enacted in the final, conference agreement.

In FY 2000, the House Republican bill provided $4.8 billion for IDEA Part B state grants, $179 million below the final conference level of $5.0 billion.

In FY 2001, the House Republican bill provided only $5.5 billion for IDEA Part B state grants, an amount that was $850 million below the final $6.3 billion approved in conference.

In FY 2002—a bipartisan year in which Democrats supported the LHHS bill—the House-passed LHHS bill provided $7.7 billion for IDEA Part B state grants, a $186 million increase over the final conference level of $7.5 billion.

In FY 2003, the House never even considered the LHHS bill. However, the Republican LHHS bill introduced by Chairman Regula recommended $8.0 billion for IDEA Part G state grants, a $500 million cut below the President's request and $846 million below the final conference level.

IDEA PART B STATE GRANTS

[Discretionary budget authority, program level, millions of dollars]

	Request	GOP House	Conference	GOP House compared to request	GOP compared to conference
FY 1996	2,412	2,324	2,324	−88	0
FY 1997	2,603	2,324	3,108	−279	−784
FY 1998 [1]	3,241	3,426	3,801	185	−375
FY 1999	3,811	4,310	4,310	499	0
FY 2000	4,314	4,811	4,990	497	−179
FY 2001	5,280	5,490	6,340	210	−850
FY 2002 [1]	7,340	7,715	7,529	375	186
FY 2003	8,529	8,029	8,874	−500	−846
FY 1996–2003				898	−2,847
FY 2004	9,529	9,874	na	346	na

Notes.—House level is the level in the House-passed bill or the House Appropriations Committee-reported bill in those years in which the House did not pass a LHHS bill, except in FY 2003 where the House level is the level in HR 246, a LHHS bill introduced by Chairman Regula.

[1] Years in which there was a bipartisan agreement on the House-passed LHHS bill.

INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

Fiscal year	Children served (000)	Appropriation ($000)	Dollar increase in appropriation	Percent increase in appropriation	Federal share as a % of APPE
1977	3,485	251,770	na	na	5
1978	3,561	566,030	314,260	124.8	10

INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES ACT—Continued

Fiscal year	Children served (000)	Appropriation ($000)	Dollar increase in appropriation	Percent increase in appropriation	Federal share as a % of APPE
1979	3,700	804,000	237,970	42.0	13
1980	3,803	874,500	70,500	8.8	12
1981	3,941	874,500	0	0.0	10
1982	3,990	931,008	56,508	6.5	10
1983	4,053	1,017,900	86,892	9.3	10
1984	4,096	1,068,875	50,975	5.0	9
1985	4,124	1,135,145	66,270	6.2	9
1986	4,121	1,163,282	28,137	2.5	8
1987	4,167	1,338,000	174,718	15.0	9
1988	4,236	1,431,737	93,737	7.0	9
1989	4,347	1,475,449	43,712	3.1	8
1990	4,419	1,542,610	67,161	4.6	8
1991	4,567	1,854,186	311,576	20.2	9
1992	4,727	1,976,095	121,909	6.6	8
1993	4,896	2,052,728	76,633	3.9	8
1994	5,101	2,149,686	96,958	4.7	8
1995	5,467	2,322,915	173,229	8.1	8
1996	5,629	2,323,837	922	0.0	7
1997	5,806	3,107,522	783,685	33.7	9
1998	5,978	3,801,000	693,478	22.3	11
1999	6,133	4,301,000	500,000	13.2	11
2000	6,274	4,976,685	675,685	15.7	12
2001	6,381	6,323,685	1,347,000	27.1	14
2002	6,483	7,512,533	1,188,848	18.8	16
2003	6,580	8,858,398	1,345,865	17.9	18
2004 Request	6,672	9,512,533	654,135	7.4	19

Note.—Annual appropriations exclude funding for studies and evaluations.
Source: Data provided by the U.S. Department of Education Budget Service.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Just to keep the record straight, the Democrats had control of the Presidency, the House and the Senate in fiscal years 1994 and 1995. During this time, Congressional Democrats voted to cut the Department of Education by over $3 billion below levels recommended by President Clinton. The fiscal year 1994 increase was only 3.6 percent, and 1995 was only 2.4.

In fiscal year 1993, a Democrat-controlled House and Senate passed a final bill that cut President Bush's education budget by nearly $700 million. I think we have to stick with the facts here today. It is obvious that there have been some different approaches in the past.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I received unanimous consent earlier to insert a table after my remarks, which I will do, which will lay out clearly what the record has been over the last 10-year period.

All I would say in further rebuttal to my good friend: Regardless of what each of us argues the past shows, the issue today is whether we are for $6 billion more for education and health care for kids and sick people, or whether you are for using that $6 billion to make sure that our struggling millionaires get a double-sized tax cut. I think the public will see by the votes who is for what.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—GOP EDUCATION CUTS

[Discretionary budget authority, program level, millions of dollars]

	Request	GOP House	Conference	GOP House compared to request	GOP House compared to conference
FY 1996	25,804	20,797	22,812	−5,007	−2,016
FY 1997	25,561	22,756	26,324	−2,805	−3,568
FY 1998 [1]	29,522	29,331	29,741	−191	−410
FY 1999	31,185	30,523	33,149	−662	−2,625
FY 2000	34,712	33,321	35,703	−1,391	−2,383
FY 2001	40,095	37,142	42,092	−2,953	−4,949
FY 2002 [1]	44,541	49,268	48,932	4,727	336
FY 2003	50,310	50,310	53,113	0	−2,803
FY 1996 to FY 2001	186,879	173,870	189,820	−13,009	−15,951
FY 1996 to FY 2003	281,730	273,448	291,865	−8,282	−18,418
FY 2004	53,139	55,380	na	2,241	na

Notes.—House level is the level in the House-passed bill or the House Appropriations Committee-reported bill in those years in which the House did not pass a LHHS bill, except in FY 2003 where the House level is the level in HR 246, a LHHS bill introduced by Chairman Regula.
[1] Years in which there was a bipartisan agreement on the House-passed Labor, HHS, Education Appropriations Bill. Figures reflect CBO scoring which may differ from OMB scoring in certain years.
In FY 1995, the House GOP proposed $1.7 billion in rescissions, of which $577 million were enacted.

THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN RECORD ON EDUCATION FUNDING

Lately, the Republican Majority has attempted to claim credit for education funding increases, and to reinvent their record on education. Just a few years ago, however, Republicans were calling for the demise of the Department of Education and billions in education cuts.

If the House Republican position on education had prevailed over 9-year period, House Republicans would have spent $20 billion less on education.

One of the first actions of the new House Republican majority in the spring of 1995 was to rescind $1.7 billion ($1.635 billion in HR 1158 and $65 million in HR 889) in FY 1995 education funding. Democrats succeeded in reducing the final rescissions to less than $600 million.

House Republicans then led an attack on education in the FY 1996 Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill when they proposed only $20.8 billion for the Department of Education—a cut of $3.6 billion below the already-reduced FY 1995 level and $5.0 billion below President Clinton's education request. The House Republican LHHS bill was $2.0 billion below the final conference version of the LHHS bill supported by Democrats, which restored the majority of the Republican cuts.

House Republicans passed a FY 1997 LHHS-Education appropriations bill that provided $22.8 billion for education, a cut of $2.8 billion below the request and $3.6 billion below the final conference level for education. Democrats and President Clinton were successful not only in reversing these Republican-led cuts, but increasing education funding in real terms, to the funding levels approved in the last Democratic Congress.

Following the 1997 bipartisan budget agreement, the FY 1998 LHHS-Education appropriations bill included a bipartisan agreement to provide $29.3 billion for education. Democrats secured an additional $410 million in the final conference version of the bill.

House Republicans were back to their old tricks in FY 1999. They could not even pass their FY 1999 LHHS bill—it was so mired in controversy. The Republican LHHS bill reported by the Appropriations Committee included $30.5 billion for education, $2.6 billion less than the $33.1 billion provided in the final conference agreement on LHHS.

In the House Republican FY 2000 Labor-HHS-Education bill reported by the Committee—a bill that never saw the light of day on the House floor—$33.3 billion was included for education, nearly $2.4 billion less than the $35.7 billion included in the final conference agreement.

In FY 2001, House Republicans included $37.1 billion in the House-passed Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations bill. This amount was a stunning $4.9 billion below the amount secured by the Clinton White House and Congressional Democrats for education in the final conference agreement ultimately reached in December 2000.

In FY 2002, House Democrats succeeded in obtaining a commitment from President Bush to support another $4 billion for the FY 2002 LHHS 302(b) allocation. As a result, the House-passed LHHS bill provided $49.3 billion for education, an increase of $4.7 billion over the Bush request. The House level was scaled back slightly (by $336 million) in the final conference agreement.

In FY 2003, House Republicans punted on the Bush education budget, which would have cut No Child Left Behind programs by $90 million—until after the elections. Although they failed to hold a subcommittee or committee mark up, House Republicans introduced a LHHS bill that provided the President's request of $50.3 billion. This Republican LHHS bill was $2.8 billion below the final level agreed to in the FY 2003 omnibus bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think that debate was held when we had the Ways and Means bill. Today we have to work with what we have.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), a valued member of our subcommittee.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the full committee chairman for bringing this bill to the floor. This bill funds a lot of critical health investments, but being a Republican, I must say that in many past years I have been very concerned about this bill. It would often have significant increased levels of funding well above and beyond the inflationary level. We would have inflation going at 2 and 3 percent, and in some of these previous Labor-HHS appropriations bills, there have been 10–15 percent funding increases.

I was particularly concerned about this issue this year. We have had a significant decline in revenue into the Federal Treasury, mainly due to the recession. We have had significant expenses associated with the war on terror, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and I think the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations should be commended. He has brought a bill to the floor that is a total of $138 billion, $46 million over the budget request, $3.6 billion over comparable levels of last year.

I think it funds education, I think, adequately under the circumstances that we are in. And I must reiterate what the chairman has already said: We have doubled education spending over the last 8 years. Some of the other programs that I am particularly interested in, it provides the third year of the President's initiative to expand health services through community health centers. I have seen these programs in action firsthand. I think they are a very effective use of health care dollars, Federal tax dollars, in providing needed health care to some of the poorest in our country.

And the chairman just made some very good points. We are the majority. We have to be the responsible adults here. If we look at the Democratic record when they were in the majority, they frequently underfunded below the authorization levels in a lot of these programs. For example, the Democratic past Labor-HHS bill back in I believe it was 1994, that year increased education spending by only 2 percent. The chairman pointed out a reduction of $3 billion in 1995.

The issue here is it is easy to pass an authorization bill, but to find the dollars to fund it is always a challenge, and I think the chairman has done really an outstanding job in meeting that requirement.

Now, regarding the business about the tax cuts, if we did not cut taxes, supposedly we would have more money for this bill. Well, let us look at what those tax cuts are doing. Some of the tax cuts, they are going to the child credit. These are families that are going to get more money to pay for the cost of raising their kids. It is money that is going to go right back into the economy.

Then, of course, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) laid this case out very, very nicely. When we cut the rates, the majority of job growth in this country has been in the small business sector. Most small businesses pay at the personal level, and most of those small businesses, if you leave more money with them, if you tax them less, they are going to leave it in the business, and it will be easier for them to create jobs. Today we had another posting of unemployment up. I think most Americans want to see, more than funding for all of these various Federal programs going up much higher than the inflation level, would rather see people getting a job.

I stand by our tax cut package. I think it was the right thing to do. It was badly needed to get this economy going. Once we get this economy going, we are going to have more money into the Federal Treasury to better enable us in the years ahead to meet the requirements of all these various programs that the Federal Government is involved in funding.

I would encourage my colleagues, conservatives, liberals, Democrats, Republicans, to support this bill. I think this is a very, very good bill in the context of where we are today. We have a recession. We have a war on terror going on. We have problems in Iraq still. Yet we have a fairly good bill that increases funding for most of these critical needs areas slightly. I think it is a very responsible, mature, adult bill. I again commend the chairman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

(Mr. JACKSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by expressing my appreciation to the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA). It is an honor to serve under the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

□ 1200

The chairman indicated at the beginning of his remarks there are two real roles, goals, responsibilities, if you will, for government under the Constitution: to provide for the common defense and to provide for the general welfare. Just a few days ago, the Congress of the United States voted in the amount of $369.1 billion to provide for the common defense; and the other constitutional provision for which the chairman spoke, providing for the general welfare, today we will vote in the amount of $138 billion. Go figure. If we are providing for the common defense, a clear responsibility under the Constitution, providing for the general welfare, $138 billion, certainly the Federal Government has room for improvement on this question.

The key here is the 302(b) allocation for this bill, which limited our committee to $138 billion. The 302(b) allocation for this bill woefully underfunds a number of programs.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this bill that is before us today. Today we are considering the bill which assists the most vulnerable in our Nation. This bill provides assistance to the unemployed and job training to those who need the skills. This bill provides health care treatment, research, prevention funds to those who are ill; and this bill provides funds for the great American equalizer. What was unclear in the chairman's statement was whether or not he advocated for more funds under the 302(b) allocation for this bill. If he advocated for more funds for the Labor, Health and Human Services bill, then he cannot at the same time say that the funding for this bill is adequate because it is inadequate if he argued for more funds under the 302(b) allocation.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does provide more money for title I, but it does not provide adequate money. Title I is the primary Federal program that helps school districts meet the new accountability and academic results mandated by the Leave No Child Behind Act. With the title I funding, low-income, low-performing children are able to get help particularly with reading and mathematics, the two subjects that the No Child Left Behind Act requires be tested in grades three through eight beginning in 2005. Title I is a critical source of funding for high-poverty schools. In adopting the rigorous new accountability standards in title I, Congress on a bipartisan basis agreed to phase in increased title I payments over several years. For fiscal year 2004, the No Child Left Behind Act authorizes $18.5 billion with additional increments each year through 2007. The majority's fiscal year 2004 budget resolution promises $1 billion, or 9 percent increase over fiscal year 2003 for title I grants for school districts for a total of $12.7 billion.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that title I falls woefully underfunded in the chairman's mark.

The Majority's FY 2004 Budget Resolution promised a $1 billion or 9 percent increase over FY 2003 for Title 1 grants to school districts, for a total of $12.7 billion. Yet, the Committee bill provides only the President's request of $12.4 billion a—$666 million or 6 percent increase over last year and the smallest increase in 4 years—and falls $334 million short of their promise.

The Democratic Substitute offered in full Committee mark-up would have eliminated this gap by providing the additional $334 million for Title 1 grants, for a total of $12.7 billion. These funds would have allowed schools to hire an additional 6,600 teachers to provide high quality instruction to about 140,000 disadvantages children who are falling behind.

The $12.4 billion included in the Committee bill for Title 1 is $6.15 billion below the amount targeted in the NCLB Act. Let me say that one more time—$6.15 billion is below the amount targeted in the No Child Left Behind Act. With the additional $6.15 billion, an additional 120,000 teachers could have been hired to provide instruction to approximately 2.5 million low-income children across this country.

NCLB imposes significant new mandates on Title 1 schools, including new annual testing requirements in grades 3–8, ''adequate yearly progress'' to achieve academic proficiency for all children disaggregated by low-income, minority, limited English proficient, and children with disabilities status, new teacher and paraprofessional qualification standards, new data collection and reporting, and additional parental notice requirements.

More than 8,600 Title 1 schools, enrolling 3.5 million disadvantaged students nationwide, have been identified as failing to meet state academic standards. These chronically failing schools will face additional sanctions under the No Child Left Behind Act if they do not improve their academic performance. More schools will be labeled failing as states implement new ''adequate yearly progress'' requirements.

High-poverty schools have the greatest challenges, but the least experienced teachers, lower teacher salaries, and higher teacher turnover-factors with a negative correlation with student achievement.

Since FY 1996, Title 1 funding has increased from $6.7 billion to $11.7 billion, an increase of $5.0 billion or 75 percent. However, these increases were in spite of, not because of, House Republicans.

If House Republicans had had their way, they would have cut Title 1 funding by a net $1.8 billion between 1996–2003. House Republicans tried to slash Title 1 funding below the President's requests by $1.4 billion in FY 1996, $414 million in FY 1997, $392 million in FY 1999, $264 million in FY 2000, $416 million in FY 2001, and $500 million in FY 2003. In total, these cuts of $3.4 billion were offset by increases of $1.6 billion in FY 1998 and FY 2002—two bipartisan years when Democrats secured additional education funding for the LHHS bill.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to this bill. In January 2002, the President signed into law Congress' commitment to the most vulnerable children in America—Title 1. This bill falls $6.15 billion short of that commitment.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), a very valued member of our subcommittee.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Some years ago when I first came to this House of Representatives, I was afforded an unusual honor. I was a freshman appointed to the Committee on Appropriations, and at that same occasion I was given an opportunity to be on this very important subcommittee; and I have had the privilege of serving for some 8½ years in this capacity and watching these debates year after year. I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that those Americans following this debate today and down through the years get a pretty good idea of the dynamics going on in this House concerning spending bills.

First of all, I want to echo what some of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle have said. We all have a great deal of affection, Democrat and Republican, for the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the full committee. Likewise, I have great respect and affection for the intellect and determination and hard-work ethic of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). We will roll up our sleeves. We will debate in an honest manner. We will come up with a result, and then we will slap ourselves on the backs as Americans and say that we have done the best that we could do for our country and for our constituents. So we are all agreed that we cast no aspersions on each other as human beings.

My friends on the Democratic side of the aisle simply have a different philosophy of government than we do on this side of the aisle. They wish that we could spend more money on this bill, and they wish that we could spend more money on a lot of bills, and that is their true feeling; and they also feel that if only we could tax more, if only taxes were higher, then we could spend more money on the programs that they believe in.

In response to some of the charges that have been made and some of the statements that have been made by those who are going to oppose this bill today, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), my chairman, has pointed out that this Republican majority has doubled education spending, has tripled special needs education spending, and has doubled research under the National Institutes of Health. And in response to those remarks about huge increases in Federal spending, frankly some of my Republican colleagues, some of my more conservative Republican colleagues actually have concern about that level of increase. They are troubled that we have increased spending so much. They are a bit embarrassed by that, and they say that we did not come here to increase the size of government.

So the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), my friend and chairman, has had to strike a balance and come up with a product that will be able to get a 218-vote majority and move this legislation forward. There are 13 bills that must pass this House of Representatives, or we are not doing our duty, and they are the 13 appropriation bills. This is one of the largest and most significant of those, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) has done a good job in balancing those competing dynamics and coming up with a very reasonable bill.

As has been pointed out by some of my colleagues, this bill tries to hold program level growth and discretionary spending to a 2.7 percent increase from last year. At the same time, it provides the third year of the President's initiative to expand health services through the Community Health Centers program, a program that the President believes in and that he campaigned on in the year 2000. It increases funding for medical research, supported by the National Institutes of Health, by $680 million on top of the doubling of NIH funding that we have had over the past 5 years, which was a bipartisan commitment.

In order to frame the debate today, my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle will want to reopen the debate on the tax cut bill which of course has already been passed and already been signed into law. Their contention is that the rich have gotten too much in terms of tax cuts and that if only we would tax the rich a little more, then we could do some more of the kind of spending that they would like to do. I contend that this type of class warfare does not serve our Nation well, and it does not accurately reflect the truth about our Tax Code.

The truth is that during the past few years taxes on the richest Americans have increased by some 250 percent. In addition, it might interest Americans and my colleagues to know that the top 50 percent of wage earners in the United States pay 96 percent of all Federal taxes. The top 10 percent of earners in America—the top 10 percent—pay 67 percent, and even after our tax cuts, the top 1 percent of earners are still paying 37 percent of the taxes which our Federal Government receives.

Mr. Chairman, we will end the fiscal year on September 30. Unfortunately, we will finish with a $400 billion deficit. We are told by economists that some $300 billion of this deficit is due to the weakness in our economy. The last thing we want to do in a weak economy is start unraveling the tax cut which we passed for the very purpose of getting this economy stimulated. We need to create jobs both in large industry but also in the private sector with our small business individuals. We think the tax cut bill that has been signed into law by President Bush will create jobs. We think that the same Americans who are benefited by the programs

in this bill will also be benefited up and down the economic spectrum by the tax cuts because the economy will improve. So I say that we should certainly vote for this bill. I support my chairman entirely. I hope we will reject the amendment as offered by the Democrats, and I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to say there are no two people more committed to education of our young children than the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA). And the budget that we are presented today, or the funding that we are presented today, in this legislation is not of their doing. That decision was made a long time ago when the decision was made to provide for the tax cuts to go out and borrow $2 trillion and give it away in tax cuts, and the result is that we do not now have a sufficient amount of money to fund the promises that were made by this administration, by this Congress for the education bill of leaving no child behind. I am very proud to have been one of the four primary cosponsors of that legislation, to be one of the architects of that legislation. I believe that the reforms that we are asking to come about in that legislation are changing education in America, are giving children who never had an opportunity before, children who were lost in the system, an opportunity. But that legislation is the most significant reforms of the Federal role in elementary secondary education in 35 years.

Constantly, as we met and talked with the President of the United States, we talked about whether or not if we did the reforms would we have the resources, and we were assured we would have them. But today is when the rubber meets the road because today this is the appropriations bill. This is when we decide the real money that we will spend, and of course what we now see is the money that was promised in Leave No Child Behind is not in this legislation. It is not here for teacher professionalization, it is not here for title I, it is not here for after-school, all of which are key components to improving the educational experience and the success of America's children, especially America's poor and disadvantaged children.

We make it a keystone of this legislation, and it is a key to improving education and that is that we have a qualified teacher in every classroom within 4 years; and yet, of course, we see here that the funding is not available. Just yesterday the Republicans promised an additional $300 million for the Ready to Teach Act and yet the money for current teachers for professionalization is not in this legislation. It is short over $200 million, $240 million that would go to taking those thousands of teachers who are not presently certified, qualified to teach the subjects they are teaching, and get them certified and get them qualified so they can teach our children what they should be learning and our children will have an opportunity to learn it.

This appropriations bill, because of the budget decisions made by the Republicans and the administration, is a series of broken promises, promises made by the President of the United States when he signed this legislation, promises made by this administration and made by this Congress to America's parents, to America's children, to our schools, our school districts, that we would provide the resources to carry out these reforms, the annual assessment of children, the determining of which children are doing well and which need additional help. All of that is now threatened by the failure to provide this funding. It is not enough to say we double the funding in past or we tripled the funding in past. This is a brand-new game. It is a brand-new game based upon these very significant, important reforms.

□ 1215

The fact of the matter is there was a bipartisan agreement reached on the money that was necessary to carry out these reforms, and now we are reneging on that, and yet we are continuing to ask school districts to go forward with these reforms. We are continuing to ask school districts to make sure that every teacher is qualified, but we are not going to provide the resources to do that.

We have here the smallest increase in the past 8 years in education. Yes, it is an increase, but the question we should ask, just as we ask in many other parts, is is it sufficient to get the job done as the American public expects?

The fact of the matter is this provision in education funding in this legislation is not sufficient to do that. It is not going to provide the outcomes that we want for America's children. It is going to leave millions of children behind to a substandard education, trapped into results of that substandard education, and the loss of economic opportunity in America's society.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I think we just have to keep the record straight today, and this is a fact. What was promised by President Bush and congressional Republicans in No Child Left Behind was that Federal K–12 education spending would increase substantially, linked for the first time to accountability and high standards, and that is precisely what has happened.

Title I, disadvantaged students, the primary spending program in the No Child Left Behind increased during the first 2 years of President Bush's administration more than it did during the previous 7 years combined under President Clinton.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a valued member of our subcommittee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, many of us, when we came to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I came off the authorization committee for education and got on appropriations, I had concern when John Porter retired. I did not know who on the Republican side could fill the shoes of John Porter, one of the most caring individuals that I have ever known as far as education, medical research and the issues that we have in this bill today.

Well, I want to tell you something. The gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA), and I think the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) would agree, has more than filled those shoes. He cares deeply about those programs, education, medical research and the other issues, and he has done everything he can to bring this bill forth that helps people.

If you vote against this bill, there is an increase in IDEA, you are going to vote against that. If you vote against this bill, there is an increase in Pell grants. You are going to vote against those increases. Maybe not as much as you want, but there is an increase, and you will vote against it.

Be partisan if you want. This bill has got a lot of good things. None of it has the things that all of us want. I would like to see, under a different economy, more into education. And I think if you take the ''tax rate for the rich'' argument, if tax relief was static, then they would be right. But it is not. President Kennedy, former President Bush, this President Bush know that when you stimulate the economy and you have more revenue coming in to the Treasury, you will have more money for the economy and for education. That is what we believe, not that we are giving money away to ''the rich.''

My friends on the other side will say, well, they drug the Republicans kicking and screaming for education. Well, no skid marks. And I want to tell you, on this chart, if they drug us through the muck to raise education funding, look at 1995 and prior and where they funded education. I will submit these charts for the record. But they sure did not drag their own party to increase education, because look at the level at which the increase in education was and what it is now.

My colleagues on the other side know there is a regular process. The other body, that many of us call the House of Lords, no matter what figure we put in for any one of the 13 appropriations

bills, they will load it with pork. Traditionally, the Democrats did so, too, when they were in the majority, and that is, I think, a little bit of these figures that go into that as well. But they knew in conference there was a negotiation, and this bill will be negotiated in the conference as well.

I think if you look at the number of increases, Republicans did not do it all by ourselves. The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) over there, I laud what he did in working with the President, and we did that in a bipartisan way. I think we can get through this bill the same way.

If you take a look at IDEA, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) yesterday said they increased IDEA 7 percent every year. That is true. But when you increase IDEA from 2 percent of funding or 3 percent of current level, it is not very much, and the maximum was 6 percent. We are up to like 18 percent now in the last 5 years. That is a significant increase.

Did Republicans do that alone? Absolutely not. We did it with the help of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), we did it with the help of our Speaker and with the Members of the other body. Unfortunately, on the floor today there is more partisan wrangling for an election coming up than there is sitting down and really wanting to work on these bills, and that is disconcerting.

I have brought forward that my real concern is that we are increasing a lot of these funds for Title I, and we did in the previous years, too, with the help of my friend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) as well. But in California, Governor Davis, for example, Title I, the extra money we got in the formula fight and increases in funding, he has taken that money and is putting it into county mental health.

IDEA, which we fight for, my sister-in-law is head of IDEA for Alan Bersin, Superintendent of city schools, who was working under President Clinton, and I am supporting him. He is a good guy trying to do the right thing. But Governor Davis is cutting the State money and using the Federal money to drive the engine of IDEA and cutting a lot of people out. There is never enough money there that we can put in to solve all of these problems. I would say all the way from Pell Grants to Impact Aid, all of these programs are being cut.

My concern is the State of California and the lack of leadership of Governor Davis. He is crucifying the education programs.

Let me go to another area. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) could really ping on me on this if he wanted to, because when I came here as a freshman, I did not support the National Endowment for the Arts or NIH. I still do not support the National Endowment for the Arts. I thought they were a waste of money.

Then Speaker Gingrich came to me and said, Duke, look at it fiscally. Look at a child with diabetes. If we can get in with early detection and intervention and healthy living, we can stop kidney dialysis, the child going blind, amputation, re-hospital visits, and those dollars we will have to apply to Medicare more.

Then I went back and trumped Speaker Gingrich, who is controversial on your side, but he really had his heart in the right direction as far as NIH. I went back with John Porter and said it should be a Republican policy to double medical research, because it is the one thing that we can do to give back. You converted me, and we have done that.

In this bill, do we keep adding the money for NIH? No. We have doubled it, and now we want a COLA to maintain. If you take out construction, which can be delayed, it actually increases it 6 percent. And we did not get here alone. The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and Speaker Gingrich and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), all of us have worked on this. I just wish I would hear a little less partisan wrangling on the floor and more coming together, because I know, my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), we have done that before. I would like to continue to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following for the RECORD:

[Charts not reproducible in the RECORD.]

SPECIAL EDUCATION

For too long, America has measured success in special education by money and regulations—not by whether disabled children are learning.

The bill provides record funding of $9.9 billion to help the states. That means more than $1,400 per special education student. This year, a new authorization will focus on instruction methods, curricula, teacher training, and education strategies, that help identify early and accurately as well as treat swiftly the needs of disabled children.

NEW SOLUTIONS FOR TEACHING DISABLED CHILDREN BETTER

There are many challenges facing special education.

For some parents, special education laws and regulations can be a morass of bureaucracy and unmet needs leading to frustrating conferences, meetings, even court rooms. But for the vast majority of parents (67%), they rate their schools as ''good'' or ''excellent.''

As a recent survey of members of the National Schools Boards Association noted, almost 9 in 10 (88%) identified special education as an issue of ''moderate'' or ''significant concern.''

For special ed teachers, special education laws and regulations can mean reams of paperwork that keep them out of the classroom.

For some educators, special education laws mean extra class work as a nurse, a psychologist, or a social worker when trying to help a student while teaching a full class.

For school officials, special education can mean tough choices about resources and other students' needs, pitting some programs against others.

No Child Left Behind applies to every student—including those with disabilities.

Under the bipartisan law, every state must set clear and high standards for what students in each grade should know and be able to do in the core academic subjects of reading, math, and science.

States will measure each student's progress toward those standards with tests aligned with those higher standards.

The law requires that all schools be held accountable for the learning of every student.

We have to identify special needs early and accurately . . .

Of the 6.5 million children in special education, half of those who are in special education are identified as having a''specific learning disability.'' In fact, this group has grown over 300% since 1976.

Of those with ''specific learning disabilities,'' 80% are there simply because they haven't learned how to read. We must change that by promoting solid curricula, good teachers and involved parents.

Children of minority status are overrepresented in some categories of special education. The fact is African-American children are twice as likely as white children to be labeled as having mental retardation and placed in special education.

. . . and get children help swiftly and surely.

By focusing on scientifically tested, evidence-based research we can end the fads that force many children into special education.

By focusing on programs that work we can find the best ways to teach children including how to meet unique learning needs. To this end, No Child Left Behind funds only scientifically based teaching materials.

And, through the President's Early Reading and Reading First initiatives, reading programs will be supported that use proven methods, equip teachers to intervene when problems arise, and allow educators to build on strengths and target learning needs.

We must move from a culture of compliance to a culture of accountability and results.

This year Congress has the opportunity to resolve these issues. The Individual with Disabilities Education Act is set for reauthorization. Now is the time for reform.

The Education of the Handicapped Act of 1975 (now IDEA) requires that every child with disabilities receive a free and appropriate education in the public schools. Millions of children have benefited.

But too many fail to catch up.

Congress has poured billions of dollars into special education. It's time to measure progress not dollar signs.

We must heed the plea of families and make the system simpler.

We must heed the plea of teachers and reduce the paperwork and increase their time in the classroom. A tree should not fall every time a child enters special education.

Special education money must yield results—not encourage districts to put children in special education to get more federal money. The percentage of children in special education has soared from 8% in 1976 to 13% in 1997.

Politics should stop at the schoolhouse door.

That's why President Bush appointed experienced educators to a special commission to find out how to best serve children with disabilities.

The Commission on Excellence in Special Education looked at ways to make sure lesson plans, textbooks, and teaching methods are scientifically proven to get results so that early classroom experiences help not exacerbate learning difficulties.

The Commission also looked at the current effectiveness of teacher training and professional development not just for special educators, but also for all educators who work with students with disabilities.

The president believes in funding with reform.

For three straight years, President Bush has asked for three $1 billion increases in federal funding for IDEA. In contrast, President Clinton asked for total increases equaling $1.7 billion during his entire eight years in office.

This year's request is the largest of any president in history; $9.5 billion dollars.

That means the federal government will be spending an $1,400 for every child with a disability. The highest funding ever.

A majority of parents with children in special education (52%) agree that ''better programs and policies, not more money, is the best way to improve special education.''

Critics have attacked the issue of ''fully funding'' special education. But this is a twenty-five year-old attack.

Special education should not be treated as a separate cost system, and evaluations of spending must be based on all of the expenditures for the child, including the funds from general education.

As the President's Commission put it, ''Funding arrangements should not create an incentive for special education identification or become an option for isolating children with learning and behavior problems. Each special education need must be met using a school's comprehensive resources, not by relegating students to a separately funded program. Flexibility in the use of all educational funds, including those provided through IDEA, is essential.''

UNFUNDED MANDATES

Some critics charge that No Child Left Behind takes away local power and imposes unfunded mandates.

RECORD SPENDING AND A COMMITMENT TO SUCCESS

No Child Left Behind mandates only one thing: results for every child. The law ends the old days of ever-higher federal spending with no expectation or demand for better student achievement or wise use of taxpayer funds.

No Child Left Behind respects the rights of states to establish their own standards, align their curriculum to their standards, and assess whether or not students are meeting those standards.

Schools and school districts must be accountable for how they spend taxpayer funds.

States must improve schools, produce results, and ensure that every child learns.

And this law is amply funded. Democrats and Republicans passed a bill that combines record spending with a commitment to reform and results.

Fiscal Year 2003 funding for No Child Left Behind programs increased by more 36 percent over 2001, and 60 percent over 2000 levels.

This year America will spend more than $8,200 per student of which the federal contribution is now 8.4 percent.

Thanks to the record spending in No Child Left Behind, federal discretionary spending on education has more than doubled since 1996.

Spending without a plan, without accountability, without studying what works, without setting standards or expectations is a mandate of sorts—a mandate to fail every time.

No Child Left Behind provides record spending—the highest spending per child ever. That federal money is meant to supplement and boost state and local spending, ensuring that all children receive a world-class education.

Educators can spend the money more freely than ever before, but they cannot waste taxpayer money on programs that don't work. That's why the bill measures every child's progress with tests and gives every parent report cards on how their school is doing.

According to a new study from the National Bureau of Economic Research, the average cost of testing is just $5.81 per student—just a tiny fraction of the $8,200 spent per student.

Total spending on all testing is a mere seven-hundredths of one percent (.07 percent) of the cost of K–12 education.

In addition, No Child Left Behind provides full funding for the development and implementation of the new assessments required by the law by requesting $390 million this year—$3 million higher than the year before.

SUPPORTING SUCCESS

President Bush has done more than support record spending levels. His administration—for the first time in history—is focusing federal money on programs that work as well as ensuring that old programs show results.

As part of that leadership, the president's budget sets up top priorities such as special education, help for the disadvantaged (Title I), and the Reading First program, which supports solid scientifically based reading instruction.

The increases and record spending to programs such as Title I (for disadvantaged children) and special education were made possible by courageous leadership.

In the past the federal government has consistently increased spending, but it has never demanded that taxpayers get a return on their investments.

Using new measures of programs and a culture of accountability the No Child Left Behind Act provides the information and options to parents to improve the future of children in schools receiving Title I funds.

In the past, disadvantaged children had no options when they were trapped in low-performing schools. Now, portions of Title I funding can be used to send students to after-school classes, tutoring, even to a new, better performing school.

This is a solution proven to work: Get children into better learning environments to raise their academic performance. It's also why the president is requesting, and this subcommittee is recommending, $12.4 billion for Title I—the highest spending ever.

New programs and budget priorities will also help prevent many children from needing special education help.

Of the 6.5 million children in special education, half of those who are in special education are identified as having a ''specific learning disability.'' In fact, this group has grown over 300% since 1976.

Of those with ''specific learning disabilities,'' 80% are there because they haven't learned how to read. We must change that by promoting solid curricula, good teachers, and involved parents.

Children of minority status are overrepresented in some categories of special education. The fact is African-American children are twice as likely as white children to be labeled mentally retarded and placed in special education.

That's why the 2004 budget and the subcommittee bill increase spending on Reading First from $1.068 billion to $1.150 billion. From that total, Early Reading First is set to get a $25.5 million increase. These two programs teach reading and literacy skills using scientifically backed research. Such instruction and curricula will help held off the reading problems that lead so many children to special education.

All this supplements No Child Left Behind's requirement that all federal funds be directed to programs reflecting scientific backed curricula and instruction methods.

Of course, to increase spending on vital programs that serve millions of children is a challenge for fiscally responsible leaders. It often means ending programs that have no track record of success or inefficiently serve too few children.

TITLE I

In 2004, President Bush's Title I funding request for disadvantaged students will provide yet another increase to record levels.

HOW PRESIDENT BUSH FIGHTS FOR TITLE I:

The president recognizes that the Title I program is at the very heart of both the federal investment in improving elementary and secondary education and the reforms called for in the No Child Left Behind Act.

Building on last year's historic increase, the president has requested and the subcommittee has approved $12.4 billion in 2004, which will result in a $4.4 billion increase since 2000—a 55% increase!

This means more than 15 million students in more than 46,000 schools will receive Title I services.

In his first three years, President Bush and the Republican Congress have sought double the support for Title I that President Clinton sought in his previous eight budget requests.

MORE THAN MONEY: REAL HELP FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Real leadership means ensuring programs help children, not just spend more money.

No Child Left Behind converts the Title I program from a system of reckless spending to a structure of accountability for finance and results.

President Bush has proposed boosting spending on Title I to over $12 billion annually—but for the additional funding, he expects clear results. States are required to develop standards in math and reading for grades 3–8, with annual assessments tied to these standards.

Title I was one of the federal government's first major education programs. It was intended to help individual children from low-income homes achieve. No Child Left Behind focuses the money back on high poverty schools to help children in those schools improve their academic performance.

Fro 38 years and with nearly $160 billion, Title I has not fulfilled its purpose of boosting academic performance.

A lack of accountability and a lack of research-based education methods left Title I efforts with few results to show. In recent decades, the achievement gap between disadvantaged children and their higher-performing, more affluent peers, has remained wide, and in some case, has grown wider still.

Under No Child Left Behind student performance will be monitored and the results will matter.

All schools must meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) objectives for all the students they serve—regardless of a child's race or socioeconomic status.

The 12-year goal of No Child Left Behind is teach every child and live up to the vision first dreamt when title I was begun.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Pell Grants are maintained at $4,050 for the maximum award. This is the highest level in the program's history.

This latest proposed increase will also continue to retire a shortfall related to the 2002–2003 award year while maintaining support for nearly 4.9 million low and middle-income students—one million more students since 2001.

The bill continues its commitment to disadvantaged students includes increased funding overall for HBCUs and HISs that strengthen institutions that serve high proportions of minority and disadvantaged students.

An increase of $10.1 million (4.7 percent) for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).

A $1.2 million increase (1.3 percent) for Hispanic-serving Institutions (HSIs).

Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG) are maintained at $760 million, which would leverage nearly $200 million in institutional matching funds to make a total of $960 million available in grants to an estimated 1.2 million recipients.

Work-Study is maintained at $1.01 billion to help 1.1 million needy students pay for college through part-time work on campus or in the community.

The Education Department waives the 25 percent match requirement for students employed as reading or math tutors.

The president's budget allows for more than $1 billion in new low-interest loans to be made to needy students qualifying under the Perkins Loan program, and continues a $99 million capital contribution to a revolving fund that has grown to a sustainable size—more than $7.2 billion—over its 40-year history.

Repayments of existing loans into federal revolving funds held at institutions will continue to support more than $1 billion in new Perkins Loans each year.

PELL GRANTS

Pell Grants give low- and middle-income students greater access to college.

Nearly 4.9 million students will receive Pell Grants in 2004.

Pell Grants because they provide millions of students with the freedom and opportunity to go to college.

In just two years (2000–2002), the number of Pell recipients has surged 25 percent!

The program is a perfect example of a need-based program meant to open doors and provide equality of education opportunity: The poorer the student, the larger the award.

Pell Grants show how freedom of choice in education works to help students and keep America competitive.

Pell Grants are an example of the federal government enabling school choice for millions of Americans. Students can use their Pell Grants at public or private schools. They can even use them to attend religious schools.

Real choice for students is one reason that this country's higher education system is the envy of the world.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, we come together all right when we have good bills to come together on, but this bill is a turkey, and that is why on this occasion we are not for it.

I will also be inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when we get into the full House several charts which relate to what the gentleman just said that demonstrate the error of his ways.

I would also point out to the gentleman, he is factually incorrect if he says that this bill was earmarked when the Democrats were in control. There were no earmarks whatsoever. In fact, Bill Natcher, the last Democratic chairman of this subcommittee, prided himself on not having any earmarks.

With respect to the subcommittee that I chaired for foreign operations, there were no earmarks in the foreign operations bill when I chaired that subcommittee either.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I think the theme of this particular bill seems to be ''promises made and promises broken.'' The fact of the matter is that this theme is true with respect to K through 12 education, where President Bush's own education bill, the No Child Left Behind bill, the promise was a deal. The deal was that there would be more accountability and more requirements in there that would be imposed or mandated on local communities to meet that cost, and, in return, the Federal Government would step up to the plate and put some more resources towards meeting those mandates.

The broken part of the promise, of course, is this appropriations bill is $8 billion short on the promised full funding. Yes, it is a little over 1 percent more than the current funding, but that is essentially a freeze when you consider the increased number of students involved and the inflationary factor.

The fact of the matter is it does not at all address the increased mandates of local communities to meet the requirements in that bill.

This theme is also true with respect to IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the promise of over 25 years ago that the Federal Government would try to come up with 40 percent of the excess cost of educating a child with disabilities. Now, we know that that high cost for a free and appropriate education of disabled students was not being met by the States, and the Federal Government stepped forward with that promise. The States now have relied on that promise. In 2004, 6.4 million 3- to 21-year-olds depend in part on the Federal Government to step forward and help out.

Promise number two in the area of IDEA is in 1994 the Republicans in their Contract on America said they would fully fund IDEA, but both of these promises have been broken. Both the 25-year-old goal and the decade-old political statement have not been met.

The third promise is the majority's 2004 budget resolution. It promised an increase of $2.2 billion over the last year's grants for school districts.

Another promise was the majority's reauthorization bill passed in April, again promising an additional $2.2 billion for IDEA.

The fact of the matter is this appropriations bill falls $1.2 billion short on IDEA. Under the Republican plan, the State of Massachusetts will lose over $29 million on grants that it otherwise would have gotten if the authorization bill's goals were met.

But that is the way it is, Mr. Chairman, with this House. The majority says when it comes to giving tax cuts to millionaires, they can take the check to the bank; but when it comes to funding educational needs for children and their families, that check is written in disappearing ink.

When it comes to millionaires getting a break, deficits do not seem to matter; but when it comes to funding education for disabled kids in Massachusetts and throughout this country, deficits all of a sudden do seem to matter, and there is no money left to help.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) offered an amendment to just make those millionaire tax cuts a few thousand dollars less so we could meet this obligation and add that $1.2 billion back into IDEA, but the majority voted it down in committee. Yesterday the Committee on Rules made sure we could not debate it on the floor of the House.

So, in this body millionaires get the huge tax cuts they make, they do not have any shared sacrifice, they do not offer back to help out, but families and children and school districts, they do not get it. They get the check written in disappearing ink.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to lend my support for the 2004 Labor-HHS appropriations bill. Much has been said today by those in opposition to the bill regarding the lack of aid to social projects and education, and the reason I wanted to come down here today is to call special attention to one program that has been given significant increases, and that has to do with mentoring. Those dollars have gone from practically zero a year ago to a significant amount. As a matter of fact, those mentoring programs have been funded by an increase of roughly 300 percent this year.

This is very important. The reason I think this is important is to realize that over the last 10 years, we have spent an additional $80 billion on education. That is both Republicans and Democrats. We have increased it $80 billion. We have seen no increase in the level of test scores, we have seen no improvement in drop-out rates.

□ 1230

So just spending large amounts of money does not fix the problem.

One of the things that has happened here is we have seen a tremendous increase in social pathology. We have more and more kids who go to school each day who are so troubled by their environment and their home life that they cannot really learn anything because they cannot focus. So mentoring

is one thing that does work. There are statistics and research that indicates this, that mentoring significantly reduces dropout rates, cuts drug abuse by roughly 50 percent, absenteeism from school by roughly 50 percent, teenage pregnancy by 30, 40 percent, violent behavior by 30 percent. It improves graduation rates, personal hygiene, and relationships with peers and with parents. It costs about $300 to $500 a year to run a good mentoring program per student. It costs about $30,000 a year to lock somebody up. Somebody addicted to meth will cost probably roughly $50,000 to $100,000 for a community, because they are going to commit 60 crimes a year, on the average. So we feel that this is very cost effective. This money will come back to society many times over.

So I would like to thank the President for his interest, as well as the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER) for his interest in mentoring, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for his help, and particularly the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA), because as I have found the chairman, he has been very fair. He has listened very carefully. He does care about children. He cares about education. He has a difficult balancing act to perform and has done it, I think, with great effectiveness. I just wanted to come down here and thank the chairman. I appreciate it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation because it abandons our commitment, our common commitment to affordable college education for American families; and it abandons those values which guide us towards that commitment.

Just last month, unemployment rose to 6.4 percent, the highest in 9 years. America's working-class and middle-class families are struggling to make ends meet; and yet college tuition is skyrocketing in this country. Double-digit tuition increases are a standard at public universities, with these costs rising by more than 20 percent in some States.

The solution in this bill to these trends of rising unemployment and increasingly unaffordable college education is to freeze all student aid for the first time in 6 years. The value of the Pell grant, the biggest and largest Federal college assistance program and other student financial aid programs, actually decreases under this bill. It does not even adjust for inflation or counteract sharply-rising college tuition costs.

I believe that this bill runs counter to the values that Members on both sides of the aisle share. I know I have talked to Members on the other side of the aisle who have expressed the importance of college education. We would not be here in this Chamber if it were not for the importance that college education provided us to move and achieve for us and for our families the American Dream.

We tell our constituents that they should have to take out a second mortgage on their homes or burden their children with increasing amounts of debt to just make college education accessible. Now, I remember a family I met, a police officer and a spouse, a teacher in a parochial school. They had two kids in high school. They looked at me and they said they had no idea how they were going to pay for college education for their kids who wanted to go to a public university. I was running for Congress and I told them about the tuition deduction which ends in 2005, their ability to deduct $4,000 from their taxes. I told them about other availabilities of States programs.

Now, we have talked on both sides of the aisle. We are all here because of the importance we put on higher education. We know it is the door which every American middle-class family or low-income family walks through so they can achieve for themselves and their families the American Dream. This bill is in violation of our common values and the principles that we hold true, that a higher education is the key to America. We should not convince middle-class families of the importance of college education and then place it out of reach for them. The only guarantee that that parent has is to take a second mortgage on their house. The only guarantee we provide is that child graduates from college with $30,000 or $40,000 or $50,000 in debt as they begin the new adventure of their endeavors in life. According to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, 48 percent of qualified, low- to moderate-income students from high school do not go to 4-year colleges because of financial barriers.

I believe, and I have talked to Members on the other side of the aisle, that this bill violates our fundamental commitment to make sure that college education is there for middle-class families by walking away from the commitment to make sure that college assistance is here today, there tomorrow, so they can go to college and achieve for themselves and their children what we are here doing for ourselves and our children.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I want to say first, before yielding to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, that his committee is looking at all of these programs to find which of those are working well and is providing reforms that will make them work even better, and I think that is an important element of what we are doing today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the dean of our Ohio delegation, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), for yielding me this time. Let me thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for their efforts in bringing this bill to the floor today. We all know this is a difficult bill. There are a lot of competing interests in this bill, and it is never easy; but they have done a good job.

There has been a lot of discussion here about the fact that this ought to be bigger. But not only did we, the Congress, support a tax cut for the American people, we also supported a $20 billion increase in discretionary spending. And the fact is, we are spending more. Our job as Members of Congress is to make decisions, decisions about where the resources that we get from our taxpayers, where those resources ought to go. For a while, in the late 1990s, revenues were flowing to the Federal Government at unprecedented rates, and we did not have to make as difficult choices as we do today, given the fact that we are in a recession and given the fact that we have been the subject of a serious terrorist attack. So we are making decisions.

But when it comes to the education issues that we fund in this bill, we all know when we passed the No Child Left Behind Act that we were going to make a serious commitment to improve all of America's schools, especially the neediest of America's schools. We know the problems that are there; and in a bipartisan way, this House and this Congress and the President worked to put in place a reform effort. And for the first time in the 37 years that the Federal Government has been involved in our local schools, we have all States in compliance with the Federal law. This never happened before. All 50 States have set their accountability plans to Washington and all 50 States, and the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, have had their plans approved. This is a major accomplishment on the part of the Congress and the administration to start the accountability process in a serious way.

We also said when we passed that bill that we would increase our funding to our local schools. Under the bill we have before us, title I gets $666 million in new money. Now, this is in addition to the money that we have given over the last 3 years. If we look at the last 3 years under President Bush, the increases in title I were greater than the increases in title I during 7 years of President Clinton.

Now, we can argue about whether it is enough, whether it is too much; but the fact is that we stepped up to the plate to help the neediest of our students, because title I money goes to poor children and goes to poor schools. I think that we have done our job, and we need to stay at it. We need to keep working to increase these amounts. But we have to understand that this $666 million increase is on top of the

$1.2 billion increase last year and a $1.3 billion increase the year before.

Let us talk about special needs children, individuals with disabilities and education. Since 1995, the Congress has increased our grants to local schools by 300 percent. In this bill we add another $1 billion of funding to help meet our commitments. Now, we can have a partisan debate about who is doing the most for education, but when Republicans took control of Congress in 1995, the Federal commitment to IDEA was 5 percent of the cost, 5 percent. With the passage of this bill, we will be up to 18.7 percent of the cost of IDEA, and it is based on a much greater number of special ed children today than what we were talking about in 1995, a 300 percent increase.

Also in the bill that we have before us, we move the reading grant for Reading First and Early Reading to $1.15 billion. Now, this is again a 300 percent increase over where we were just 3 years ago in terms of our commitment to help children in kindergarten through third grade and even younger in the earlier grant money to help them have a chance at being able to read by the end of the third grade.

Charter schools in this bill will get an increase of $71.5 million, another significant increase, made up of $220 million of money for start-up and planning for new charter schools, and $75 million worth of facility money, which will be leveraged into over $200 million worth of money to help plan facilities. There is another $885 million in this bill, an increase, to do Pell grants.

We all know, especially the speaker that spoke before, of the increasing challenge that this Congress has to meet our commitments under the Higher Education Act, to provide more access for the neediest of our students who are able and want to go to college. The more we work to increase access, the harder it becomes because the cost of tuition and fees at our colleges and universities continues to outstrip inflation by a rate of two to three times the inflation rate, causing us increasing problems. As we reauthorize the Higher Education Act, as we go through the balance of this year and next, we will continue to look at what we can do to ensure that the children have better access.

Head Start gets an increase here of $148 million of new money. But overall, spending on discretionary education programs in this bill increases by $2.3 billion. Mr. Chairman, $2.3 billion, that is real money on top of the money we are spending, bringing the total to some $55.4 billion that we are committing in this bill to discretionary education programs. This does not include the cost of student loans and mandatory spending programs, but $55.4 billion worth of discretionary money. I just think that if we look at over the last 3 years since President Bush has taken office, that is an increase of $13.2 billion of real money, trying to help improve our schools and to ensure that every child in America gets a chance at a good education, because without one, they will have no chance at a shot at the American Dream. We need to support this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply correct several of the impressions left by the previous speaker.

I want to congratulate the Republican Party. I will readily admit that they have changed somewhat since they took over in 1995. When they took over in 1995, they wanted to cut the guts out of education funding, and they wanted to abolish the Department of Education. They have become somewhat more civilized since that time. But they are still producing appropriation bills that do not meet the promise of their authorizations and do not meet the promise of their budget resolutions. That is obvious.

With respect to title I, the fact is that between fiscal year 2001 and 2003, the Bush administration requested a total increase of $1.3 billion for title I, only 44 percent of the total $2.9 billion increase eventually provided by the Congress, one House of which is under Democratic control. On Pell Grants, if House Republicans had had their way, the Pell Grant maximum award would have been cut between fiscal year 1996 and fiscal year 2003 by a net total of $530 below the final levels enacted into law.

So let me simply say those are the facts with respect to the past. But the past, in my view, is not quite as important as the future; and I would simply say that today it is very simple: Do we want to use $6 billion to guarantee that people who make more than $1 million a year will get an $88,000 tax cut, or do we want to limit their tax cut to $44,000 so we can move $6 billion into education and into health care, most of which will go to protect the health care of children?

□ 1245

That is the issue that is before us, not yesterday, but today; and when the votes are counted, we will see where each party stands.

REPUBLICAN RECORD ON PELL GRANTS

If House Republicans had had their way, the Pell Grant maximum award would have been cut between FY 1996 and FY 2003 by a net total of $530 below the final levels that were enacted into law.

In FY 1996, the House Republican LHHS bill cut President Clinton's request for a $2,620 maximum Pell Grant by $180 to $2,440. The Republican bill provided $30 less than the $2,470 maximum grant provided in the final LHHS bill.

In FY 1997, House Republicans again cut President Clinton's request for a $2,700 maximum Pell Grant by $200 to $2,500. The Pell Grant award level in the House Republican LHHS bill was $200 less than the final $2,700 maximum award approved in the LHHS conference agreement.

In FY 1998, a bipartisan House-passed LHHS bill provided a $3,000 maximum Pell Grant level. This amount, secured by Democrats, provided a $300 or 11 percent increase over the previous year, and was later enacted into law.

In FY 1999, the House Republican LHHS bill provided a token $25 more than the final conference level of $3,125 for the maximum Pell Grant.

In FY 2000, the House Republican LHHS bill provided $3,275 for the maximum Pell Grant, $25 less than the $3,300 maximum Pell Grant approved in the final conference agreement supported by Democrats.

In FY 2001, the House Republican LHHS bill included $3,500 for the maximum Pell award—$250 less than the $3,750 secured by House Democrats in conference. The final level secured by Democrats provided a $450 increase over the previous year and was the largest Pell Grant increase in more than 25 years.

In FY 2002—a bipartisan year—Republicans agreed with Democrats to raise the maximum Pell Grant to $4,000, an increase of $250 over the previous year. This level was enacted into law.

In FY 2003, the Republican LHHS bill introduced by Chairman REGULA accepted the President Bush's proposal to freeze the maximum grant at $4,000. The bill provided $50 less than the $4,050 level ultimately approved in the FY 2003 omnibus appropriations bill.

PELL GRANT PROGRAM—MAXIMUM AWARD

	Request	GOP House	Conference	GOP House compared to request	GOP House compared to conference
FY 1996	2,620	2,440	2,470	−180	−30
FY 1997	2,700	2,500	2,700	−200	−200
FY 1998 [1]	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0
FY 1999	3,100	3,150	3,125	50	25
FY 2000	3,250	3,275	3,300	25	−25
FY 2001	3,500	3,500	3,750	0	−250
FY 2002 [1]	3,850	4,000	4,000	150	0
FY 2003	4,000	4,000	4,050	0	−50
FY 1996–2003				−155	−530
FY 2004	4,000	4,050	na	50	na

Notes.—House level is the level in the House-passed bill or the House Appropriations Committee-reported bill in those years in which the House did not pass a LHHS bill, except in FY 2003 where the House level is the level in HR 246, a LHHS bill introduced by Chairman Regula.

[1] Years in which there was a bipartisan agreement on the House-passed LHHS bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today reluctantly in opposition to the 2004 Labor-Health and Human Services bill because I know how much our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), really cares about these issues and how he is committed to these issues. And I also want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). They are all men of great principle and fairness. I enjoy serving with them, and I do respect them.

However, I am really disappointed that this process operated under terms and with restraints for the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) that do not do justice to the millions of Americans whose lives are improved by the programs funded in this bill. For example, one would hope that students attending college could count on greater support from the Federal Government during these hard times, but with this bill they will not be able to. The maximum Pell grant is frozen at 4,050. Not only have House Republicans consistently neglected the Pell grant, but it is important for us all to remember that when the program was started in 1975, Pell grants paid about 84 percent of college costs. It now pays only about 38 percent of college costs. And under the Republican bill, funding for the four campus-based aid programs, Supplemental Education Opportunity Grant, College Work Study, Leveraging Educational Assistant Partnership, LEAP, and Perkins Loans Program, are also level-funded.

The average student loan debt has nearly doubled in the last 5 years. Last year the average undergraduate borrower left school with nearly $17,000 in debt due to Federal student loans. With nearly 64 percent of students depending on student loans, and that percentage is sure to grow during this time of economic hardship, how can we in good conscience not increase funding for the very programs that encourage States to implement need-based aid?

In New York, the State and city university systems are on the cusp of instituting massive tuition increases, and they are not alone in their struggle to make up for faltering State budgets and decreased philanthropy. Colleges across the country are hiking tuition by record levels, including colleges and universities in Texas, Iowa, Missouri, and Massachusetts.

And let us not forget, we have to couple the lack of college funding assistance in this Labor-HHS bill with the administration's recently announced regulation change that would decrease college loans for millions of students and their families. Nationwide under the Bush regulations, 84,000 students would lose Pell grant eligibility altogether, and millions more would lose some Federal assistance. It really was a shame that we could not have corrected that in this bill.

I will give you an example. I visit the community colleges and the 4-year colleges in my district all the time.

For example:

A family of four living in New Jersey with one child in college, attending full time, would have to pay about $100 more toward college expenses; and

A family in New York with $45,000 combined income, one child attending college full time, would have to pay about $300 more toward college expenses.

During Committee consideration of the Labor HHS, we had an opportunity to put the breaks on the Bush proposal. But, and I think it's important for America's hardworking families and dedicated students to know, Committee Republicans rejected that attempt.

In pointing out the problems with this bill, I do not fault either of the chairmen. They had a bad set of parameters to work with. But the 2.9 million graduating high school students, the 5 million Pell Grant recipients, and the millions of Americans who rely on the student aid programs to make attending college a reality deserve more. And the Democratic substitute would have done just that!

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Republican Labor HHS bill.

Let us hope that we can correct this bill and work together as the bill comes back from the Senate and reach the level that I know our chairman and our ranking member and all of us really want to achieve. I thank the gentleman again for working so closely with us.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to comment that in the last 8 years we have doubled Pell grants, and I will also add that we have added $885 million this year. The reason the maximum has stayed stable is that more people are taking advantage of it, and that is good. That is a positive thing. As a naval veteran, I am a product of the GI bill, and I realize how very important these opportunities are. And I would like to do more, but I think we have done a good job, considering the resources that are available.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I rise in support of this bill, and I rise particularly to support the funding for diabetes prevention and control activities that are contained in it.

As the cochairman of the Diabetes Caucus in the House, I believe that increased funding for these programs is of utmost importance, and I thank the committee for its attention to the issue of diabetes. This bill increases funding for NIDDK over the last year's level by $47 million and increases funding at the CDC by $300 million over last year's level.

The progress made to date with this money that has already been appropriated by the House is very impressive, and I want to emphasize to the chairman and the Members that clinical trials involving the transplantation of insulin-producing cells into individuals with Type I diabetes has brought us within reach of a cure. Of the approximately 200 patients who have received these transplants, 160 of them no longer need to take insulin. If you are involved at all with diabetes, you know how significant this is. It is a life-saving event.

So as we consider the bill, I know there are some upcoming initiatives that we need to emphasize, and they will be very important in the prevention of diabetes in America, and in turn they will save taxpayers' dollars.

On March 31, 2003, the Department of Health and Human Services announced that the Department would be launching a diabetes detection initiative. The goal of the initiative is to encourage people at risk with diabetes to get tested and to refer those who test positive for a follow-up. About 6 million people in this country have diabetes, but they just do not know it. So by supporting this initiative in the future, the committee and the House can help these people avoid the devastating complications of diabetes, because they are so much a part of the Medicare cost that we face in this country.

I have been working to develop a national diabetes strategic plan with the American Diabetes Association and the Office of the Surgeon General along with former Speaker Newt Gingrich, who has been a leader in this effort to bring a cure to diabetes, and the details on this announcement will be made later in the coming months, but it is very exciting, the initiatives that are out there. The committee has an excellent record on diabetes prevention funding, and I am certain that the needs of these meritorious programs will be recognized as we go to conference on this measure.

I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for his good work.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness, Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, today's education funding bill completely ignores the reality facing the neediest of our college students today. College costs are rising dramatically over the last 10 years. College tuition is up 38 percent, and the buying power of the Pell grant is at an historical low. Due to the sour economy, State legislatures have dramatically reduced their support for a postsecondary education as they seek to balance State budgets. Charitable giving, alumni support and endowments are down.

How has all of this affected our students? Students, especially the neediest students, are literally being denied a postsecondary education because

they do not have the resources to pay for college. According to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, nearly one-half of all college-qualified, low- and moderate-income graduates will be unable to attend a 4-year college due to rising costs. Nearly 170,000 students will be unable to attend any postsecondary institution.

As a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness, I have heard from countless numbers of students and student associations on their need for relief, but here on this floor the Republican response to the financial difficulties of students is to freeze the maximum Pell grant.

We have passed tax cuts that have benefited the wealthiest of Americans. Those within incomes of $1 million receive an $88,000 tax cut, and student aid was frozen. This is a terrible priority. We cannot provide the $5,800 maximum authorized Pell grant to our students because we prioritize those tax cuts over the needs of students. Are we now asking the neediest students to walk across town to those who got an $88,000 tax cut and plead for help in going to college?

What is really happening to our country? We are better people than that.

The entire increase in Pell grants during the Bush administration is less than the increase made in Pell in the last year of the Clinton administration. Clearly financial access to a postsecondary education has not been a priority for this administration. Freezing Pell grants at a time when more and more individuals are seeking retraining and education due to the sour economy sets us back as we struggle to come out of this economic recession.

Rather than passing another tax cut for the wealthiest in our Nation, we should defeat this bill on the floor. Instead of passing this legislation, we should significantly increase funding for Pell grants and other critical education priorities.

When I was growing up, my dad had to pick one of his five children to go to college, one of the five. Although my brothers and sisters were qualified, he had to pick one. Are we returning to those days when those choices had to be made?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) has 16 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 46 minutes remaining.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

We hear on the Pell grant, I want to point out something, and that is that in the last 2 years, the numbers have increased 25 percent. So even though the level which we have increased substantially in the last 6 or 8 years was the same this year, it is because we wanted to give more students a chance. We have increased the total amount by $880 million that will be available for Pell grants, but there are so many more, and that is good. I like to see more and more students gets involved and use this service, but it makes it a tough budgeting situation. At least that is the reason that we have gotten to the situation we are in.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON), a member of the committee.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and the great work he has done on this, the most difficult, I believe, of the appropriation bills.

We have continually heard today during this debate that 302(b) allocations were insufficient or inadequate, and, consequently, we do not have enough money to spend on this appropriation, and it is all due to the tax cuts.

If I remember correctly, during the debate on tax cuts, we could not do those tax cuts because of the increase that they would cause in the deficit. And now we see the truth. They were never concerned about the increase in the deficit. They were concerned that there would not be enough money to spend on the variety of programs that they want to spend money on.

Well, the distinguished minority whip said that we cannot wash our hands, like Pontius Pilate, of the debate on the deficit and the tax cuts and on the budgets because they are all interrelated, and he is absolutely right.

There is one thing that should be clear from the past decade. We cannot raise taxes enough to eliminate the deficit that has occurred. Another thing should be clear is that we cannot cut spending enough to eliminate the deficit that has occurred.

The only way to eliminate the deficit is to have a growing economy. We learned that in the 1990s. The only way to have the resources to spend on the programs that today you complain about as being inadequately funded is to have a growing economy. And we on this side of the aisle believe that one way to help that economy is to stimulate it by reducing taxes to put more money into people's pockets to grow the economy. That is why we supported the tax cuts, not because we care more about millionaires than we care about children or anything else. It is so in the future, in the long term, we have the resources for these programs that we all believe are vitally important.

Yet, in spite of the economy, we have produced a bill which continues the improvements we have made in education and health funding over the past 8 years.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) continually says, and quite emphatically, that the only reason we have been able to increase the funding for education or double it over the last 8 years is because he brought us across the line kicking and screaming. And I guess that may be true. I do not know. I have not been here 8 years. All I want to know is who was he bringing across the line kicking and screaming when his party controlled the House, the Senate and the White House? I am not sure who was doing the kicking and screaming, but you have been much more successful with our party than you were with your own party.

□ 1300

The distinguished minority leader last year on the debate on the rule went through a litany of programs in education and health that were cut. What the distinguished minority leader did not say is that in each and every one of those programs that she mentioned, I believe every one of them, there is actually an increase in spending. She was talking about a decrease from the authorized level, and I do not know of hardly any program in the Federal Government that is actually funded at the authorized level. Yet we have continued to improve funding for these programs.

As an example, in special education grants, $1 billion more than last year. That is not a cut. In Title I, $660 million above last year. That is not a cut. Improved teacher quality, $49.4 million. For transition to teaching to assist eligible members of the Armed Forces and midcareer professionals to obtain certification of teachers, $2.93 billion, an $81 million increase above the budget request for professional development. Math and science partnerships are funded at $150 million, an increase of $50 million. That is not a cut. In Impact Aid, $1.238 billion, $50 million over last year's level. That is not a cut. In Head Start, $148 million over last year's level. That is not a cut.

The list goes on and on. Only in Washington, D.C., can an increase in spending be considered a cut. This is a good bill, and I compliment the chairman for his work on it.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I plead absolutely fully guilty to wanting to spend more money to invest in education and to spend more money so we can guarantee that poor kids are not knocked off Medicaid and SCHIP programs so that they have some health care when they need to be seen by a doctor. Fully Guilty!

I also plead fully guilty to wanting to spend more money for NIH so we can deal with the ravages of cancer, heart disease, Lou Gehrig's disease and the like.

One example: a year ago my brother-in-law was diagnosed with terminal pancreas cancer, 1 year ago. He is still alive because he is lucky enough to have gotten into a clinical trial, and they found a drug that seems to be working for him. I plead fully guilty to wanting to add a lot more money to the Federal budget so that a lot more people can be as lucky as he is.

Madam Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Virginia.

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill for fiscal year 2004. This legislation, if passed and signed into law, will be a setback to one of the great American ideals of equal access to a quality public education.

It was once said that ''Education is the great equalizer in a democratic society, and if people are not given access to a quality education, then what we are doing is creating an underclass of people who will ultimately challenge our very way of life.''

This quote has never been more meaningful and poignant than today, as we are poised to do just that: create an underclass of people.

A year and a half ago, this Congress stood with President Bush and our House and Senate education leaders, to pass a bill which would redefine our education system and strive to ''leave no child behind.''

Just two months ago, the Majority passed a conference report for the fiscal year 2004 Budget Resolution that promised to provide a $3 billion increase over the previous year for the Department of Education and No Child Left Behind initiatives.

Unfortunately, this bill still underfunds No Child Left Behind by $8 billion dollars.

In other words, we are telling our schools that they must implement these reforms for greater accountability, but offering no additional resources to do so. In fact, we are doing the complete opposite of the intent of the No Child Left Behind law. We are leaving our children behind, our teachers behind and more importantly, letting the American people down by breaking yet another promise.

Unfortunately, there is not enough time in general debate for me to catalog every shortchange in this bill, such as National Institutes of Health funding, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act funding, bioterrorism preparedness funding, and failing to provide an increase for programs under the Nurse Reinvestment Act.

This bill is full of broken promises. We can attribute these broken promises to the fact that this Congress and our President gave to this country's wealthiest 1% massive tax cuts in a time of economic uncertainty.

While I am not pleased with the funding levels of several initiatives in this bill, I am pleased that my colleagues, Mr. OBEY and Mr. GEORGE MILLER are offering an amendment to correct a recent unfair Department of Labor proposal to eliminate overtime under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

This unfair proposal would affect thousands of workers in my congressional district who rely on overtime pay to help make ends meet.

This proposal will make it feasible for employers to reclassify workers as ''white collar'' employees, rendering them ineligible for overtime pay.

Some of these 8 million workers include police and firefighters, nurses and other First Responders, who would be the first line of defense in the event of a terrorist attack.

After these workers are reclassified and ineligible for overtime pay, they would still be required to work longer hours for less money, which is the real intent of this proposal.

The Obey-Miller amendment would prohibit the Department of Labor from using funds to enforce any regulation that would cut overtime pay.

Brick by brick we are building the road to create an underclass of people.

Let us not break yet another promise to the American people.

I urge all my colleagues to vote in support of the Miller-Obey amendment to protect overtime pay and to vote against final passage so that this body may consider a bill that more adequately funds initiatives at the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education.

Mr. REGULA. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I rise today to talk about the role this plays in helping promote the culture of life, a culture that values and respects human life at every stage. I believe that we have a responsibility to protect innocent life whenever and wherever possible, and so I applaud and thank my colleague from Ohio, the chairman of the subcommittee, for including funding in this appropriations bill for the Promoting Safe and Stable Families program.

This program helps fund safe havens created by laws passed in 42 States that try to reach out to desperate and troubled parents. Too often we hear of infants who have been abandoned in trash bins and alleys and, much more tragically, killed.

Just this past week, there was a case in my home State of Minnesota where a mother decided to throw her twin infants over a bridge. We must reach out to these parents who are unwilling or unable to care for their infants and let them know that they can take care of their infants by taking them to a safe haven and leave them in the hands of those who will care for them and see that they are placed in loving families.

Let me be clear, safe havens are not a substitute for education and adoption, merely a last resort for desperate parents considering the unthinkable. Safe havens can help avert tragedy and preserve the most precious of all things, innocent human life, but these safe havens only work if those that need them are aware of them.

That is why I am sending a letter to the Secretary of Health and Human Services Thompson and to the GAO calling for a review of the safe havens to find out how much of the funding is being spent on raising the awareness of safe havens so we can make recommendations on how it can be expanded and improved.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), former chief school officer of his State.

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Let me thank the chairman. I will say to him, I served as chairman of the committee on appropriations at the State level for 4 years, so I recognize the challenge he faces.

Budgets are about priorities, and I have strong oppositions to this bill because of the priorities that it sets out. I will vote against it. I do not like voting against appropriations bills, and I will urge my colleagues to do the same because of the draconian cuts that I see it places on education at the very time when we ought to be investing not less, but more in the future of this country and in our children and in our ability to compete in an international economy.

Last Congress, strong bipartisan majorities in this House and in the Senate voted to pass the President's No Child Left Behind legislation, and I joined in with that vote, but we promised to fund to the level of the authorization the moneys for the schools to meet their needs, and this bill is $8 billion short in that requirement.

As my ranking member has said, I am the only former chief serving in this Congress. I know what budget priorities are about, but I also know what happens in the schools when these cuts come. At a time when we are asking our schools to do more than ever, these educational cuts will destroy the morale of our teachers, parents and students. These educational cuts will make meeting the requirements we have almost impossible because we have set high standards for accountability. I think we should. Without the needed funding, though, No Child Left Behind is a massive unfunded mandate on our local communities and our State budgets at a time when States are struggling just to meet the funding needs.

In every State in this Nation, schools are currently working to determine how they will measure up to the Federal Education Department's definition of adequate yearly progress. Over the next several weeks and months, we are going to find out about that because they are going to be reporting in. Early estimates are there may be as many as 80 percent in some States that cannot meet AYP.

Plain and simple, these schools need that $8 billion to comply with these tough new educational reforms. The education cuts in this bill will make No Child Left Behind a cruel hoax on our schools and on our children.

This bill also fails to provide adequate funding for Impact Aid. Let me remind my colleagues, Impact Aid is the money we provide for those communities that have military bases that have men and women who are deployed or protecting our interests around the world. It is critical for those children in the military personnel. In my district alone, the communities that surround Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base, truly one of the important bases in this country, with many, many women deployed right now, the tax base is not there to meet the needs due to the Federal presence. These funds

provide flexible operating resources and finance teachers, books, computers and others.

Under this bill, North Carolina loses $16.8 million. We can do better. We must be better as our men are deployed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Libya.

Under this bill, North Carolina will lose $16.8 million in Impact Aid below the level authorized. At the very time that states are under stress, we are cutting funding in some states.

As we continue to deploy our troops to Iraq, Afghanistan, Liberia and other hot spots throughout the world, we ought not to neglect the schools their children attend back here in the states.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this bad bill.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me time to talk about how this bill is woefully inadequate in funding biomedical research, especially Parkinson's research, which is near and dear to my heart, as I believe it is to many Members of this body.

Over the last 5 years, Congress took on the charge of doubling the NIH budget, and we accomplished that goal. It was a worthy goal. It still is a worthy goal because this added funding for NIH will help find cures and better treatments for some of the world's deadliest diseases. The bill will bring to a halt this progress that we have made in funding biomedical research.

There is just an increase of 2.5 percent, the smallest percentage increase in 18 years. It falls short of what is needed to just keep up with research inflation costs, which NIH estimates at 3.3 percent for the year 2004. So the bulk of the increased funding will go to these multiyear research projects that are in place, thereby leaving very little time and very little money for new research.

The bill provides only a 3.9 percent increase for Parkinson's disease, not enough to keep up with inflation and grant renewal costs, and definitely little or nothing left over for new or expanded research efforts.

Madam Chairman, we have heard that tax cuts are the answer to all of our problems, and now those tax cut chickens are coming home to roost. We do not have the resources to meet these research needs. We see research cuts, and I want to conclude there is not a Member of this body as a Congressman, but as a son, a father, a nephew, a friend, Parkinson's disease is known as the most uncommon common disease in our country. We cannot go more than four or five people in asking them a question, do they know anybody with Parkinson's disease, before we hear somebody who will say, yes, I know somebody, a friend, an uncle, a sister, somebody in my community that has Parkinson's disease. We know colleagues in this body that have Parkinson's disease. We ought to honor them and support Parkinson's disease research in the way that we can find a cure for this terrible disease.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I thank my friend from Wisconsin for yielding me the time.

Madam Chairman, this body passed a resolution on June 10 recognizing two major advances in public health: the 50th anniversary of the discovery of the double helix structure of DNA, and the completion of the Human Genome Project. Good congratulatory words in this Congress, but as usual from around here, nothing to back it up.

The bill we are considering today provides funding for NIH barely sufficient to support existing research projects, much less any ground-breaking new research into avenues like gene therapy.

In a recent survey, taxpayers were asked what the Federal Government's major priorities should be. Public education, first. The public said medical research, second. Yet today we are considering a bill that underfunds both education and medical research.

Whom does Republican leadership report to? It is certainly not the American public. The bill's authors argued that this Congress has other priorities. It has chosen tax cuts for the wealthiest people in this country instead of research for cancer and Alzheimer's and ALS and MS and spinal cord injury. It has chosen to give a millionaire a tax cut of $93,000 instead of spending the money where Americans want it spent, on basic medical research.

The bill provides an increase today of only 2.5 percent for NIH, the smallest percentage increase in 18 years, in a sharp drop from what we have been doing the last several years. NIH estimates its spending on cancer research would only rise 3.7 percent, short of the 4.7 percent just necessary to stay even on what we are doing with cancer research. The number of grants for new research projects and renewals would increase by just two-tenths of 1 percent.

Is that what the American public asks for when it says its top two priorities are spending money on public education and spending money on medical research?

Madam Chairman, vote against this bill. Unfortunately, medical research seems to be an afterthought in this Congress.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me the time.

I know there has been a lot of hard work in trying to put together an appropriations bill that would deal with the neediest of our Nation, but we confront two, if you will, systemic crises in this country. We have a 6.2 percent unemployment rate, and it is increasing. The faces of the unemployed are not here in this body, and they cannot speak for themselves, but they are workers who made $100,000 a year and have children in college and mortgage payments, and they are those who are the chronically unemployed, who have never had a chance to work.

□ 1315

And yet this bill, instead of dealing forthrightly with their crisis, it cuts the community services block grant by $150.8 million. The cut will reduce services for the growing numbers of low-income working poor and the long-term unemployed.

The tax cut that was rendered just a few weeks ago for the rich does nothing to invest in this economy. In fact, economists have said that those who will receive a $90,000 tax cut will not invest in the economy, will not create jobs; but what they will do is to invest in themselves and make sure they have a big fat savings account.

As a member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, I have advocated constantly, in addition, that we should invest in homeland security and provide the resources for our first responders and our neighborhoods. I have been asked the question: Are our neighborhoods safe in America? No, they are not. And here we are not providing the necessary resources to fund those neighborhood groups, those citizen corps, so that neighborhoods will be on the front line if there is a terrorist attack in the United States.

And in conjunction with that, rather than fund bioterrorism preparedness, the important research to be able to prevent bioterrorist attacks or to be able to ensure that more people's lives will be saved, we are cutting the resources for bioterrorism. That means, for example, that if someone decided to use a mosquito that had the West Nile virus, to use that as a bio weapon, who knows, we are still unprepared in our communities.

Madam Chairman, I wish we could have a bill we all could vote for. I ask my colleagues to enthusiastically vote ''no'' on this legislation.

Madam Chairman, I rise today to express my disappointment at the failure of the Republican Party to adequately fund vital programs in H.R. 2657, the Labor, HHS, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2004.

Madam Chairman, we have failed our Nation. The Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations bill leaves our health care system, our schools, our children and our communities at risk. Sadly, my Democratic colleagues and I have seen the writing on the wall.

Over the past several weeks, my fellow Democrats and I have been very outspoken

on the Republican financially irresponsible bills. We opposed the Republican's tax cuts. We opposed the Republican's Medicare package. And now we oppose their appropriations request in H.R. 2657, and our opposition to the insufficient funding in this bill is directly due to the Republican's poor budget initiatives.

H.R. 2657 falls short of adequately funding our education and health care programs, among many other valuable programs.

EDUCATION

H.R. 2657 fails to adequately fund our Nation's schools and fails to live up to the many promises made by the Republican Party.

When the ''Leave No Child Behind'' legislation was passed we all believed we were committed in a bipartisan way to guarantee that good schools were established in our communities to improve our overall living standards and close the gaps that divide our societies along economic, social and racial lines. The Republicans promised to be committed to bettering our education system. They have not lived up to that promise.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle promised in its fiscal year 2004 budget resolution to provide a ''$3 billion increase from the previous year for the Department of Education.'' Despite that promise, the H.R. 2675 bill provides only a $2.3 billion increase over fiscal year 2003—far less than the promise they made.

Another broken promise is the inadequate funding of the Title 1 Program. The Title 1 Program is critical to enabling schools with large student populations of low-income children to meet the No Child Left Behind Act's accountability and academic mandates. These schools enroll students with the greatest academic deficits, but they have the least experienced teachers, less competitive teacher salaries, higher teacher turnover, less rigorous curriculum, and less than their fair share of resources. All of these factors negatively impact student achievement.

The Republican's fiscal year 2004 budget resolution promised a $1 billion increase over last year for the Title 1 Program. However, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have failed to keep their word here as well. Instead of $1 billion, H.R. 2675 provides only a $666 million increase. The result of the committee's action is that this bill falls $334 million short of the majority's own promise. The loss of that money does not affect my Republican colleagues or their wealthy supporters. It affects millions of low-income children nationwide and their ability to get a quality education.

In the area of special education, the Republicans promised in the fiscal year 2004 budget resolution to provide $2.2 billion over the current level. The Republicans repeated this promise in H.R. 1350—the bill reauthorizing the Individuals with Disabilities Act, adopted on April 30 on the House floor. Instead of providing our special education students with the funds they desperately need, and because of their massive tax cuts, this bill falls $1.2 billion short of that promise. This massive funding shortfall will force schools to continue to absorb the extraordinary costs of providing special education for nearly 6.7 million schoolchildren. Consequently, other education programs will have to be reduced or local taxes will have to be raised to make up the funds.

Perhaps the biggest broken promise by the Republican Party is the destructive impact of their budgetary action on the No Child Left Behind Act. The Members of the Republican Party put tax cuts ahead of their education promises in the Leave No Child Behind Act. As a result, H.R. 2657 falls a stunning $8 billion short of the fiscal year 2004 funding targets in the No Child Left Behind Act.

On the issue of higher education, the Republicans have harmed our college students as badly as they have harmed our low-income and special education students. As a direct result of the Republican's economic mismanagement over the past 2 years, only eight States in our Union are not facing a severe budget crisis. The declining State fiscal crisis has forced States to make huge cuts in the budgets of public colleges and universities. When States make cuts to public schools, the schools must raise their tuitions. The raising tuition costs are crushing working families who want to send their kids to college.

HEALTH CARE

Health care is another area in which the majority's bill falls short of meeting urgent national needs. In these tough economic times, with the high rates of unemployment and the loss of health insurance that comes with it, Federal health care is even more crucial to our communities.

Additionally, the State fiscal crises are causing many States to cut back on eligibility and benefits under health care programs like Medicaid and the State Child Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), as well as on public health protection. The programs that are funded by the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill help provide a crucial health care safety net for people without other access to care, and also help States and localities provide basic public health services.

The majority's appropriations bill provides little funding to deal with the growing health care crisis. There are virtually no increases to the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant and no increase at all for the National Health Service Corps, a vital program which provides student loan repayment aid and scholarships for doctors and dentists who work in areas with a shortage of health providers.

The committee bill also provides no increase at all for childhood immunization grants. That program has struggled to provide immunizations for children with the rising cost of vaccinations, and the bill will lead to further shortfalls. Additionally, while the administration asked for $100 million to help us get better prepared to deal with an influenza pandemic, the bill provides only half of that request.

CONCLUSION

Madam Chairman, H.R. 2675 is yet another example of poor budgetary policy impacting the American people. The majority party's failure to act responsibly with America's funds has impacted our ability to fund our first responders so they can protect our homeland from terrorists. The majority party's failure to act fiscally responsible has resulted in 9.4 million Americans being unemployed. Now, through H.R. 2675, the majority party's failure to act fiscally responsible is depleting the resources of our schools and our health care system. This result is unacceptable for the hardworking Americans we represent. I oppose this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time.

A few years ago, a friend of mine that I went to law school with called and told me that his 4-year-old son had been diagnosed with leukemia. He and his wife were obviously devastated by this news. They wondered what life would be like if this precious little boy were to be taken from their lives. That little boy will start third grade next September, in large part because of the huge advances that have been made in health care, in pharmaceutical products, and largely underwritten by the National Institutes of Health, an organization that has had bipartisan support in this body for a very long time.

How can we justify shutting down this miracle factory by increasing its funding by only 2½ percent, barely enough to keep up with inflation? What choice are we making by doing this? How could we pay for a more robust increase?

Here is what we could do. If we increase NIH funding to keep in line with what has been done by bipartisan majorities in the last 10 years, a 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 percent increase, we would have to reduce the tax cut this way: for every $1,000 worth of tax cut, we would have to take away $20. So we could still take the person with the $1,000 tax cut and make it $980 and keep the NIH doing the research, continuing the progress it has made so that more parents could hear the good news that their little son or daughter is in remission.

What an unwise choice. What a profoundly reckless judgment is being made in this bill. I would urge opposition to this bill for this reason, among many others.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. Madam Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Unfortunately, I must rise in opposition to this bill, and for many of the same reasons already mentioned: the underfunding of the Leave No Child Behind Act, the cut in the children's health programs, the LIHEAP energy assistance program for low-income people, Head Start, and cancer treatment and research.

Today, however, Madam Chairman, I would like to speak on urban hospitals, the hospitals in America that treat most Americans when they have traumatic illnesses. Urban hospitals need help in our system, and we are not in

this bill giving them that help. Urban hospitals treat hundreds of thousands of people with uncompensated care, no insurance or underinsurance.

It is unfortunate that our country, the richest in the world, cannot at this time help our hospitals that are in critical condition. I met with my group of doctors just this last Monday, the Michigan State Society of Medical Doctors. They all talked about not being able to treat patients, about the reimbursement rates and the underinsuring. Many of them are dropping patients. We have got to do better by our health institutions. Our health system is in critical condition. This Congress could help support that. This bill does not do that.

I cannot support this bill in its present form, and I would hope we could go back to get a better bill to help the people of America, to help the seniors that have built this country, and so that our health care system in our urban hospitals can sustain themselves and take care of their mission, which is taking care of the people of America.

Madam Chairman, I rise today to express my dismay and concern about H.R. 2660, the appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies. This bill is being touted, even hailed, as a major achievement on behalf of supporting the education of our children, in addition to providing financial resources for our Nation's schools. The facts of the matter are, this bill is terribly flawed, under-funded and misrepresented.

The bill is terribly flawed for the following reasons. First of all the bipartisan supported No Child Left Behind Act is a gargantuan unfunded mandate. The President promised to revamp our educational system, to make schools accountable, to raise standards, to increase teacher competency and training, and to increase parent involvement. Instead, what has been delivered amounts to lip service.

The Labor HHS bill seriously under-funds the No Child Left Behind Act by $8 billion and provides the smallest percentage increase in education funds in eight years. The bill requires school districts to meet student testing requirements, improve teacher quality and imposes other mandates. Additionally, the bill falls $350 million short of the $3.3 billion promised in (real terms) to states to improve teacher quality. Fifty-four thousand fewer teachers will receive high quality, federally-supported professional development.

This bill falls $334 million short of the $1 billion in Title I funds promised. In my home state of Michigan, under this bill, the children of Michigan will lose $202 million in Title I grants below the amount called for by the No Child Left Behind Act. This situation is further compounded by the fact that after-school learning opportunities are being short-changed. Under this bill, Michigan will lose $23 million in After-School Program Funding.

I said earlier, this bill has been misrepresented. This fact is true. Children and entire school systems are going to be left behind. The American public has been fed a feel-good diet of positive rhetoric by the President regarding our educational system. The reality is, the promises are empty, the financial cupboard is bare, administrators are disillusioned and our children are the losers. The insult that is added to the injury is that State budgets are crippled by unprecedented tax cuts that have been enacted, despite the reality of downward spiraling State economies.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have been a witness to the collegial discussions about the constrained budgetary environment we are forced to operate within, thereby causing the under-funding of vital programs such as No Child Left Behind. I cannot sit by idly and embrace the current rhetoric that our Nation's school systems and their students are well-served by the bill before us today. This is not a good bill for America's children.

Madam Chairman, we are telling our children that the pursuit of an education and obtaining a degree will unlock the doors to opportunity. I am compelled to pose the question, where will the money come for to pay for students to attend school? Let us consider this, tuition at colleges and universities is increasing rapidly. Under this bill, grants such as Pell Grants, will finance only 38 percent of the cost of a public university—compared to 84 percent when the Pell Grant program was established. Students are confronted with greater costs and fewer means to pursue their dreams.

I stated earlier that this bill is being touted, even hailed, as a major achievement on behalf of supporting the education of our children. Furthermore, the President has informed Americans that needed financial resources are being provided for our Nation's schools. The facts of the matter are, this bill is terribly flawed, under-funded and misrepresented. The bill under consideration does not best serve the needs of so many of our Nation's students and school systems who were promised a first-class funded educational system, but instead they will receive thrift store funding. False hopes were created and broken promises in the form of un-funded mandates will now be the reward. I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

We are experiencing a health care crisis in our Nation. In my district alone, there are two hospitals that are operating at such negative losses that they may be forced to close. These urban-safety net hospitals, like most other urban hospitals across our Nation, have a high percentage of uncompensated, uninsured and underinsured care. They do not turn anyone away. We cannot turn our backs on them as well.

The closing of these hospitals across our Nation creates a cascading effect that only adds to the health care emergency in our Nation. When one hospital closes, other hospitals must take on the burden of uncompensated care and the problem continues until the next hospital closes. When are we going to step up to the plate and ensure that we provide the funds necessary to fix our shattered health care system?

Instead of passing tax cut after tax cut that only raid our cupboards and benefits the wealth, Congress should take heed of the problem our urban hospitals are facing and provide a funding stream to help these important health care entities in this bill that provide a high percentage of uncompensated care. But no, tax cuts are more important.

Our distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations committee, Mr. OBEY tried to offer an amendment that would have restored Medicaid and SCHIP coverage to children who have been removed from those programs over the last two years. This amendment was defeated on a rollcall vote in committee. The amendment would have provided the funds by making modest reductions in the benefits that the highest-income taxpayers received under the 2003 tax bill.

At a time when high unemployment is causing many Americans to lose their job-related health care coverage, the State fiscal crisis is leading States to cut back health coverage through Medicaid, SCHIP and various state-finance programs. This is acceptable to many here in Congress that would prefer to see massive tax cuts than a strengthened health care infrastructure.

With States making the difficult decisions of cutting Medicaid and SCHIP eligibility, more and more individuals are joining the ranks of the uninsured. This in turn puts more of a burden on our hospitals that already are struggling to keep afloat. We need to get our priorities straight. We can do much better than what we have done with this bill to help those across our Nation.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, could I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. Madam Chairman, let me talk a little bit about some of the programs that I am so concerned about.

ALS is one program that has affected my office. I know that this disease is familiar to many, many people because of Lou Gehrig. It is a rare disease; but when you see it firsthand, you begin to recognize what research could do. A person becomes completely debilitated with this disease; and depending upon the severity of it, it happens either very quickly or it happens over a long period of time.

Now, the mind remains completely clear, but physically they deteriorate substantially and finally die after a period of either 1 to 5 years. So any increase in this program would be a real benefit to the people that have this dreaded disease.

Also, let me talk about diabetes, because in my district I have the highest rate of diabetes in the country. Now, we put $10 million in the defense budget for research for one part of my district because Brownsville, Pennsylvania, has the highest rate in the district so it is the highest rate in the country itself. And, of course, diabetes has so many ramifications that are directly related to it, and this research is so important.

Education, in my estimation, is the key. We have to spend some money convincing people that once they eat right and they do exercises they are going to limit their opportunity to

have diabetes. And I am talking about Type 2 diabetes. I am not talking about Type 1 diabetes. Matter of fact, we have a young woman that was Miss America, of I think 1999, from the district, who had Type 1 diabetes. She has been out talking about it, and she convinced me that we needed to do something about this.

Alzheimer's disease and of course Parkinson's disease are two more of great concern to me. Joe McDade, who served in this House for 35 years, developed Parkinson's disease, and I sat beside him and saw him. His mind was completely clear, but it debilitated his body. Now, he has worked his way through it with drugs, and improvements in drugs made a tremendous difference.

I appreciate what this committee has done over the years in the research facilities and the work they have done in order to make sure there is as much money available as possible. I would hope that when we go to conference with this bill, we will be able to make sure that these research projects, which are so important, and which we have tried to supplement what you do in the defense bill with money for breast cancer, for ovarian cancer, for research in those areas, but I am hopeful you will be able to do even more in your bill this year. Because it has such a dramatic impact on preventing these diseases and, of course, actually saves us money in the long run.

So I would urge the committee when they go to conference to make every effort to increase the amount of research for these very debilitating diseases.

Mr. REGULA. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to point out to the gentleman who just spoke, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), that we do have report language urging NINDS to focus on ALS. I know it is a devastating problem for those who are afflicted, and we are concerned about it.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chairman, the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education bill has always reflected our priorities as a Nation. I believe we have an obligation to the people of this country to provide services that help us meet the most basic needs we have as a community, be they health, the education of our children, or scientific research that finds the medical cures for tomorrow.

Wherever one stands on the distribution of tax cuts that the Republican leadership in this Congress has passed, it is undeniable that they have significantly limited this government's ability to meet those challenges and to do our jobs. And of all the glaring inadequacies in this bill, cutting funding for the National Institutes of Health, the largest and the most distinguished biomedical research organization in the world, might be the most egregious.

It is not overstating the case to say that the NIH has prolonged or improved the life of every American. Childhood leukemia, because of research at NIH, the cure rate is now 80 percent. Diabetes, because of new treatments in Type 1, diabetics are now producing their own insulin, no longer requiring daily injections. NIH is also working on state-of-the-art treatments for Alzheimer's, Parkinson's and HIV.

As someone who was diagnosed with the deadliest of gynecological cancers, ovarian, more than 17 years ago, I know firsthand how this research has changed lives. It saved mine. And today, because of a new test to find ovarian cancer in its earliest stages, through a simple blood screening, millions of women will get the treatment that they need when it is most effective. That is the power of the NIH.

All of this has only been made possible because of a commitment we have had in the Congress to double the NIH's budget which created the most outstanding generation of basic and clinical scientists in history.

So what does this bill do? It breaks that commitment to double the NIH budget. It cuts NIH funding in real dollar terms. There will be no room to fund new research ideas, or little room. It will threaten NIH's abilities to continue its support for large clinical trials that go well beyond what the industry can fund. And by effectively paving the way for smaller, less expensive studies and clinical trials, scientific research will often be reduced to mere suggestions and not definitive conclusions.

Mr. Chairman, say what you will about the virtues of tax cuts, they do not save lives. Americans need to recognize that this debate is really about choice. It is a choice between medical research that touches every single American life, every life, and a trillion dollar tax cut that affects mainly the wealthiest in this country. And I guarantee that if Americans are forced to make that choice, that if the facts are laid before them, they would choose medical research each and every time.

For generations this body has made the right choice. Oppose this bill. It is an abdication of our responsibility to millions of American families and to this institution.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 26 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

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

□ 1330

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to discuss the Impact Aid program, which is critically important to me and many of my colleagues across the country. The Sixth Congressional District of Washington State, which is impacted by several large and vital military installations. Our region willingly hosts thousands of Active Duty personnel, who represent a large economic force in the Pacific Northwest. Washington is also home to 27 federally recognized Native American tribes. However, with these advantages comes a drawback: the loss of substantial property areas from the local tax base.

As my colleagues know, military bases and tribal lands do not pay most State and local taxes, but local school districts are still required to provide an education to children that live on these lands. Often this imposes millions of dollars in additional costs to these districts. Congress created the Impact Aid program to address this glaring problem.

I was extremely disappointed when the President submitted a budget to Congress earlier this year that contained a cut of more than $170 million to this important program. This proposal was very poorly considered, coming at a time when hundreds of thousands of troops were preparing for deployment around Iraq. As it becomes more and more apparent that large numbers of American troops will be required to remain in Iraq for the foreseeable future, the decision of the President to cut funding for educating their kids is more difficult to comprehend.

I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for coming to the rescue of Impact Aid and rejecting the Bush proposal. However, even with that, the Department of Education estimates that another $583 million is necessary to meet these needs. With the hundreds of billions of dollars that the Congress and the President have dedicated to tax cuts, it is astounding that we cannot find just a half billion in this budget to fully meet the needs of the children of our men and women who are fighting overseas on our behalf.

For years I have worked closely with dozens of Democrats and Republicans to make this a bipartisan proposal. Again, I commend the chairman and ranking member for fixing part of the problem, but we still have more to do.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, today we see the consequences of the massive tax cuts of the Bush administration. Theirs is not a policy of benign neglect, theirs is a policy of designed neglect. It is a policy to defund the government in 2010 and 2015 and 2020 and 2025. That is $3 trillion worth of tax cuts over that time frame which has already been passed.

Well, that means that the money will not be there for nursing home care for the 14 million Americans who are going to end with up Alzheimer's, with the 5 million with Parkinson's, the money will not be there for nursing home care for those seniors. What is the alternative? The alternative is to cure Alzheimer's and Parkinson's and ALS. That would be the NIH budget here today. But they are only going to increase that budget by 2 percent.

Now, the budget for smart bombs is unlimited; unlimited, but the American people want the same budget increases for smart medical research because it is just as important for the protection and defense of the family well-being of those tens of millions of families who are going to be afflicted by these diseases.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) has a heart of gold. He really does. He is a wonderful man; but the overall environment of these massive tax cuts that the Bush administration has put in place makes it impossible now for us to fund either end of this spectrum, either the long-term nursing home care for those Americans who are going to be afflicted by these diseases, or the full funding, the doubling of the funding, the tripling of the funding which as a consequence would be necessary in order to cure those diseases. We cannot have it both ways. It is either one or the other. We must increase the NIH budget to protect the long-term interests of all American families.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. As cochair of the Biomedical Research Caucus, the House Cancer Caucus, the Heart and Stroke Caucus and as founder of the House Nursing Caucus, I can tell Members that this bill shortchanges the health of the American people. It is inadequate in so many ways, but I want to focus on just one.

We are missing a tremendous opportunity to support critical biomedical research that can save lives. Congress last year completed the doubling of the NIH budget after years of underfunding this national institution. This was a tremendous accomplishment supported by Members from all across the political spectrum, but now we are going to begin throwing away the benefits from responsibly funding NIH. It is terrible news for cancer patients, heart disease patients, and others suffering from chronic diseases.

I watched my daughter Lisa struggle with lung cancer, pinning her hopes on a clinical trial. For these people to have hope, we need to fund new research, not just to continue existing grants. They need cures and treatments that have not been discovered yet. This bill will not allow new research. Instead, it will severely curtail new research opportunities.

An optimistic assessment shows that under this bill, NIH will be only able to provide 21 new grants next year. The 2.5 percent increase in the bill does not match NIH's estimates of inflation in research costs. Cancer patients, heart disease patients, Alzheimer's patients, stroke survivors, Parkinson's patients, ALS, many others are just going to have to wait. This bill defers their hopes of new cures.

As many of my colleagues have stated, we are seeing the cost of these tax cuts. The majority will tell us we cannot afford spending for institutions like NIH above the 2.5 percent increase, we cannot afford the benefits of life-saving medical research. The irresponsible tax cuts the majority has rammed through are costing us lives. We should reject this bill and get our priorities straight.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to tell the cancer patients in my district that their research has been blocked. Do you?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, given my deep respect for the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and his sincere efforts to address critical needs within the restraints that he was given, I regret that I must rise in opposition to this bill.

I am particularly concerned about the funding levels for the Older Americans Act programs and their impact on the elderly of our Nation. The Older Americans Act of 1965 was passed the same year that Medicare was enacted to meet the needs of elderly Americans and to enable them to live their twilight years with dignity and respect by helping them with nutrition, transportation, and other services that would allow them to stay independent and in their homes. This bill jeopardizes that promise.

It is hard to overpraise the generation that our parents and grandparents represent. Theirs is the generation that helped to make this Nation great. Unfortunately, because this bill provides less than a 1 percent increase for programs in the Older Americans Act, even after the committee restored the $25 million cut in the President's budget, senior services critical to their quality of life will have inadequate funding; services such as Meals on Wheels, in-home support services, preventive health programs, and programs to guard against elder abuse and exploitation.

This inadequate funding will also create greater headache in the future when one considers that one-sixth of our Nation, over 46 million people, are already 60 and older, and that by 2005 an estimated 13 million more baby-boomers will join them.

I ask my colleagues to vote against this bill and to send our elderly a strong message of support and appreciation for their past sacrifices and their right to live with dignity and respect.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the previous speaker, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

I think it is a disgrace in this budget, although our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), have made the best out of a bad situation.

We are underfunding the Older Americans Act. At a time when our baby-boom generation is getting ready to retire, it seems to me we ought to be getting prepared to deal with these issues. Instead, I will give an example of two programs that we severely underfund in this budget because of the allocation we are given; one, the Meals on Wheels program, and the Congregate Meals program.

I can tell Members, having been out there with meal site workers and with those on the Meals on Wheels program, this is the only meal they get any day. I have been in the homes. These people are looking forward to the knock on the door. In fact, some seniors leave their door open, and we all know how concerned they are with someone breaking in, but they leave the door open when they know the meal site worker is coming by to deliver that hot meal. When the worker comes in, they want to take the dessert and the bread and put it over here because that is their dinner. They have one meal per day, and we are underfunding Meals on Wheels in this bill.

The second issue I want to take up is the issue of the caregiver program. I do not understand our priorities. I thought we were about trying to save money and save lives. It seems to me there is no more valuable way to take care of our seniors than to have the very family members, their spouses and their children, give them the opportunity to take care of their parents. It is $40,000 a year to keep a senior citizen who has disabilities in a nursing home. Why put him in a nursing home when they do not want to go to a nursing home; and, two, and they can live independently at home with just a little support from a family member. We are cutting the caregivers' program. We spend $5 per caregiver so they can take care of their loving spouse.

To me, this budget does not reflect America's priorities. I know I am going to vote against it, and I think we are seeing the consequences of these $3 trillion tax cuts when it comes to delivering hot meals to seniors.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member and the chairman of the subcommittee for their efforts.

I rise in support of the Obey substitute, and specifically the increase in

Low Income Home Energy Assistance funding it provides. The underlying bill has only $1.7 billion in regular LIHEAP funding appropriations and a small $100 million account for contingencies.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) wisely provides $2.25 billion in regular appropriations for LIHEAP. For low-income and elderly Americans trying to weather through the terrible energy bills in this country, LIHEAP is critical, and every dollar helps out.

But for folks from the South, there is even a bigger reason to support the funding level in the Obey amendment. LIHEAP funding has a $1.9 billion threshold, which means that after funding exceeds that level, Southern States that use LIHEAP for cooling during the summer months receive a fairer portion of the funding. People die from heat more than from cold in our country.

The Obey amendment provides an additional $28 million in low-income assistance for Texans struggling to pay their electric bills. Texas LIHEAP averages about $500 per family, so that means an additional 56,000 families could be reached just in Texas alone.

The President in his Statement of Administrative Policy says he believes we need more LIHEAP funding. I bet if he saw the levels in the Obey amendment and if he saw what it means for low-income Texans, he would support it, too.

I strongly believe that the LIHEAP formula needs to be reformed to address the situation in the hotter Southern States. Texas receives the second lowest amount per low-income person in the country under LIHEAP, about $10. Minnesota receives $160 per low-income person. My colleagues know that heat causes serious health problems that can kill. According to the National Weather Service, in 2000 and 2001, there were 324 heat-related deaths and 30 cold-related deaths. Heat worsens heart conditions, lung conditions, diabetes, circulatory conditions. During a Texas summer, for old folks and the disabled and those with chronic conditions, air conditioning is a lifesaver, not a luxury. I urge my colleagues to support the Obey amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

□ 1345

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, let us think for a moment about what our great Nation can be and then think at the same time about the direction in which we are going. And this legislation, this appropriations bill reflects the fact that we are moving in a very bad direction. The reality is that in our great Nation, we have the capability of providing a decent life for all of our people. The middle class should be expanding, not declining. Poverty should be going down, not increasing. Unemployment should be going down, not up. We should be taking care of the most vulnerable people in our country, the elderly, the sick, the children, not seeing them exposed more and more to the dangers that impact upon their lives. We should be asking the wealthiest people in this country to help make our entire Nation great, not provide trillions of dollars in tax breaks for people who do not need it.

That is what the United States of America is about. That is where we should be going, a good life for all of our people, not extraordinary wealth for a few, the decline of the middle class and an increase in poverty. In terms of our elderly, think about what millions of elderly people are trying to do today, as we speak, in an attempt to survive on Social Security. They are trying to figure out how can they afford to pay the outrageously high cost of prescription drugs which the pharmaceutical industry imposes on us. They are thinking about in the cold weather, States like Vermont, how can they heat their homes when oil prices go up and they have inadequate sums of money. They are thinking about what happens to their family if they need home health care, if they need a nursing home. They are thinking about the pleasures that they receive, few as they may be, when they are getting Meals on Wheels delivery to their homes. These are frail people who cannot leave their homes, who every day have someone knock on the door giving them sustenance. These are people who once or twice a week go to a congregate meal program which gets them outside of the home, which enables them to socialize with their friends, which enables them to see a social worker which adds years to their lives. And then think about what this bill does and what the right wing Republican agenda is all about. What the agenda is about is to defund the basic programs in this country that protect the littlest children and the oldest people, that provide people with a basic minimal standard of living.

We have got to defeat this legislation, cut back on these huge tax breaks, and make sure that all Americans get the kind of help that they need.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield another 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), who has the quaint idea that we should not be gutting our efforts to control child labor.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his steadfast leadership on these issues of great importance.

I would like to again ask to have the remarks of my predecessor be included in the RECORD as remarks that I would be associated with.

And let me say to the people what this bill does in terms of child labor. We always complain when we see those stories about that 5-year-old, that 12-year-old over in some part of this world that is weaving together a rug that will be sent back to this country and sold at Wal-Mart for $10. And yet $10 will probably be all that child sees in any given year, and under this bill this administration cuts by over $100 million the funding to inspect and enforce child labor laws around the world.

Let me just give an example. Between 5 years of age and 14 years of age, there are over 250 million children between 5 and 14 who are working in violation of the International Labor Organization standards. Do the Members not think we ought to do something about that. Do the Members not think that this country has a moral obligation to ensure that these children are not being exploited? Apparently, the administration does not feel that way. They have cut the budget $100 million.

Right now the President is over in Africa. He is talking about HIV/AIDS. Remember he was promising them a lot of money? Guess what. In this budget he cuts funding for HIV/AIDS partnerships through the ILO, which can help create a private sector involvement to help tackle the scourge, the pandemic of AIDS in Africa. That money has been cut. So we can most clearly see our Nation's priorities are based upon where we spend our money. Millionaires in this country get $87,000-a-year tax cuts, millionaires; but we are going to underfund inspections of child labor. That, I think, is a disgrace.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us has many shortfalls that are being detailed today. Underlying many of them is the need for funding for nurse education programs. We are in the midst in this Nation of a growing nurse shortage. The nursing workforce is aging and approaching retirement. Fewer and fewer nurses are coming into the field. Today we are currently short 126,000 nurses. The demand for nurses will increase by more than 25 percent over the next 7 years; and according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, we will need 1 million more nurses by 2010 to meet the needs of this country. To make matters worse, these shortages will peak just as the baby boom generation begins to retire. The shortage is already complicating the deliver of everyday health care.

As health care professionals can tell us, dealing with the nursing shortage is about ensuring quality patient care. The joint Commission on Accreditation of Health Care Organizations has studied the link between staffing shortages and increased medical errors and found that one quarter of all unexpected deaths and injuries caused by hospitals

can be linked to the lack of nurses. The nursing shortage is hampering our homeland security preparedness efforts. Who is going to administer smallpox vaccines or other bioterrorism treatments if we do not have enough nurses? Last year the Congress recognized this threat to health care and preparedness in our country. We have passed the new nurse reinvestment act to recruit and train nurses and keep current nurses on the job.

But the bill before us fails the commitment we made just last year to address the nursing shortage. It offers no increase for funding as this baby boom generation approaches retirement, no way to deal with shortages in this bill. The nursing funding is already so low compared to other health care priorities that it should not be cut at all. In fact, in 1974 during the last serious nursing shortage, funding for nurse education programs was $153 million. In today's dollars that would be worth $533 million, almost five times what we are spending now.

We can afford to make a modest increase in this underlying bill to address today's shortage. We must do this. If we miss this opportunity to make an investment in our health infrastructure and our homeland security efforts, we will be reaping the consequences of yet another reason we should not have voted for that huge tax cut. And I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. Let us start over again and address the nurse shortage.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss some ways this bill falls short in our commitments to eradicating child labor and promoting core labor standards. Less than a month ago, Secretary Chao stood before the International Labor Conference and proclaimed the administration's solid support for ILO programs. She even announced ''new'' initiatives to combat child labor and to fight the scourge of AIDS. In the days when the credibility of the United States is strained, it is unconscionable to make hollow promises, and that is what Secretary Chao did when she implied the administration would ramp up the International Labor Affairs Bureau's work, including expanding HIV/AIDS prevention programming.

My colleagues, like the administration's fiscal year 2004 budget, the bill before us provides $12.3 million for ILAB. A 92 percent reduction in funding for the Bureau would gut our efforts to eradicate child labor and promote decent labor standards abroad. Furthermore, our ILAB public-private partnership aimed at combating the spread of HIV/AIDS would be completely eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, the International Labor Affairs Bureau's programs are working. Since fiscal year 1995, our child labor elimination projects have targeted more than 500,000 children for prevention or removal from exploitive work. In turn, more than 140,000 children have been either prevented or have been removed from exploitive work; and since October 2002, 24,000 children have been removed from just awful conditions and placed in education and training programs. ILAB assistance has also resulted in 41 counties making commitments to initiate programs or expand existing projects that are designed to promote and implement core labor standards, including occupational safety, health, model job banks, mine safety programs, veterans employment and training. I realize that as of May 31 ILAB had only obligated 8 percent of its fiscal year 2003 appropriated funding.

Please let us vote against this bill so we can work with the Senate and expand the numbers for this very important program.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican bill. Democrats were denied an opportunity to offer our substitute that would have reversed a decade-long funding stranglehold that has provided flatline funding on the senior citizen meal program, including Meals on Wheels. In the past I have offered amendments during the appropriation process to reverse this trend, and the Republican majority has stricken my amendments in conference. The funding for senior meals programs when translated into today's dollars has steadily been dropping when adjusted for inflation, and this has resulted in significant reductions in meals provided at senior centers. In my district, from Ironwood to Au Gres, senior centers have been struggling to keep their heads above water because funding has dwindled.

In fiscal year 1994, we allocated $151 million for the Nutritional Services Incentive Program. If we were merely to just keep pace with inflation, the funding today should be $191 million. Instead, the proposal in the Republican bill cuts funding by $2 million to below where we were in 1994, where we are at $149 million. This decrease in funding ignores the large growth rate in the senior population and insults senior citizens who depend on these programs to feed themselves daily. I repeat. This Republican bill continues a decade-long flatline funding plus cuts another $200 million from the senior meal funding and ignores the needs of seniors in my district and throughout this country.

I urge all Members to vote ''no'' on this appropriation bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we have documented the numerous ways in which this bill does not meet its responsibilities to the American people. The situation we are in is basically this: We are going to be asking the majority to reconsider a decision it made just a few weeks ago to put all of our eggs in one basket in the form of tax cuts rather than reserving some of those eggs and putting them into needed health care and education and worker protection programs. The problem with the way this House is being run is that the budget system is being misused to hide from the American people the consequences of the actions taken by the majority party on tax policy.

□ 1400

They want to hide behind the House rules and say, ''Oh, look, we already decided the tax issue, and so now you are stuck with the room that is left under the budget resolution.'' We do not think that is a good enough reason to continue to do something that is stupid and unfair and, in some cases, heartless.

What we are asking our majority Members to do is to reconsider the decision that decided that it was necessary to give millionaires in this country an $88,000 tax cut. We are asking you to use an unusual procedure in order to revisit that decision and instead limit that tax cut for those 200,000 people who make more than $1 million a year, limit that tax cut to $44,000 a year, so that there is some room in the inn left to improve the quality of education for our kids, to protect our workers against child labor, and to see to it that not a single child in this country is knocked off the health care rolls because of State budget crises.

So that is a simple choice. Now, you can try to convince the press and convince the country that you have already made these decisions and so you have no choice but to move on.

You always have choices. You always have choices. It depends on whether you are willing to insist on exercising them. Every person who votes for this bill today will be saying they would rather leave the tax package as is and go ahead with this bill as is. I do not think that is a wise decision. I do not think it is going to be an acceptable decision when the American people understand what you have done.

The choice is very simple: Are we going to make kids pay for giant-size tax cuts for the most privileged people in this society, and, in the process, weaken their ability to get a good education and weaken their ability to be taken care of when they need to see a doctor or a nurse? That is the simple choice.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I would simply appeal to Members' consciences.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) for a colloquy.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Chairman, very briefly, we deeply appreciate the consideration the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) has given to the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program and we know he understands the importance of this vital program. Many of us remain concerned, however, Mr. Chairman, about the direction as it is contained in this bill.

As you know, prices this year for energy are up 30 percent for natural gas, 60 percent higher for heating oil, 25 percent higher for propane, and on and on and on. We certainly think that as the process continues, we need to look at this issue further, and we would, in spite of all your good efforts to this point, urge you to continue to recognize the impact that our Nation's current weakened economy and the high price of energy on low-income and fixed-income energy consumers is having.

We would certainly hope that LIHEAP could be increased to avoid a crisis, and urge you respectfully, Mr. Chairman, a consistent supporter of this initiative, to consent to working toward that $2 billion in funding for LIHEAP as was agreed upon by the Senate.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCHUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for voicing his concerns. In my own State I have seen firsthand how critical LIHEAP is for low- and fixed-income families. I support providing an adequate funding level for this program.

When the House and Senate go to conference on this appropriations measure, I will work with my colleagues to ensure the viability of this crucial program.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his consideration.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, this bill before us today will fund the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, in my opinion, at the appropriate levels. It maintains fiscal discipline and makes necessary spending reforms, and it also sets priorities. It reflects America's commitment to education, Federal health initiatives and working families.

The bottom line is that it meets our needs, and, of course, it does so without raising taxes. But raising taxes is exactly what the minority wants to do. It is the basis of the proposal of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and most of the people that have spoken on the other side of the aisle.

The gentleman from Wisconsin suggested earlier that he thinks 90 percent of the people affected by his tax hike actually want higher taxes. I repeat, the Democrats think Americans want and deserve higher taxes. Now, that is a debate I wish that we could have every week, every day, on the floor of this House, because the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) says his tax hike, and I thank him for his candor, would only cost a small business $28,000. Only $28,000.

Mr. OBEY. Will the gentleman yield? I never said any such thing. I never mentioned any small business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is controlled by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman is going to quote me, he ought to quote me accurately.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. OBEY. Do not use the rules to lie about what I said.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is out of order and the time is controlled by the gentleman from Texas.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, it is correct that it is wrong to use the term directed to another as a ''liar'' on the House floor, and, if so, I wish the gentleman's words to be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules on the point of order that the Member must avoid such personal references to other Members.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) may continue.

Mr. DELAY. ''Only $28,000.'' But $28,000 to a small business is a job. That is a salary, money a small business could use to hire a new employee. And they want to take it away.

Now, Democrats want to stifle job creation to fund their big government programs. But, Mr. Chairman, Republicans know better. We understand that the economy cannot be improved without job creation, and we understand that 70 percent of all new jobs are created by small business.

So, when the Democrats propose raising taxes on the very small businesses that would create these jobs, you have to understand our confusion, and you have to understand our excitement. After all, this has been a wonderful debate, and I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin and the Democrats for their clarity and their consistency. I want to thank them for touting this idea to raise taxes on small businesses and stifle job creation. I truly do.

Though, I have to admit, when I heard about the Democrat's proposal, I almost forgot what year it was. I started looking around for bell-bottom pants and aggressive chest hair. But before I dusted off my polyester, you will be happy to know, Mr. Chairman, that I had come to my senses, because, despite the earnest wishes of the Democrats, it is not 1977 anymore, and hiking taxes to pay for big government programs is as dead as disco.

Now, I do not mean to single out the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) or the Democrats. After all, as you can painfully see, a lot of bad ideas were fashionable in the 1970s. But nowadays big tax-and-spend hikes make as much sense as my old pink and red leisure suit.

Mr. Chairman, thankfully most Americans had the common sense to let the embarrassing fashions of the 1970s go. So on behalf of everyone with a picture like this in their family album, I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill and vote against the small business tax hike of the disco Democrats.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, who is that nice-looking girl with that young guy?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, that is one of the most beautiful women in the world, my wife.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 25 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for a colloquy.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies for yielding to me and for his tremendous work on this legislation and important issues. I also want to thank the chairman for working with me to provide adequate funding for Down Syndrome research, particularly in the area of enhancing cognition and preventing the early onset of dementia for people with Down Syndrome.

This year, the National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities at the Centers for Disease Control recognized the need for studies in these two areas. The first study would develop estimates of the number of persons with Down Syndrome by age group and racial and ethnic breakdowns. The second study would document the onset and the course of secondary and related developmental disorders and health conditions of individuals with Down Syndrome. The committee report makes reference to these proposed studies, and I want to thank the chairman for including that language in the report.

Current estimates indicate that there are approximately 350,000 individuals living in the United States today with Down Syndrome, but we do not know how they break down by age group or by ethnic group. We also do not know why children with Down Syndrome are more at risk for developing secondary conditions, like autism and obsessive-compulsive disorder.

Mr. Chairman, I want to know, do the gentleman agree that the funding of these studies should be a national priority?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on this issue and agree with him that the study of Down Syndrome should be a national priority. The committee has encouraged the NIH and CDC to place a greater priority on Down Syndrome research, which has generally lagged behind other kinds of disability research. The testimony that was provided to the subcommittee on May 13 was very informative and very helpful, and I look forward to working with the gentleman from Texas to encourage NIH and CDC to fund this important research.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I want to thank the gentleman for his comments and would ask if he would be willing to work with me in the conference towards funding these two studies of the CDC in fiscal year 2004?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I look forward with working with my friend to address these specific concerns in this appropriations bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gracious gentleman for his time and for his work.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and any manifestation of approval or disapproval of the proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the House rules.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) for a colloquy.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I represent the Clark County School District in the great State of Nevada, the seventh largest school district in the country.

Nevada is the fastest-growing State in our Nation and has grown more than 75 percent since the 1990 census. Clark County School District is accepting close to 12,000 new students a year, opening more than a dozen new schools and hiring over 1,800 teachers a year.

Education funding levels are not keeping pace with the population growth occurring in Clark County, Nevada. A major problem the Clark County School District faces is the number of new students moving into the district that come from other school districts, many from other States, where funds previously allocated for that student are not following them to Nevada.

Currently, the Census Bureau has been conducting biannual updates to calculate and update current population to be used in establishing Federal education funding in Title I of No Child Left Behind.

Nevada, more specifically Clark County, would benefit significantly from an annual poverty update to be provided for in the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill. I commend the committee for including the language to provide $3.5 million to the Census Bureau to conduct an annual poverty update. This language will help track population changes as closely as possible.

While I appreciate the committee's efforts to address the needs of fast-growing States, Mr. Chairman, you understand the degree to which Nevada suffers Federal funding shortfalls due to our exponential growth.

□ 1415

Therefore, I would request that the chairman of the subcommittee continue to work with me to secure additional funds to help Clark County and the State of Nevada fill some of the funding gaps we have been facing.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I will be happy to work with my colleague, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER), as this legislation moves through the legislative process.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his attention to this matter.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the people who are watching, we are going to do some procedural things. We are making every effort to try to get this bill finished in a timely manner, so bear with us.

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Chairman, today I intended to offer an amendment to fund the fight against mosquito borne illnesses such as the West Nile virus. However, due to the agreement for limited debated on the Labor-HHS Appropriations legislation I was not able to offer the amendment. I would like to express to my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee the importance of addressing this issue in conference.

I commend the CDC for the work that they have done on educating our constituencies on prevention and for the support they have given for surveillance. Unfortunately, the CDC and many others were taken by surprise by the aggressive nature of the virus. And although the House appropriators have seen fit to increase CDC funding for the West Nile virus it is simply not enough. Counties across this country need help with controlling mosquito outbreaks. Education and surveillance alone is not going to put an end to the spread of this virus.

This is a major public health threat, and Congress has recognized this by passing the Mosquito Abatement Safety and Health Act. H.R. 342 would provide financial assistance to localities as they attempt to battle the spread of such an aggressive virus. Both the House and Senate have recognized the importance of this legislation by passing my bill, and I am anxiously awaiting final negotiations on the bill so that it can be sent to the President for his signature.

But an authorization is not enough, as we all know. This legislation needs to be funded at its authorized amount—$100 million. As of July 7, 28 states have experienced the West Nile virus, and the first human case of 2003 was diagnosed last week. For many of our constituents there are months of West Nile activity still ahead. Most of the 4,000 plus cases of West Nile infection in 2002 occurred in the last 6 months of the year.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to further fund the fight to stop the spread of mosquito borne diseases and to appropriate funds for H.R. 342 when it is authorized—which I hope will happen before a conference on the Labor-HHS bill concludes.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

For the past 2 years, the Bush Administration and the GOP have claimed that they are about educating children. But with this bill, Republicans are proving that they do not.

Where is the money that Republicans promised with the No Child Left Behind Act? The bill shortchanges our children by nearly $8 billion dollars.

This bill slows increases in education spending from 19 percent to 4 percent.

Republicans have promised to leave no child behind but under this bill, it is clear, many many children are being left behind.

How can we give tax cuts to the wealthy and take away from our children the right to a good education?

This bill will dramatically affect many school districts around this nation, but it will especially hurt my community—San Bernardino County California.

This bill cuts $64 million in funding for programs that help non-English speaking students learn to speak the language.

This bill completely ignores the needs of children in our public schools today. Today, 4.5 million children with limited English skills speak more than 460 languages.

The number of children who need help learning English has more than doubled over the past decade.

These children live in every state and are enrolled in half of our Nation's school districts. But I know that with this cut many children in my district will be left behind.

Places like the Ontario-Montclaire school district, where more than half of the students have limited English.

They need this money. Their children deserve a better chance at life too.

And nearly 40 percent of the children in the Fontana school system and nearly seventy percent of the students in the Rialto school system have limited English skills.

These school systems need this funding. How do we expect teachers to teach, when they do not even speak the same language as the students.

Students who can't read or write English have a greater likelihood of dropping out of school and have a greater chance of being in poverty for the rest of their lives.

Of the 530,000 Latino dropouts, one in three is an immigrant with limited English.

But this bill not only increases the likelihood that students will drop out, it practically guarantees it.

Under this bill $11 million is eliminated from the Drop Out Prevention Grants.

Every year, nearly 15 percent of young Latinos between the ages of 16 and 19 drop out of school. This is twice as high as the dropout rate for Anglo children.

Children who drop out of school are more likely to commit a crime or end up in prison. And they are 67 percent more likely to become involved in drugs or alcohol.

We need to find ways to motivate these students to stay in school, not discourage them by denying them English language skills and a proper education.

I oppose this bill in the name of all of the Latino children in my district that will be harmed by these education cuts.

We must find a way to get districts the money they need to help our children and Republicans must find a way to keep their promises.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

Just 2 years ago when Congress passed the Leave No Child Behind Act, we made a commitment to improve education for every American child. We promised that there would be a qualified teacher in every classroom within 4 years. We pledged to provide every school district with the resources to meet new achievement and accountability standards for raising academic performance. We committed to making sure after school programs were available to provide a safe environment for children to pursue extracurricular activities that help them learn.

My how times change. Today, the President and Republicans have turned the promises of Leave No Child Behind into a hoax. They refuse to fully fund the initiatives that are vital to its success. They've passed the buck to the States, which simply don't have the resources to fund these programs but still must meet rigorous achievement standards. In this short-sighted and callous effort, Republicans have doomed Leave No Child Behind to fail. This is a slap in the face to school kids everywhere and to their parents who simply want their children to have good schools and qualified teachers from which to learn.

You don't have to take my word for it, just look at the numbers. Republicans provide $334 million less than was promised for teacher training and recruitment. This means 54,000 teachers won't receive needed training next year and another 7,000 teachers won't be hired to provide specialized instruction in reading and math to 170,000 at-risk children. For Calfornia, Republicans make sure our public schools will lose nearly $1 billion in grants to meet new student achievement standards and $50 million less for grants to ensure teacher quality.

In addition, highly successful after school programs are being underfunded by nearly $1 billion. California will lose out on $100 million in funding for these activities. Grants provided under IDEA are $1.2 billion less than promised. So California's school districts will lose out on nearly $130 million for educating children with disabilities.

Now, if you thought failing our children and their future was bad enough, consider how this bill shortchanges America's workers and their families. Even in the midst of this tough economy and growing unemployment, the Republicans can't seem to bring themselves to increase funding for job training. Federal job training programs are simply funded at last year's level. And for those Americans who are lucky enough to have jobs, the Republicans want to take away your right to earn overtime pay.

We had the opportunity today to stop the Labor Department's proposed regulations expanding the number of employees who are exempt from receiving overtime pay when they work more than 40 hours in a week. Republicans defeated our Democratic amendment to make sure no funding was provided to enact these flawed regulations. In doing so, 8 million American workers could lose their right to overtime pay, which translates into a huge pay cut for working families who depend on overtime pay to maintain their standard of living. This change would also encourage employers to work employees longer hours, leaving them with less time to spend with their families. There is no question that working families deserve better.

Lower income families, women and their children also deserve better when it comes to health care. Yet, this bill also threatens their ability to receive the medical services they rely on.

Like so many programs, Title X, the nation's cornerstone health services and family-planning program, won't receive additional funding next year if this bill passes. This is despite the fact that more than 4.8 million low-income families and their children receive basic health care through its 4,500 clinics nationwide.

Title X clinics provide needed health services: screening for breast and cervical cancer, sexually transmitted diseases, breast and pelvic exams, in addition to prenatal, postpartum and well-baby care. They also provide educational services, counseling and information concerning both abstinence and contraceptive methods. By providing these family-planning services, Title X contributes to the reduction in unintended pregnancies and makes abortion less necessary.

In the 13th District alone, these family health clinics were able to serve over 63,000 patients in 2002—but they could be doing more and they should have the resources to do it. Unfortunately, anti-choice lawmakers are holding funding for these clinics hostage despite the success of these services in preventing unintended pregnancies.

Ideology, not science, has led Republicans to divert funding to ineffective ''abstinence-until-marriage'' programs. Congress now devotes $117 million to these entirely unproven methods while flat lining funding for title X programs. But, unlike Title X, abstinence-only programs provide no actual clinical health services.

I urge my colleagues to take a stand for the future of our children, working families and women in voting down this bill. We shouldn't throw away America's future by neglecting the education of our children, the economic security of working families, or the health care they need and rely on. I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 2660.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, this body should be ashamed of itself.

The healthcare and education of the citizens and residents of this country are in a stranglehold because of a greedy oversized tax cut, and we couldn't even vote to consider reducing it by just a small amount—to allow us to provide as better education for this country's children so this country itself can be better and stronger, and help to reduce the premature, preventable deaths that occur everyday in our communities of color and poor and rural areas.

Mr. Chairman, it is a travesty that this body is moving ahead today with H.R. 2660 the 2004 Labor HHS appropriations bill as passed by the Republican members of the committee.

Democrats did not support it for good reason, and we must oppose it now.

There are many reasons why this bill is a terrible insult to the people of this country, but let me just focus on health care for my brief time:

Even for its centerpiece—community Health centers—it provides the smallest increase since 1998.

There is no increase at all for the Maternal and Child health block grant or for childhood immunization, further turning our back on our children.

The bill provides no increase for the National Health service corps; it cuts programs that help students from minority and disadvantaged backgrounds prepare for and succeed in health professions schools, and freezes funding for health professions training, at a time when we are unprepared to meet not only our everyday health needs, but to protect our country from bioterrorism attacks.

I could go on and on, but let me just end with funding for HIV and AIDS. Not only is the minority HIV/AIDS initiative flat funded when the proportion of people of color being infected is increasing, but the program which provides treatment to persons with AIDS, ADAP, is grossly under-funded, increasing the waiting list for persons with AIDS for treatment, putting their lives and those of others at increased risk.

When did we become such an uncaring country, which would leave children unprepared for life, and others to lose theirs when we could do something about it?

This appropriations bill is not worthy of this country and this body. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Obey substitute and against the base bill.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, the Republican funding for vital Education, Health, and Labor programs is dismal. While this country's richest one percent enjoys an average tax cut of $85,000,000 the country's poorest will see dramatic cuts in programs designed to close the gap between the rich and the poor. If we are to provide for ''No Child Left Behind'' it is imperative we fully fund programs for children with disabilities. The Republicans decided not to honor their commitment for putting this program and other NCLB programs on a path to full funding by 2009.

Under this bill New York will suffer education cuts of approximately one billion dollars less than the levels authorized by the ''No Child Left Behind'' and the ''IDEA Reauthorization'' Acts. It leaves behind military dependents living near New York bases. It does nothing to help low-income college students pay for the 24-percent increase in tuition while freezing funding for teacher quality grants.

The Bush administration along with the Republican led Congress has passed tax cuts for the wealthy and left our Nation's children behind. The IDEA reauthorization which provides funding for children with disabilities was promised an increase of $2.2 billion. This appropriations bill comes up 55 percent short. A promise to fund teacher quality grants falls $350 million short, leaving 54,000 fewer teachers who would have received training and development. We passed stronger accountability standards for schools, yet this bill falls $334 million short in Title I funds. The NCLB pledged $6.15 billion more for FY04, but this

bill will leave nearly 2.2 million disadvantaged children behind. We wanted to see students achieve in reading and math. We wanted higher standards, but where is the common sense in underfunding these programs? In order to provide children with adequate facilities, equipment and specially trained teachers more money must be appropriated.

After-school programs play an essential role in the education of disadvantaged children, but this bill falls $750 million short of the NCLB promise. As a result, more than one million children will be denied the opportunity to participate in after-school programs.

Higher Education assistance through the Pell grant program is frozen under the Republican bill. Every one knows the way to close the gap between the wealthy and the working poor is through affordable education. Historically, the Pell grant program allowed students to achieve their goals without accumulating large debts, but this bill freezes the maximum Pell grant. When the Pell Grant program was initiated it financed 84 percent of a public university education. This bill would only finance 38 percent of the tuition cost.

This bill stifles the National Institutes of Health by providing only a 0.2 percent increase for programs other than bio-defense, leaving cancer and other disease research underfunded. With rising medical costs, childhood immunizations, Community Health Centers, Maternal and Child Health Block Grants will receive little or no increase. No new funding is included for nurse education and training to help with the increasing nursing shortage. While the Nation's richest are having elective surgeries in spa-like, fully staffed hospitals, the rest of our Nation is woefully underserved.

Services such as those provided by the Community Services Block Grant are to be reduced by $150 million, leaving our low income wage earners and the unemployed with little opportunity to upgrade their skills, hampering their ability to rise above the poverty level. In addition, it shuts down emergency food distribution efforts for the homeless and other low-income families. This bill further punishes by cutting funding for ''Low Income Heating Assistance'' at a time when heating bills could rise by double digits this winter for about half of all Americans.

The Labor Department, not to be outdone by the Republican Congress, is intending to take more money away from 8 million workers including some 500,000 fire fighters, police officers and nurses. New overtime regulations proposed by the Department of Labor will make it much easier for employers to stop paying overtime compensation, demand longer hours and cut their employment rolls and thereby increasing unemployment. This decision at a time when the overall unemployment rate rose to 6.4 percent while the rate for African Americans rose to 11.8 percent. This rate reflects 9.4 million people who were unemployed in June, a fifth of whom were unemployed for more than 6 months.

The Obey/Miller amendment which I fully support would block these ill advised new Labor Department regulations.

Working Families deserve much more. This legislation will leave its imprint on millions of families. It will not help with our continuing poverty problem, leaving our country to look more and more like a developing nation. A country which gives CEOs of Pharmaceutical companies salaries exceeding $26 million dollars cannot with good conscience cut key domestic programs. The FY2004 Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill leaves children and families behind.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak against the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations bill, H.R. 2660.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill is enacted, the consequences to most Americans will be horrendous. This bill is proof positive of the Republican gameplan of promises made in domestic authorizing bills becoming promises broken when it comes time to fund them during the appropriations process. This bill fails all of the American people. That is because in this bill, significant domestic programs—K–12 and higher education, Title I, IDEA, after-school programs, Pell Grant Assistance grants, College Work Study Assistance, Perking and SEOG grants, health care, and healthcare research at the National Institutes of Health (NIH), maternal and child health programs, job training programs, and summer youth programs at the Department of Labor, as well as the LIHEAP program and the Child Care Development Block grants to name a few—are under-funded or level-funded. There is no fixing this bill, it is necessary that we scrap this bill and start over.

Many Americans are going to wonder why if this bill is so bad that the Democrats are not going to offer a slew of amendments to make it better. Fellow countrymen, I say to you, this bill is atrocious and beyond repair. But in an effort to make it better, we are offering a comprehensive substitute under the skilled auspices of Mr. OBEY that would add an additional $5.5 billion in funding to this bill offset by the recent Bush tax cut.

This bill only offers a total $3.3 billion increase over last year's funding—which represents a mere 4 percent increase in education, the lowest increase in the past 10 years. It only provides a 1.6 percent increase for the No Child Left Behind Act—that's only $382 million more for the bill that holds States to the highest education accountability standards in history. Will these spartan funds carry through on the promises of increased achievement for our children in reading and math?

It underfunds IDEA, the program that helps the 7 million children and youth with disabilities by $1.2 billion under the President's budget. It underfunds Title I by $6.1 billion below what's authorized in the No Child Left Behind Act—as we know Title I helps 9 million disadvantaged children nationwide. It allocates only $1.0 billion for afterschool programs for our children, when No Child Left Behind calls for almost twice this amount.

This bill provides only a 2.5 percent increase to the National Institutes of Health, when we need at least a 3.2 percent increase to keep up with inflation. Needless to say, important programs related to ending health disparities, maternal and child health, immunizations, and community heath centers will suffer. There are also additional cuts to programs in rural health, important components of the Ryan White AIDS Care program, and nursing education and training programs in the face of a worsening nursing shortage.

EDUCATION

Let me continue to recount what is so bad about this bill—quickly since debate is always limited on important spending bills under the current House leadership. As we all know, this bill is supposed to fund K–12 and higher education. However, not only does this bill underfund authorized levels in the No Child Left Behind Act and those anticipated in the Higher Education bill, but it underfunds the President's already under-funded budget. Most importantly, this bill cuts the Fund for the Improvement of Education by 63 percent, Troops to Teachers by 31 percent, Innovation State Grants by 12 percent, Teacher Training in Technology by 100 percent, Community Technology Centers by 100 percent, Occupational Employment Information Center by 100 percent, freezes Pell grants, along with similar freezes in Perkins, SEOG grants, and the Work Study Program.

JOB TRAINING

This bill also fails to provide any substantial funding increases for vocational and adult education programs. These programs are vital to the nearly two-thirds of Americans that do not obtain a 4-year college degree and to the 25 percent that go to work directly after high school.

HEALTH CARE

Again, this bill only calls for an overall increase for NIH of 2.5 percent, when we should be increasing funding by at least 3.2 percent just to keep up with inflation. Although doubling funding for NIH over 5 years was completed successfully, this bill reflects the smallest percentage increase in more than 15 years. Needless to say, all of the gains we anticipated in the areas of healthcare research, biomedical research, AIDS research, advances at the CDC, bioterrorism advances and ending healthcare disparities stand to be squandered with this sparse funding. It bears repeating that the community health programs, maternal and child health programs, Child Care Development Block grants and the LIHEAP program that are either cut or flat-funded will suffer under this bill, as will the people who rely on these services. Lastly, we must also mention the $170 million of underfunding in this bill to help end the backlog of administrative cases at our Social Security Administration.

It is very disheartening to see the largest and one of the most important non-defense domestic funding bills on the floor of this House, the contents of which completely ignores the cries of the people who most need our help.

Mr. Chairman, I ask what message are we sending to our children? I think it is that you are not as important as tax cuts to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans and your future is not bright if you will need a little help. And let's remember that with unemployment over 6 percent and college tuitions sky-rocketing, many more of our young people are going to need help getting a quality public education.

I ask what message are we sending to American families and the 41 million who lack healthcare coverage. Is it that your health is not as important as lacing the pockets of the top 200,000 families with $88,000 extra dollars in tax cuts?

DEMOCRATIC SUBSTITUTE

With all of the negative implications that come out of this bill on the floor, needless to say, I would like to lend my support to the thoughtful Democratic substitute crafted by Mr. OBEY. This bill would restore funding for our nation's important domestic programs by increasing overall funding by at least $5.5 billion

over the Republican bill. It would cost us nothing since it will accomplish this critical increase by scaling back the President's tax cut for the richest 1 percent of taxpayers from $88,000 dollars to $60,000. $28,000! I think this is a small sacrifice to make. I think the American people will agree.

The question is clear—are we going to give this $5.5 billion dollars to those who need it least or to those who need it the most—to help educate our children and to provide health care and job training assistance to their families during these difficult economic times? This bill makes the wrong choice. Support the Obey substitute.

I urge my colleagues to vote against final passage of this bill.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in opposition to H.R. 2657, the Labor, Health and Human Service, and Education Appropriations bill.

This bill is the single most important appropriations bill we will consider. It provides funding for critical programs such as Head Start, the National Institutes of Health, Low-Income Energy Assistance, Pell Grants, the Community Access Program, the Centers for Disease Control, and countless other programs that directly serve most Americans.

This is the bill that, more clearly than any other bill, shows the glaring differences between the parties, because this bill woefully underfunds almost every one of the programs I just mentioned.

For example, many of my colleagues have mentioned that the bill breaks the Majority's promise made in the FY 2004 Budget Resolution to provide a $3 billion increase from the previous year for the Department of Education.

This means less money for programs like Title I, on which my schools rely to help educate low-income and disadvantaged children.

This bill falls $334 million short of the majority's promise to provide $1.0 billion more for the poor and minority children who aren't getting the education they need and deserve.

Further, the bill eliminates other No Child Left Behind programs like Drop-Out Prevention Grants, freezes State Assessment Grants, and shortchanges Safe Schools Initiatives, only a few of the programs that the current legislation affects.

In fact, annual increases in the Federal investment in discretionary education programs have actually spiraled downward since the act was signed into law—from 18.2 percent in FY 2002 to 6.4 percent in FY 2003 to a meager 4.3 percent in FY 2004 under this bill—the smallest dollar increase in 4 years and the smallest percentage increase in 8 years.

Public health programs also suffer in the proposed appropriations bill.

The bill provides an overall increase for NIH of just 2.5 percent—the smallest percentage increase in more than 15 years and a sharp deceleration from the 15 percent annual increases that NIH has received during the past 5 years under the bipartisan program to double the biomedical research budget.

The bill's 2.5 percent increase would fall short of what is needed merely to keep up with inflation in research costs, which NIH estimates at 3.3 percent.

And as I mentioned during debate on my colleague from Wisconsin's amendment, this legislation does not do nearly enough to provide funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP).

LIHEAP is critical to my constituents in Houston, helping them to pay their cooling bills. It is 91 degrees in Houston today, with 88 percent humidity. This summer, temperatures can be expected to average in the high 90s. Senior citizens rely on LIHEAP to help protect them from these extreme conditions.

Yet this legislation underfunds it by $200 million. This is a serious problem, and don't just take my word for it.

Even the President of the United States, in his Statement of Administrative Policy, expresses his disappointment at the funding level, saying that this funding level ''could limit the ability to address the heating and cooling needs of low-income families.''

There are so many problems with this legislation that there is simply no way to improve it. There is no money to shuffle from one account to another in this bill, because all of these programs are critical.

We simply don't provide enough funding for them, and that's because we have squandered our resources on a tax cut. This bill makes that priorities of the leadership clear—tax cuts for the wealthy, and program cuts for everyone else.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations bill. While I applaud many of the funding provisions in this legislation, I also believe that this bill makes unacceptable spending cuts to education, health care, worker training and other critical initiatives at a time when we should be investing more in our nation's future, not less.

There is absolutely no higher priority for our families than providing a quality education for our children. While I support the intentions of last year's education reform promise to leave no child behind, I am also convinced that the success of this new law will be determined in part by the investment made in this historic reform effort. I am deeply disappointed that this funding plan falls more than $6 billion short of the resources promised for low-income and disadvantaged school districts, translating to a $19 million shortfall in North Dakota alone.

This bill also breaks a promise made earlier this year to put us on a path to fully funding the Federal Government's share of the cost of educating a special needs student. Further, it shortchanges educational funding for military and Indian children in federally impacted districts, under funds after-school learning programs, freezes funding for teacher quality grants, and eliminates vocational and career guidance funding in my State.

Not only does this bill fall short on critical funding for education, but it also includes inadequate funding for rural health care programs, including outreach grants and research, and slashes funding for the State Offices of Rural Health by more than 50 percent of last year's level.

Certainly, this bill includes provisions that I support. I was pleased that the Rural Education Achievement Program received a $2 million increase to help rural districts manage the No Child Left Behind Act's new accountability requirements. I was also pleased that this bill contains important funding increases for disease research at the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), as well as critical increases in funding assistance to states for Medicaid funding.

I remain hopeful that we can work on a bipartisan basis to develop a fiscally responsible funding plan that provides adequate resources to strengthen our schools, address our public health needs, and support our nation's workers.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the underlying bill and to the shortchanging of the nation's students, teachers, and schools.

We often hear about the need to leave no child behind. Yet, this budget leaves millions of children behind by underfunding vital education programs.

This bill falls short of providing funds to improve teacher quality, student achievement, and special education programs. The costs of higher education continue to increase, but this bill freezes the maximum Pell Grant award. We should do more to help students who face the daunting task of paying for a college education.

During these uncertain economic times, many families must rely on the incomes of two parents or on a single parent working more than one job. This bill does not provide enough funding for after-school programs which provides children with valuable learning opportunities and also helps children constructively use their time at the end of the school day.

While this bill will provide some funding to critical education programs, the bill does not do enough. It's time that we fulfill the promise to ''leave no child behind.'' This nation's families and schoolchildren deserve more.

On a separate issue, I oppose this bill because it undermines the nation's progress on scientific and medical research at the National Institutes of Health.

With a bipartisan effort in Congress and the leadership of the past two administrations, we have succeeded in doubling the budget for the National Institutes of Health over the last 5 years, increasing it from $13.6 billion in 1998 to $27.2 billion in fiscal year 2003. The hope, and in many instances the reality, is that these strong investments in biomedical research will encourage scientific advances that will ultimately translate into better health care for the American people, including better treatment and cures of devastating diseases like Parkinson's.

I am proud of this past national investment. However, I am very troubled that today's appropriations bill does not fully support the work and research of the National Institutes of Health. We should maintain a robust level of funding for NIH. We must continue a strong commitment to biomedical research funding so that medical advances can continue. Yet, this bill includes only a 2.5 percent increase—the smallest percentage increase in more than 15 years. The doubling effort was inspired, we should not reverse course and starve the research that we helped to spur.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, today I sought to offer an amendment that would have increased funding for dislocated worker employment and training programs under H.R. 2660, the FY 2004 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations bill by $88 million, from $1.46 billion to $1.549 billion, restoring funding for these essential services to their FY 2002 level. The bill before us today would freeze funding at last year's level.

In my congressional district of El Paso, TX, 20,000 workers have lost their jobs as a result

of the North American Free Trade Agreement—more than any other community in the United States. These job losses have left dislocated workers struggling to learn new skills that will allow them to find jobs that pay a living wage, and they have left El Paso with an unemployment rate that has soared into the double digits at times.

My district is not alone in facing these challenges. In communities across the country, workers have lost good jobs as a result of NAFTA. These workers desperately need Federal assistance to prepare them to successfully rejoin the workforce and provide for their families.

At a time when the national unemployment rate is at a 9-year high, this bill fails to provide additional, desperately needed funding to ensure that all dislocated workers get the services to which they are entitled. Unfortunately, these programs are just a couple of the many critical health, education, and worker programs that are woefully underfunded in the bill. And yet, this Congress recently saw fit to give millionaires a tax cut of at least $88,000 each.

Mr. Chairman, America's workers are the engines that drive our economy. We need to make sure that they have all the tools they need to help get it moving again, both for their sake and for the nation as a whole. Restoring funding for Federal dislocated worker programs would be a good start toward that goal, and toward putting our spending priorities back in proper order.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I must oppose the appropriations bill before us today because it shortchanges the children of America. This legislature has promised to fund its broad mandate called No Child Left Behind, NCLB. Compared to the authorizations promised when that vote was solicited, Every Child Is Left Behind.

Let me be specific for the children I represent.

Title I is the foundation of NCLB. Of course, the total dollars have been increased by $1 billion. However, the administration deleted $1.5 billion worth of over 40 specific, successful programs whose continued existence had been promised to gather support for the bill. It was then suggested that those programs could be paid for under the smaller increase in Title I, which was designed to cover additional programs the federal government has mandated for those students. However, even that increase does not match the promise. Others have noted that the appropriation for Title I is more than $6 billion less than the FY 2004 authorization. For California, that is $872,616,000 less than promised for the neediest, low-income children.

Similarly, when this House passed its reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA, the FY 2004 authorization was to be a $2.2 billion increase. Yet, only six weeks later, you are offering an increase of only $1 billion! Why would you cut your commitment by 60% in six weeks? This amounts to a $129,826,000 reduction in federal support to California districts to pay this federal mandate. We continue to break the promise made in 1975 to fund 40% of the excess costs these special needs students require in order to be able to learn.

I represent a district with one of the largest aggregations of military bases and personnel in the country. The Impact Aid program helps provide for the school costs of military children whose families do not pay state income taxes, local sales taxes for commissary purchases, and property taxes if they live in federally supported housing. We are proud to have these families in our communities, but federal support to offset this loss of taxes is critical. Yet, this bill cuts is authorization commitment by $62,421,873 for California children.

After-school programs are critical to the children in my district. I was able to author legislation in the California legislature to provide funding to launch these after school services, and San Diego County has a wonderful program coordinating organizations and services for children before and after school. However, we still reach a small proportion of eligible and needy children. Federally promised funds are critical. Although NCLB authorizes $1.75 billion for FY 2004, this bill only appropriates 57% of that amount. California children lose $102,831,000.

The list could go on and on—just with promises made in NCLB—such as to fund teacher quality grants in order to be sure that every classroom will have a highly qualified teacher. Failure to adequately fund the level of Pell Grants for college students compared with the percentage of cost at a public institution that these grants initially provided is also highly disappointing.

There are other critical shortfalls as well. I must mention, in particular, the failure to continue the improvement in funding for the National Institutes of Health. In San Diego, we are privileged to have several eminent research institutions—Scripps Institute, the Salk Institute, The Burnham Institute, and the University of California at San Diego, to name a few—working on critical issues such as bioterrorism, cancer, diabetes, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease and the health of minority populations.

I understand the significance this funding holds for NIH to continue its work and for the numerous patients and communities that benefit from the results of this research. The scientific inquiries that these grants underwrite are the critical crucible for the incredible discoveries that have enabled many people with chronic and serious illnesses to continue to lead productive lives because of the resulting discoveries in drugs, medical devices, and health care strategies. Children will lose to preventable disease by undercutting scientific research.

Though I am pleased to see an increase in funding for our nation's mentoring programs, I am disappointed to see that this amount still comprises only half of the Bush Administration's request. The President took an important and long-overdue step towards recognizing the significance of mentoring in the lives of our children by proposing a robust increase in these programs. The mentoring relationship provides children and young adults with a stronger sense of self and instills them with new optimism for the future. All young people can benefit from the support of a mentor, and we should be doing all that we can to encourage the expansion of these critical programs.

We have heard repeatedly how many more dollars in specific programs under No Child Left Behind are appropriated in this bill. What those speakers don't say is how many dollars other programs authorized by the bill have lost. What else those speakers don't acknowledge is how much was promised as recently as week ago for the children of America. Smoke and mirrors don't belong in this debate.

The children of California are being shortchanged by over $1 trillion just in these programs. Under this bill, Every California Child Is Being Left Behind.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in reluctant opposition to this Labor-HHS Appropriations bill—for the investments it refuses to make and the promises it fails to keep for the American people.

I am profoundly concerned about the growing gap between what we say and what we do in this Congress.

We say we want a healthy America. But this Appropriations bill shatters a five-year bipartisan commitment to the NIH by funding the world's premiere scientific and medical research organization with a paltry 2.5% increase—the smallest in fifteen years. And the majority's solution to our nation's critical nursing shortage? A funding freeze for the Nurse Reinvestment Act. No new money at all.

For the growing ranks of our unemployed, a $150 million cut in the Community Services Block Grant program. That's less help for those left behind by the Bush economy—just when they need it the most.

Perhaps nowhere is the credibility gap between the Republican leadership's rhetoric and its honest-to-goodness priorities more glaring than in the area of education. Not three years ago, President Bush—the self-proclaimed ''education president''—signed the No Child Left Behind Act into law. In exchange for higher expectations and new, tough accountability measures to meet them, the President and the Congress promised students, states and school districts the requisite funds to get the job done. The bill we are asked to support today falls $8 billion short of that promise. It is an unconscionable abdication of our national responsibility.

When the Education and Workforce Committee—on which I sit—took up the IDEA bill this Spring, the committee's leadership repeatedly refused to make IDEA funding mandatory—arguing that the Republican party could be trusted to provide what was necessary for the proper education of children with disabilities. In a grandiose show of GOP commitment, the Chairman even went to the Budget Committee and announced he had secured an additional $4.6 Billion in authorized funding over the next two years for IDEA. Now we see the true colors: Less than 50% of the $2.2 billion authorized. And astonishingly, even less than the $1.4 billion authorized in the original bill. So much bluff and bluster.

Mr. Chairman, Appropriations bill are about so much more than dollars and cents. They reflect who we are as a people. Our values. Our priorities. And the course we wish to chart for the future. I believe this bill charts precisely the wrong course, and I urge my colleagues to defeat it.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Chairman, I will be voting against H.R. 2660, Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2004, because, among many other deficiencies, the bill underfunds our nation's elementary and secondary schools and increases funding for the National Institutes of Health at a rate that does not keep up with that of medical research inflation. But I rise in support of language in the accompanying report regarding the Pension Benefit

Guaranty Corporation. Over the course of the past year, the PBGC has grown increasingly aggressive in terminating early the pension plans of private companies before the companies have asked PBGC to take control of their plans. PBGC has terminated the pension plans of many companies, specifically of those in the steel industry, during the last year to avoid paying benefits negotiated between a company and its workers prior to a plant's shutdown. I applaud the Appropriations Committee's attention to this matter and hope that the PBGC will discontinue this unfair practice and move to redress pensioners who have suffered from this past year's adjustment in policy.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, the completely inadequate appropriations bill before the House speaks volumes about the Majority Party's priorities. Over the last three years, they've locked in tax cuts that disproportionately benefit the very richest families in America—those with incomes of over $1 million a year. As a result of this reckless tax policy, the federal deficit has ballooned to over $400 billion this year and these budget shortfalls are projected to continue as far as the eye can see.

Another result of this tax policy is that we don't have the resources needed to fulfill the promises this Congress has made to the American people. The Republican budget passed earlier this year, which enabled the latest round of tax cuts, promised a $3 billion overall increase for education. The bill before us breaks that promise.

Funding for special education in this bill is $1.2 billion short of what was promised in the budget resolution. Funding for Pell Grants to help families afford the rising cost of a college education falls $410 million short, and the maximum Pell Grant award is frozen. Title I funding promised in the budget to help school districts meet the new accountability requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act falls $334 million short of what was promised. Funding for improving teacher quality and after-school programs is likewise significantly less than what was promised in No Child Left Behind.

The bill before the House also shortchanges medical research, low-income energy assistance, and healthy care for unemployed workers. The Majority likes to pretend that it can pass more than $2 trillion in tax cuts without any consequences. This is simply not true. The tax cuts—again, the lion's share of which disproportionately benefit the very wealthy—are being paid for by breaking promises made to adequately fund education, medical research, health care and energy assistance.

This bill is not worthy of anyone's support. I urge the House to defeat it.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, the Labor, Health, Human Services and Education appropriations bill is a logical consequence of misplaced priorities in the budget resolution and tax cut proposals that have been pushed through the House of Representatives this year. Despite the overwhelming support from people in my community and around the country for investing in the future, and for funding our commitments in the President's signature No Child Left Behind legislation, this bill would systematically undercut funding promises. This Congress has authorized funding levels that would help school districts implement costly new programs and provide Pell Grants to help low-income college students struggling in a difficult economy. The House finds itself allocating far less than it authorized just months ago for IDEA programs. The administration's fiscal management leaves us with shamefully low funding levels for these programs and soaring budget deficits.

While our school districts fight their own fight back home, this Labor/HHS bill cuts education funding for Oregon's children by a total of $98,039,089 below the levels authorized by the No Child Left Behind Act and the IDEA Reauthorization Act. This is illustrative of the impact that will be felt in every state, and we ought to avoid this added burden on the nation's school systems.

At a time when so much has been done for a few who need help the least with massive tax cuts, it is unconscionable that we are not meeting obligations under prior legislation or even the minimal levels established under the Republican Budget resolution.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations bill before us. This bill shortchanges critical education and health and human services programs, reverses the progress we have made in building up the National Institutes of Health (NIH) in recent years and fails to fulfill promises this Congress made to disadvantaged children. There is a theme developing in the 108th Congress and it is one of unfulfilled promises and inaction—whether it's special education, college aid or biomedical research—the Republican leadership talks about access and accountability while failing to provide for it.

In the last five years, Congress has worked in a bipartisan fashion to double NIH funding, something we were all able to go home and be proud of. This doubling of funding signified an unprecedented federal commitment to research and resulted in the beginning of some remarkable projects—many of which have the potential to end great human suffering caused by disease and epidemics such as diabetes, heart disease and AIDS. Federal researchers are even poised to make significant discoveries about what causes cancer. I am sorely disappointed to see that this year's proposed budget for NIH contains the smallest increase in 15 years—one that is less than the rate of inflation and cannot sustain the projects we worked together to begin in recent years and at the same time, provide for critical new initiatives. The proposed amount would provide just 21 new grants for all of NIH outside of bio-defense research. American citizens should not have to choose between life-saving research and bio-terrorism preparedness. Both should be priorities and both should be adequately funded.

The proposed budget for education also fails to recognize the rise in tuition costs, as it freezes the maximum Pell Grant—the primary federal grant for college and university studies for 5 million disadvantaged students—despite its declining buying power. As a result, these grants would finance only 38 percent of the cost of a public university. When Congress established the Pell Grant program, they covered 84 percent of the cost of study—clearly intended to play a significant role in increasing access to colleges and universities for lower- and middle-income individuals. The funding levels in H.R. 2660 would force students to take on increasingly large levels of debt to finance their college eduations—if they are able to pursue higher education at all.

Last year, we passed a landmark piece of legislation called the No Child Left Behind Act, which promised education reform to millions of American students. The time has come to fund that legislation—to fulfill the promise—and the money is not there. H.R. 2660 falls $334 million short of the $1 billion in Title I funds promised in the budget resolution to help school districts meet the challenge of new accountability requirements in No Child Left Behind. Just yesterday, we passed the Ready to Teach Act, which promised millions of dollars in teacher quality and preparation programs. Yet, the appropriations bill falls $350 million short of our earlier promise to fund teacher quality grants created in the No Child Left Behind Act. The result is that 54,000 fewer teachers will receive high quality, federally-supported professional development.

Earlier this year, Congress made it a priority to pass a $350 billion tax cut that overwhelmingly favored the wealthy—on top of the trillion dollar tax cut this same population benefited from in 2001. The Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill—more than any other funding bill—sends a clear message to the children, the families and the working people of this country about our priorities. As Democrats, as Republicans, as Members of Congress—collectively, we know that education and health care are of the highest priority to the American people and that they want us to do more. Yet, the fact remains that the bill the Republican leadership presents us with does not reflect those priorities or provide the funding that they deserve. I urge all of my colleagues to vote against H.R. 2660.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, the bi-partisan passage of the Ready to Teach Act, with crucial Democratic amendments, and the teacher Recruitment and Retention Act of 2003 is a step in the right direction towards improving the standards of public education across this country. My Democratic colleagues and I understand that we must go beyond the empty promises and rhetoric of our Republican counterparts and put Americas tax dollars where they are truly need.

Unfortunately, today the House will vote on a Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations bill that will severely underfund education. This bill fails to deliver on a whopping $8 million dollars that was promised, but not delivered by the President's ''Leave No Child Behind Act.''

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately I am not surprised that my fellow Democrats and I are forced to stand here today to advocate for monies that are desperately needed to provide adequate education to our Nation's children. To make this lack of funding even more egregious, the Republicans promised America's children and parents last year, that no child would be left behind. I believe it is important that Americans know today that this Republican sponsored bill will:

Cut Title I grants by $16.15 billion dollars as compared to the funding levels called for by No Child Left Behind (NCLB). The children of Michigan will lose Title I grants totaling $202,981,000 dollars below the amount called for by NCLB.

Reduce IDEA grants, which are used by school districts to educate children with disabilities by $1.2 billion dollars as compared to that which was promised in the Republican IDEA Reauthorization Act. Michigan children with disabilities will lose $44,264,000 dollars in promised IDEA grants.

Shortchange children in need of constructive after-school activities by cutting funding for After-School Programs to $750 million dollars below the level promised in NCLB. As a result, Michigan children will be shorted $23,384,000 dollars in After-School Program funding.

Freeze funding for Teacher Quality Grants at $2.9 billion dollars. That is $350 million dollars less than the $3.3 billion promised in No Child Left Behind. Unfortunately, this translates into a loss of $10,172,000 dollars in promised Teacher Quality Grants for Michigan.

Leaves Military dependents behind by cutting $583 million dollars in Impact Aid program funds—well below the previously authorized funding level. Michigan military families will lose $5,054,632 dollars in Impact Aid.

Overall, abandons the promise Republicans set forth in their FY 2004 Budget Resolution wherein they committed to provide a $3 billion dollars increase over FY 2003 for the Department of Education. Instead, this bill provides only a $2.3 billion or 4.3 percent for this year. That is the lowest dollar increase in four years and the smallest percentage increase in eight years. The children of Michigan will lost a total of $311,052,632 dollars in education funds authorized in both the No Child Left Behind legislation and the IDEA Reauthorization Act.

Our commitment to educating our children is being undermined today. I appeal to my colleagues to honor our commitment to America's greatest treasury—our children. Let's pass an appropriations bill today that will fully and adequately support the education of America's children.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. Two years ago Congress and the President worked together on a historic piece of legislation: the No Child Left Behind Act. This bipartisan agreement exchanged tough accountability standards for significant financial resources to help local schools implement reforms. Everyone agreed that money alone would not improve schools. But, funding and reforms were to go hand in hand.

I had some concerns about provisions in No Child Left Behind and the burdens they would place on our local schools. But, I was reassured that with overwhelming, bipartisan support, Congress and the President would deliver the needed resources to make this effort a success.

Since the No Child Left Behind Act was signed into law in 2001, the federal commitment to provide the necessary resources has been broken. Congress has let our schools and our children down.

Our teachers are hard working, and our administrators know what they are doing. They continuously do much with very little. But, we are pushing our education system to the breaking point. Without adequate resources our local schools are struggling to meet tough new accountability standards. Despite provisions stating that states would not be required to spend their own resources on federal reforms, that is exactly what is occurring.

State budget shortfalls have already drained precious resources from our local schools. Constantly asking them to do even more with even less is the wrong pattern. it cannot reform or improve our schools. It will leave them unable to perform many of their core functions. It will eliminate quality, successful programs. And, it will drive teachers out of the education profession.

The federal pattern continues to be: promises made, promises unkept. Sadly enough, the promises being broken are those made to the next generation.

Providing a quality education for our children should be a top priority. However, as states are assembling their plans to assess and improve student performance, the federal government is eliminating the tools that would help them succeed. After-school programs that provide tutoring services have been cut. Resources to train and provide professional development for teachers are being reduced. The mandates should not continue if the requisite funding is not supplied.

The cornerstone of No Child Left Behind is Title I funding for schools serving large proportions of disadvantaged, low-income students. In order to raise the academic performance of these students, Congress promised incremental funding increases in Title I. For this fiscal year, $18.5 billion was promised. However, this appropriation bill would only provide $12.35 billion, continuing the pattern of breaking federal promises. In addition, Utah would receive nearly $4 million less than promised for after-school programs, $2 million less than promised for teacher quality programs, and over $8 million less than promised for Impact Aid that offsets the costs of education near military bases and Native American reservations.

These are not just numbers; they are tools: the resources that are critical to meeting new standards. Without the tools, our schools simply cannot work.

This legislation would also continue the pattern of failing to deliver on the promises made decades ago to provide 40 percent of the costs of special education. It would fund Utah at $11 million less than the amount promised by the House of Representatives this April when we reauthorized the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Our nation and my state are facing tough economic times that require tough choices. But, it is shortsighted not to recognize the role of education in the prosperity of the next generation. It is an investment worth making. It is an investment we cannot afford to neglect. Keeping our commitments regarding education funding will be critical to training the teachers and educating the leaders of tomorrow. It is time for Congress and the President to work together in a bipartisan way to keep our promise.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, there is not one Congressional District in our nation that will benefit from this Appropriations bill. I definitely know that my district will dramatically feel the effects of the cuts and the level funding for education, health care, and energy cost. Some of the best programs Congress has embraced and funded in the past suddenly seem to no longer be a priority.

Our young people who are in desperate situations will face dramatic cuts in the education provided to them. Low-income children attending Title I schools, children with disabilities, and young people trying to obtain a college education are facing the most critical budget cuts under education. Combined these students will lose over $1.6 billion—and this is not even including the $8 billion that is missing from Child Left Behind Act 2004 funding target. We are allowing an extra burden to be put on deficit stricken states, local school districts, communities, and working class families that are already trying to make ends meet in our sluggish economy.

The no increase in funding and cuts extend into our health care system. In my District, I have 25 hospitals, four of which are teaching hospitals. Like in many of the hospitals in other districts, the ones in my district are already feeling the effects from the fiscal crisis facing Illinois. This bill provides no increase for child immunizations, the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant and the National Health Service Corps, which provides student loan repayment for doctors and dentist who work in areas with shortages of health providers. We are all very aware of the nursing shortage facing our nation's health system and I was proud that last Congress we passed the Nurse Reinvestment Act to assist in the shortage. Yet not only is there no increase in funding for those programs, there is actually $7 million less than the President's request for the program that provides scholarships to nursing students who agree to work in areas with a serious shortage of nurses. Although there have been great advances and success stories in respect to fighting HIV–AIDS, there is a cut in the Ryan White AIDS Care programs. I am particularly disappointed that this bill cuts funding by 12 percent compared to 2003, in programs that help students from minority and disadvantaged backgrounds prepare for and do well in medical school and other health professionals schools.

Just two days ago, the Subcommittee on Education Reform had a hearing on the Community Service Block Grant (CSBG) and LIHEAP. I was very proud that one of the individuals' testifying was one of my constituents and also my dear friend, Dr. Mary Nelson from Bethel New Life, Inc. My colleagues that serve on the Subcommittee with me were all impressed by the great work that is being performed by Dr. Nelson and the other panelist. Yet we are cutting the funds that allow Bethel New Life, Inc. and the other organizations to expand community and economic development, provide energy assistance, housing, winterizations, nutrition and countless other exceptional programs that help families get out of and remain out of poverty. The CSBG will be cut by $151 million or 23 percent. LIHEAP is cut by 10 percent at a time when projections predict that natural gas prices will be at least 50 percent higher in the coming winter as more than half of LIHEAP recipients rely on natural gas.

Mr. Chairman, this bill just does not make any sense to me. Level funding programs may be considered sufficient but is considered a funding cut to me. We are hitting the programs that have already been cut and hit by the states. We are cutting funding for programs that are basic components to our society: education and healthcare. What does America stand for? What does out body stand for? This bill does not express the American values. This bill expresses that it is acceptable to cut the basic right of education, cut the ability to provide health care, encourage unequal opportunities, and keeping our citizens on the streets instead of having a warm place to sleep. Our body has worked together to pass some great pieces of legislation that will help our nations' schools, hospitals, and less fortunate—but those bills are just pieces of paper without the funding necessary to allow them to be effective.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, on May 30th the Administration quietly issued a new regulation

that will put an additional financial squeeze on millions of college students and their families by cutting their deduction for state and local taxes in the student financial aid eligibility formula.

This new rule, which was finalized by the Department of Education without review or approval by the Congress, will effectively eliminate Pell Grant eligibility for some needy students and reduce Pell Grant awards and subsidized loans for other students.

The Pell Grant program is the cornerstone of federal student financial aid, providing assistance to nearly 4 million students. These grants are the foundation of their financial aid packages. Without them, it is likely that these students will not have enough money to go to school. And in our new highly-skilled work environment, a college education is more important than ever.

College is the best investment of a lifetime. We must take steps to ensure that higher education is within the reach of all Americans so that they are prepared to meet the challenges they will face in our increasingly competitive world.

This new rule, will force students to mortgage their futures by going further into debt to attend college.

For example, a family of four living in Pennsylvania, earning $63,000 a year, with one child attending college full time, would have to pay about $800 per year more toward college expenses.

A family of four living in New Jersey earning $45,000 a year with one child in college, attending full time, get an estimated $1,600 Pell Grant under the Bush regulation compared to a $1,700 Pell Grant under current regulations. For a middle class family, working hard to make ends meet in a poor economy, these are big differences.

This is happening just as attending college gets more expensive every month, with states and private institutions raising tuition and other costs.

The Labor, Health Human Services and Education appropriations bill before us does nothing to remedy this problem.

The new student aid state tax allowances created under this rule will reduce the state tax percentage deduction for nearly all students at a time when the state and local tax burden is going up, not down, for many families.

The Department's new state tax rates, however, are based on outdated data from 2000.

Since then, our economy has spiraled downward, and many states and local communities have had to increase taxes in order to offset budget shortfalls.

Nationwide, the Administration's regulation could result in the loss of hundreds of millions of federal assistance to students and families.

The Department of Education estimates that 84,000 students would lose Pell Grant eligibility altogether as a result of the regulation.

As the legislative process continues, I hope my colleagues will address this problem, which is making college less accessible to middle-class families.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, when the House adopted and the President signed the most recent tax cuts, at a time when we are at war and in deficit, we knew the other shoe had to drop soon. And it has, Mr. Speaker, with a great thud, in the form of this year's Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2004 (H.R. 2660). The House Leadership has followed the passage of these irresponsible tax cuts with an appropriations bill which underfunds a host of important programs and initiatives while breaking many of the pledges the Leadership made when the House adopted the FY04 Budget Resolution.

We cannot extol the virtues of programs like Head Start and organizations like National Institutes of Health while adopting legislation which threatens their very existence. These actions abandon this Congress' responsibility to provide resources necessary to improve schools, protect public health, provide for America's seniors and disabled, expand opportunities to higher education, and seek cures for diseases that threaten the health of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we are starving our nation's most valuable programs. Last year alone, Head Start provided over 900,000 children with comprehensive early childhood education. But it is estimated that current funding levels leave behind over 40 percent of eligible children. This year I joined with Representative LORETTA SANCHEZ in spearheading a letter signed by ninety of our House Colleagues calling on the House Appropriations Committee to increase funding to the Head Start Program by $1 billion which would result in the enrollment of 87,000 additional children.

I remind you, Mr. Chairman, that Head Start is an extremely popular and effective program. In a 1999 study released by the President's Management Council indexing public support for and belief in government programs, Head Start rated a 94 percent, tops among all government programs. Moreover, studies have shown that the economic benefits of Head Start far exceed their costs, with one study showing that for every $1 spent by taxpayers, they received $7 in future benefits.

Yet, in the face of this data, with the passage of this legislation, we will close the door of the Head Start program to tens of thousands of deserving children and their families. This substandard funding increase means we will continue to leave nearly 40 percent of eligible children behind and severely undermine local Head Start organization' ability to provide training and technical assistance to teachers and parents.

But this bill will not only leave Head Start children behind. It will also shatter the promises Congress made to America's school children when it adopted the No Child Left Behind Act and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). This legislation falls $8 billion short of fully funding No Child Left Behind and continues this Congress' deplorable record of underfunding IDEA.

Students seeking higher education fair no better under this bill. In 1975, when the Pell Grant program was instituted, it financed approximately 84 percent of the cost of attending a 4-year public college. Today, that number is down to 40 percent. Under this bill that number will drop to approximately 38 percent. In my own Southern California district, higher education costs have increased with California's growing budget deficit forcing public universities to substantially raise tuition costs. This same scenario is being played our across our nation and a continued shortage of grant assistance threatens the higher education aspirations of millions of young people.

By adopting this legislation we will effectively shift a greater burden of college costs to students and working families and will undoubtedly ensure that too many of our children either leave college with overwhelming debt or are shut out of higher education all together.

But state budget crises do not only affect education costs, they also endanger the health care safety net which millions of Americans have come to depend on for needed health care services. And yet, under this legislation, struggling community health centers, which provide primary care services to low-income Americans, find no relief.

In Los Angeles County alone, over 30 community clinics have been forced to shut their doors. Under this legislation these clinics and those that find themselves on the brink of closure will be provided no relief because any funding appropriated to community health centers will be used to expand health center sites where they have not existed in the past. At this bill's funding level, the lowest since 1998, we are forced to choose between scaling back our expansion initiative or underfunding existing centers. This is simply an untenable solution to a growing health care crisis that affects low-income Americans.

Finally, H.R. 2660 abandons this Congress' commitment to double the National Institutes of Health (NIH) budget thereby stifling improvements in science and medical research. This legislation increase NIH funding by 2.5 percent, an increase that according to NIH is not even enough to keep up with inflation in research costs. In comparison, over the last five years, Congress has adopted annual increase of 15 percent.

A funding increase which only allows NIH to introduce 21 additional research grants will not allow this agency to continue to provide our nation with the cutting edge research which we have come to expect.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is inadequate. I urge my colleagues to oppose it and work to adopt legislation which adequately funds America's priorities.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2660, Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

Overall, the Republican Labor/HHS/Education bill under-funds the landmark No Child Left Behind Act by $8 billion, and provides the smallest percentage increase in education funds in eight years. To improve education, we must improve teacher training. But while the Republicans promise $300 million in the ''Ready to Teach Act,'' they have yet to fulfill their earlier promise to fund the teacher quality grants created in the No Child Left Behind Act.

To improve education, we must raise student achievement in all core subjects and improve early education opportunities. While the Republicans promise $17,500 in college loan forgiveness for math, science and special education teachers in the ''Teacher Recruitment and Retention Act,'' they refuse to provide the same incentives to teachers in other core subject areas such as social studies and Head Start.

To improve education, we must demand results. But the Republican Labor/HHS/Education appropriations bill falls way short in special education funding promised under the IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) reauthorization bill passed earlier this

year. While the IDEA reauthorization bill and the Republican budget resolution promised an increase of $2.2 billion, the Republican Labor/HHS/Education appropriations bill provides only $1 billion—a 55 percent shortfall.

To improve education, we must demand results. But the Republican Labor/HHS/Education appropriations bill falls $334 million short of the $1 billion in Title I funds promised in the GOP budget resolution to school districts to help meet the challenge of the new requirements in the No Child Left Behind Act.

To improve education, we must provide after school programs. But the Republican Labor/HHS appropriations bill falls $750 million short of the $1.75 billion for after school centers promised in the No Child Left Behind Act.

To improve education, we must expand early childhood education programs. But the Republican Head Start reauthorization bill would end the high quality federal standards and comprehensive services that have made Head Start the premiere early education program for American toddlers.

To improve education, we must have education performance standards for early childhood education. But the Republican Head Start reauthorization bill would actually weaken standards for early childhood education programs.

To improve education, we must involve parents. But the Republic Head Start reauthorization bill would allow states to end the parental involvement that makes the program so helpful to disadvantaged children.

Two months ago, the Majority passed a conference report for the FY 04 Budget Resolution that promised to provide a $3 billion increase over the previous year for the Department of Education. This bill falls far short of that commitment, and provides only a $2.3 billion (or 4.3%) increase—the smallest dollar increase for education in four years and the smallest percentage increase in 8 years.

Included in programs proposed for flat-level funding are Pell Grants, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG), Federal Work Study, Perkins Loans, Leveraged Educational Assistance Program (LEAP, the state partnership program), and Graduate Education. Even though none of the programs were cut in this tight budget year, there is room for concern and disappointment.

Earlier promises to increase the Pell Grant maximum (currently $4,050) are just one example of where the bill falls short. Providing lower income students with access to college is critically important, especially in a year when Ohio and many other states are cutting appropriations for higher education.

Federal-sponsored loans, a repayable debt for students and parents, represent another 40% of the average financial aid package. Less than 8% of financial aid is provided by federal grants. Roughly an equal amount comes from State grant programs. Compared to the administration's request, the bill appropriates $271 million less for student financial aid.

For Pell Grants the bill appropriates $12.3 billion, which is $885 million (8%) more than the current level, but $465 million (4%) less than the administration's request. The bill maintains the maximum Pell Grant award at its current level of $4,050.

For Work Study this bill appropriates $1.0 billion, which is equal to the current level but $7 million less than the administration's request.

The Pell, SEOG, and Perkins Loan programs are especially critical for lower income families to make college accessible and affordable. Congress must do more to assure that they are not left behind. National polls indicate that 72% of Americans believe that student aid should be the highest priority of Congress. The current bill does not reflect this priority.

I received a letter today on behalf of the President of John Carroll University, Rev. Ed Glynn of the 11th Congressional District of Ohio that stated:

> I write to urge Congresswoman Tubbs Jones to vote against the Labor, HHS, Education Appropriations bill for FY 2004 when it reaches the House floor, possibly as early as this Thursday, July 10. . . . John Carroll University provides about 45% of the financial aid that goes to our students each year. This share is typical among private institutions. . . . Please vote ''no'' on the bill and thereby register your position that more funds be appropriated for student aid.

I rise today to reiterate my opposition to H.R. 2660, Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak on H.R. 2660, the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2004. This is the second largest appropriations bill, funding many vital social programs.

I am pleased to report that the $138.036 billion in new budget authority and $134.765 in outlays for fiscal year 2004 in the committee-reported bill—as scored by the Congressional Budget Office—is within the 302(b) allocation adopted by the Appropriations Committee on June 17th.

Unfortunately, the spending level in the bill does breach the budgetary allocation ceiling for fiscal year 2003. It does so by shifting $2.2 billion that was advance appropriated for 2004 in last year's appropriations act back into 2003. This creates more room under the 2004 spending cap, but causes a breach of the 2003 cap. As a result, the legislation is in violation of section 302(f), which prohibits consideration of bills in excess of an appropriations subcommittee's 302(b) allocation of budget authority and outlays established in the budget resolution. The bill also violates section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of bills providing new budget authority that would cause the total level of budget authority and outlays established in a budget resolution to be exceeded. It is my hope that this violation of the budget resolution is the only one that occurs this year.

Since this bill has in the past been one of the more controversial spending measures, I am pleased that the House is moving this legislation sooner, rather than later, in the appropriations season. I hope that the level of appropriations for programs funded by the Labor-H bill will be determined—and finalized—before the Congress moves on to complete the smaller appropriations bills. I think it makes sense to determine the funding level for the many large and important programs this bill funds as early as possible, instead of relegating such discussions until the very end of the appropriations cycle.

On that score, I do have some concern that the specific levels of funding in this bill provided for certain high priority education programs may be artificially low, with funds being redirected to lower priority programs—many of which were recommended for reduction or termination by the President. Spending on IDEA, Title I and Pell Grants has increased rapidly in recent years, reflecting the strong support for these programs in the Congress. In this bill, funding for IDEA State Grants is $1.2 billion under the level authorized in the IDEA reauthorization bill passed by the House this year. The bill's $666 million increase for Title I is not insignificant, but it may be lower than the level sought by the majority of members. Finally, as pointed out in the Statement of Administration Policy, the funding level for Pell Grants appears to be less than the amount necessary to fund the maximum grant level established in this same piece of legislation. I am concerned that these problematic funding levels for key education programs in H.R. 2660 will ultimately result in a push to increase overall spending levels.

Despite these caveats, I believe the bill is a generous one. In fact, if the $138 billion funding level set in H.R. 2660 is enacted, the Labor-H bill will witness a 12.2-percent average annual growth rate between 2000 and 2004. This is much greater than the 7.7-percent growth rate in total discretionary spending during the same period. The budgets of two important agencies funded under the Labor-H bill—the Department of Education and the National Institutes of Health—have been doubled since the Republicans took over the Congress. I think that H.R. 2660 reflects the continued strong support by the Congress for these and other agencies funded by the Labor-H appropriations bill.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, this funding bill shortchanges an important program designed to prevent child abuse, reunify families, and promote the adoption of certain children in the foster care system. Under this legislation, the Promoting Safe and Stable Families program would receive only half its discretionary allocation. This inadequate funding level stands in stark contrast to President Bush's budget, which proposes full funding for the program. The bill also ignores a bipartisan plea from the Chairman and Ranking Member of the authorizing subcommittee to fully fund this important program.

The Promoting Safe and Stable Families Program (Title IV–B, Subpart 2 of the Social Security Act) provides grants to states for four kinds of child welfare services: family preservation, family support, time-limited family reunification, and adoption promotion and support. The program represents the most significant effort by the Federal government to support services that may prevent child abuse and neglect from occurring, and that help children move quickly from foster care to permanent homes. With over half a million children currently in foster care, and nearly one million cases of child abuse or neglect substantiated every year, funding for this program is vitally important.

If we really care about helping and protecting our most vulnerable children, then we should be willing to make at least a modest investment to achieve that goal. Congress has approved nearly $3 trillion in tax cuts for mainly wealthy Americans in less than three years. Surely, we can spend a tiny, nearly imperceptible fraction of that amount on preventing child abuse and on helping struggling families. As this debate moves forward, I hope we can

make progress on a goal President Bush laid out not only in his budget, but also in his 2000 campaign for the Presidency. Let's fully fund the Promoting Safe and Stable Families Program.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, we will never be able to close the achievement gap in education with the funding levels we see in this appropriations bill.

I applaud the efforts of the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the Committee and Subcommittee. They truly have done the best they could with the funds they were allotted.

Sadly, the majority and the administration have decided to allocate our federal resources elsewhere. They have chosen to squander the national surplus on tax breaks for the very wealthy. These tax breaks have been so important to them, that they have been willing to drive the nation into unprecedented debt to pay for them.

Meanwhile, Hispanic children are told that there is not enough money for their education. The Census Bureau just confirmed that Hispanics are the largest minority group in America.

Hispanics are also fueling the growth of America's workforce, accounting for one of every three new workers hired and are projected to be one of every two new workers by 2025. Yet, Hispanics continue to have the lowest levels of education attainment of any group in the country.

If we do not invest in advanced education and training for this emerging population, we put our Nation's economic foundation at risk.

The Congressional Hispanic Caucus, where I chair the Education Task Force, focuses on a group of Federal education programs that are critical to the Hispanic community.

These include Titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, migrant education programs, dropout prevention, HEP and CAMP, TRIO, GEAR UP, Hispanic-serving institutions and adult english as a second language. We call these programs the Hispanic Education Action Plan.

Unfortunately, the bill before us falls far short of the funding levels we need for these programs. I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my disappointment at the failure of the Republican party to adequately fund vital programs in H.R. 2657, the ''Labor, HHS, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

Mr. Chairman, we have failed our Nation. The Labor-HHS—Education Appropriations bill leaves our health care system, our schools, our children and our communities at risk. Sadly, my Democratic colleagues and I have seen the writing on the wall.

Over the past several weeks, my fellow Democrats and I have been very outspoken on the Republican financially irresponsible bills. We opposed the Republican's tax cuts. We opposed the Republican's Medicare package. And now we oppose their appropriations request in H.R. 2657, and our opposition to the insufficient funding in this bill is directly due to the Republican's poor budget initiatives.

H.R. 2657 falls short of adequately funding our education and health care programs, among many other valuable programs.

EDUCATION

H.R. 2657 fails to adequately fund our nation's schools and fails to live up to the many promises made by the Republican party.

When the ''Leave No Child Behind'' legislation was passed we all believed we were committed in a bi-partisan way to guarantee that good schools were established in our communities to improve our overall living standards and close the gaps that divide our societies along economic, social and racial lines. The Republicans promised to be committed to bettering our education system. They have not lived up to that promise.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle promised in its FY 2004 budget resolution to provide a ''$3-billion increase from the previous year for the Department of Education.'' Despite that promise, H.R. 2675 bill provides only a $2.3 billion increase over FY 2003—far less than the promise they made.

Another broken promise is the inadequate funding of the Title 1 Program. The Title 1 Program is critical to enabling schools with large student populations of low-income children to meet the No Child Left Behind Act's accountability and academic mandates. These schools enroll students with the greatest academic deficits, but they have the least experienced teachers, less competitive teacher salaries, higher teacher turnover, less rigorous curriculum, and less than their fair share of resources. All of these factors negatively impact student achievement.

The Republican's FY 2004 budget resolution promised a $1 billion increase over last year for the Title 1 Program. However, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have failed to keep their word here as well. Instead of $1 billion, H.R. 2675 provides only a $666 million increase. The result of the Committee's action is that this bill falls $334 million short of the Majority's own promise. The loss of that money does not affect my Republican colleagues or their wealthy supporters. It affects millions of low-income children nationwide and their ability to get a quality education.

In the area of special education, the Republicans promised in the FY 2004 budget resolution to provide $2.2 billion over the current level. The Republicans repeated this promise in H.R. 1350—the bill reauthorizing the Individuals with Disabilities Act, adopted on April 30th on the House floor. Instead of providing our special education students with the funds they desperately need, and because of their massive tax cuts, this bill falls $1.2 billion short of that promise. This massive funding shortfall will force schools to continue to absorb the extraordinary costs of providing special education for nearly 6.7 million school children. Consequently, other education programs will have to be reduced or local taxes will have to be raised to makeup the funds.

Perhaps the biggest broken promise by the Republican party is the destructive impact of their budgetary action on the No Child Left Behind Act. The Members of the Republican party put tax cuts ahead of their education promises in the Leave No Child Behind Act. As a result, H.R. 2657 falls a stunning $8 billion short of the FY 2004 funding targets in the No Child Left Behind Act.

On the issue of higher education, the Republicans have harmed our college students as badly as they have harmed our low-income and special education students. As a direct result of the Republican's economic mismanagement over the past two years, only eight states in our union are not facing a severe budget crisis. The declining state fiscal crisis has forced states to make huge cuts in the budget of public colleges and universities. When states make cuts to public schools, the schools must raise their tuitions. The raising tuition costs are crushing working families who want to send their kids to college.

HEALTH CARE

Health care is another area in which the Majority's bill falls short of meeting urgent national needs. In these tough economic times, with the high rates of unemployment and the loss of health insurance that comes with it, federal health care is even more crucial to our communities.

Additionally, the state fiscal crisis are causing many States to cut back on eligibility and benefits under health care programs like Medicaid and the State Child Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), as well as on public health protection. The programs that are funded by the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill help provide a crucial health care safety net for people without other access to care, and also help states and localities provide basic public health services.

The Majority's appropriations bill provides little funding to deal with the growing health care crisis. There are virtually no increases to the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant and no increase at all for the National Health Service Corps, a vital program which provides student loan repayment aid and scholarships for doctors and dentists who work in areas with a shortage of health providers.

The Committee bill also provides no increase at all for childhood immunization grants. That program has struggled to provide immunizations for children with the rising cost of vaccinations, and the bill will lead to further shortfalls. Additionally, while the Administration asked for $100 million to help us get better prepared to deal with an influenza pandemic, the bill provides only half of that request.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman H.R. 2675 is yet another example of poor budgetary policy impacting the American people. The Majority Party's failure to act responsibly with America's funds has impacted our ability to fund our first responders so they can protect our homeland from terrorists. The Majority Party's failure to act fiscally responsible has resulted in 9.4 million Americans being unemployed. Now, through H.R. 2675, the Majority Party's failure to act fiscally responsible is depleting the resources of our schools and our health care system. This result is unacceptable for the hardworking Americans we represent. I oppose this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2660) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for

the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2660, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H.R. 2660 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 312, no amendment to the bill may be offered except:

Pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the majority leader or the minority leader or their designees for the purpose of debate; amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 3, 4, 5, and 8, each of which shall be debatable for 10 minutes; the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 6, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes; an amendment by Mr. OBEY regarding overtime regulations, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes; an amendment by Mr. OBEY regarding SCHIP, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes; an amendment in the nature of a substitute by Mr. OBEY, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes; an amendment by Mr. TANCREDO regarding school safety, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes; an amendment by Mr. ALLEN regarding title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes; and an amendment by Mr. TOOMEY regarding National Institutes of Health grants, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes.

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in this request, or a designee, or the Member who caused it to be printed, or a designee; shall be considered as read; shall not be subject to amendment; and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. Each amendment shall be debatable only for the time specified equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against each of the amendments shall be considered as reserved pending completion of debate thereon; and each of the amendments may be withdrawn by its proponent after debate thereon.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would simply like the assurances of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that with respect to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), that time would be yielded to the minority side as well.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I think the unanimous consent indicates that it would be equally divided.

Mr. OBEY. No. That is a different question. I just want to make certain that of the committee time in opposition to those two amendments, that the minority will be yielded some of that time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentleman there is no problem with that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 312 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2660.

□ 1420

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2660) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, no amendment to the bill may be offered except:

Pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, the majority leader or the minority leader, or their designees for the purpose of debate; amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD numbered 3, 4, 5 and 8, each of which shall be debatable for 10 minutes; the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD numbered 6, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes; an amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) regarding overtime regulations, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes; an amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) regarding SCHIP, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes; an amendment in the nature of a substitute by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), which shall be debatable for 10 minutes; an amendment by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) regarding school safety, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes; an amendment by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) regarding title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes; and an amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) regarding National Institutes of Health grants, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes.

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in the request, or a designee, or the Member who caused it to be printed, or a designee; shall be considered as read; shall not be subject to amendment; and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question. Each amendment shall be debatable only for the time specified equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against each of the amendments shall be considered as reserved pending completion of debate thereon; and each of the amendments may be withdrawn by its proponent after debate thereon.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2660

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA).

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding. I would like to take this opportunity to engage in a colloquy with my good friend from Ohio, but first I would like to compliment the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman REGULA) for the incredible work that he has done, once again, to put this bill together. He is again, as many have heard comments from both sides of the aisle today, one of the most respected and admired leaders in this House, and I am just proud to serve with him on the Committee on Appropriations.

The chairman has been a leader and a champion of funding for community health centers for many years now, and I appreciate the time he has given me on a regular basis to talk about the funding levels that are necessary to keep this wonderful program running. The chairman knows that the $122 million that is currently included in the bill is greatly appreciated. That would bring the fiscal year 2004 total to $1.627 billion.

However, there is great concern that this would not be enough to sustain the services at some health care centers, and that, in some cases, they could be forced to reduce services to existing patients as costs increase around the country. My purpose is simply to engage the chairman to ask for his consideration to continue working with us