Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his outstanding leadership on this extraordinary remedy for a woman who, when I observed her on videotapes, clearly is conscious and has the ability to feel.

I believe in the sanctity of human life. I think most of us feel in good conscience we can't just sit by and allow this innocent woman to starve to death. Just because she has lost her ability to verbally communicate her feelings in no way means that she has lost her desire to live or her right to life. When in doubt, I think it is appropriate and, indeed, logical to presume that people want to live.

I am proud of the Senate and Senator MARTINEZ for his leadership in helping to protect Terri Schiavo's right to life.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MARTINEZ. To close, I thank the leadership of the minority and majority. I never anticipated that my first legal measure on the floor of the Senate would be something such as this. I am very pleased that we have had the cooperation we have had. I thank Senators HARKIN and CONRAD and so many others on our side of the aisle who have worked with me tirelessly to get to this point and the encouragement they provided me.

By voting for this bill, we will simply be allowing the Federal judge to give one last review, one last look in a case that has so many questions, that has so many anxieties, and that will provide us the kind of assurance before the ultimate fate of this woman is decided to know that we did all we could do and that every last measure of review was given her, just like it would have been given to a death row inmate convicted and sentenced to die.

I ask for a vote in support of the measure that we might keep Terry Schiavo alive and give her a chance to have a Federal review of her case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 30 seconds.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I want to make it clear that although I believe it is a mistake for Congress to be moving into this area with this haste and speed, in the most difficult decision-making a family could ever face—I intend to vote no—the language in section 1 also makes it clear that a Federal court would have to find a violation of a constitutional right or a right under U.S. law in order to provide an order that she be maintained on life support.

It is very clear in here that there has to be a violation of the U.S. Constitution or Federal law for a Federal court to provide the continuation of life support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (S. 653) was passed, as follows:

S. 653

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

SECTION 1. RELIEF OF THE PARENTS OF THERESA MARIE SCHIAVO.

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida shall have jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on a suit or claim by or on behalf of Theresa Marie Schiavo for the alleged violation of any right of Theresa Marie Schiavo under the Constitution or laws of the United States relating to the withholding or withdrawal of food, fluids, or medical treatment necessary to sustain her life.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2006—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 188

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 1 minute of debate on Feinstein amendment No. 188. Who yields time?

The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, this is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, submitted by myself and Senators KYL, HUTCHISON, CORNYN, SCHUMER, and CLINTON, having to do with the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program.

As we all know, illegal immigration is the responsibility of the Federal Government. Since early 1990, the Federal Government has provided some reimbursement to States. That authorization has run out. We have just passed it out of the Judiciary Committee this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, we have serious reservations about SCAAP which we discussed earlier when we debated this amendment. However, since this amendment is a sense of the Senate and since we are getting to a point where some of these sense of the Senates we think we can take, this one is clearly at the margin on that exercise, but rather than going through the exercise of a vote on it, we accept the amendment with prejudice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 188) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 240

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 1 minute for debate on Byrd amendment No. 240.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this amendment would boost the amount of funding in the budget to allow for a highway bill totaling $318 billion. That is the same size as the highway bill we passed last year. Every Senator should look at the table on their desk and see how much money and how many jobs he or she is foregoing by voting against this amendment. The offsets for the amendment are not new taxes. The offsets are precisely the same offsets that were used in the finance title of last year's highway bill. I urge the Senate to approve the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, there is an agreement—and it is fairly well agreed to, not only within this body but on the House side and with the President—that the highway bill will be $284 billion. That is funded in this budget resolution. This would increase that funding by approximately $30 billion. In addition, it raises taxes by $14 billion. It is a classic tax-and-spend amendment. I hope it will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VITTER). The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 240.

Mr. GREGG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:]

[Rollcall Vote No. 71 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Akaka	Durbin	Lincoln
Baucus	Feingold	Mikulski
Bayh	Feinstein	Murray
Biden	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Inouye	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Jeffords	Obama
Byrd	Johnson	Pryor
Cantwell	Kennedy	Reed
Carper	Kerry	Reid
Clinton	Kohl	Rockefeller
Conrad	Landrieu	Salazar
Corzine	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Dayton	Leahy	Schumer
Dodd	Levin	Stabenow
Dorgan	Lieberman	Wyden

NAYS—54

Alexander	Coleman	Gregg
Allard	Collins	Hagel
Allen	Craig	Hatch
Bennett	Crapo	Hutchison
Bond	DeMint	Inhofe
Brownback	DeWine	Isakson
Bunning	Dole	Kyl
Burns	Domenici	Lott
Burr	Ensign	Lugar
Chafee	Enzi	Martinez
Chambliss	Frist	McCain
Coburn	Graham	McConnell
Cochran	Grassley	Murkowski

Roberts	Snowe	Thomas
Santorum	Specter	Thune
Sessions	Stevens	Vitter
Shelby	Sununu	Voinovich
Smith	Talent	Warner

NOT VOTING—1

Cornyn

The amendment (No. 240) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 159; 160; 164; 194; 209; 226; 180, AS MODIFIED; 198; 153, AS MODIFIED, AND 182, EN BLOC

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I wish to propound a set of unanimous consent requests. We have 11 amendments that have been cleared as a result of extensive work and in an effort to be cooperative by both sides of the aisle, which I appreciate.

I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be approved en bloc. First is amendment No. 159, by Senator OBAMA, regarding Avian Flu; No. 160, by Senator LEAHY, regarding UNICEF; No. 164, by Senators GRASSLEY and KENNEDY, regarding the Family Opportunity Act; No. 194, by Senators HATCH and GRASSLEY, regarding S-CHIP Program; No. 209, by Senators COCHRAN and BYRD, regarding advance appropriation scoring; No. 226, by Senators THOMAS and CONRAD, regarding rural health; No. 180, by Senator MIKULSKI, as modified, regarding HOPE credit; No. 198, by Senators ALLEN, VOINOVICH, DODD, WARNER and DEWINE, a sense of the Senate relative to NASA aeronautics; No. 153, as modified, by Senators DEWINE and DODD, on HIV/AIDS; amendment No. 182, by Senator LOTT, on DDX destroyer.

I send the modifications to the desk on behalf of the Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that those amendments be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 159

(Purpose: To prevent and, if necessary, respond to an international outbreak of the avian flu)

On page 9, line 15, increase the amount by $25,000,000.

On page 9, line 16, increase the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 9, line 20, increase the amount by $11,000,000.

On page 9, line 24, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 10, line 3, increase the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 26, line 14, decrease the amount by $25,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 26, line 18, decrease the amount by $11,000,000.

On page 26, line 21, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 26, line 24, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 160

(Purpose: To increase funding for UNICEF and other international organizations)

On page 9, line 15, increase the amount by $44,000,000.

On page 9, line 16, increase the amount by $40,000,000.

On page 9, line 20, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 9, line 24, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 26, line 14, decrease the amount by $44,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, decrease the amount by $40,000,000.

On page 26, line 18, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 26, line 21, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 164

(Purpose: To provide a reserve fund for the Family Opportunity Act)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE FAMILY OPPORTUNITY ACT.

In the Senate, if the Committee on Finance reports a bill or joint resolution or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is submitted thereon, that provides families of disabled children with the opportunity to purchase coverage under the medicaid coverage for such children (the Family Opportunity Act), and provided that the committee is within its allocation as provided under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise allocations of new budget authority and outlays, revenue aggregates, and other appropriate measures to reflect such legislation if any such measure would not increase the deficit for fiscal year 2006 and for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

AMENDMENT NO. 194

(Purpose: To provide a deficit-neutral reserve fund for the restoration of SCHIP funds)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE RESTORATION OF SCHIP FUNDS.

In the Senate, if the Committee on Finance reports a bill or joint resolution or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is submitted thereon, that provides for the restoration of unexpended funds under the State children's health insurance program that reverted to the Treasury on October 1, 2004, and that may provide for the redistribution of such funds for outreach and enrollment as well as for coverage initiatives, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise allocations of new budget authority and outlays, revenue aggregates, and other appropriate measures to reflect such legislation, if such legislation would not increase the deficit for fiscal year 2006 and for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

AMENDMENT NO. 209

(Purpose: To modify a provision defining advance appropriations subject to limit)

On page 41, line 17, strike ''au-'' and all that follows through ''in'' on line 19, and insert: ''authority in''

AMENDMENT NO. 226

(Purpose: To restore discretionary funding levels for crucial rural health programs, such as the rural health outreach grant program, the rural hospital flexibility grant program, the small hospital improvement program, telehealth, trauma programs, and rural AED programs to fiscal year 2005 levels and offset this change by reductions in overall government travel expenses)

On page 18, line 16, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 18, line 17, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 24, line 16, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 24, line 17, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 180, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide a deficit neutral reserve fund for the Hope credit)

On page 40, after line 8 insert the following:

SEC. _____. RESERVE FOR FUNDING OF HOPE CREDIT.

If the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that increases the Hope credit to $4,000 and makes the credit available for 4 years, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise committee allocations for the Committee on Finance and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations of new budget authority and outlays by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, if that measure includes offsets including legislation closing corporate tax loopholes and would not increase the deficit for fiscal year 2006 and for the period of fiscal years 2006 though 2010.

AMENDMENT NO. 198

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding funding for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for subsonic and hypersonic aeronautics research)

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 510. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FUNDING FOR SUBSONIC AND HYPERSONIC AERONAUTICS RESEARCH BY THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The economic and military security of the United States depends on the continued development of improved aeronautics technologies.

(2) Research and development on many emerging aeronautics technologies is often too expensive or removed in terms of time from commercial application to garner the necessary level of support from the private sector.

(3) The advances made possible by Government-funded research in emerging aeronautics technologies have enabled a longstanding positive balance of trade and air superiority on the battlefield for the United States in recent decades.

(4) The aeronautics industry has grown increasingly mature in recent years, with growth dependent on the availability of the research workforce and facilities provided by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

(5) Recent NASA studies have demonstrated the competitiveness, and scientific merit, and necessity of nearly all existing aeronautics wind tunnel and propulsion testing facilities.

(6) A minimum level of investment by NASA is necessary to maintain these facilities in operational condition and to prevent their financial collapse.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the level of funding provided for the Aeronautics Mission Directorate within the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should be increased by $1,582,700,000 between fiscal year 2006 and fiscal year 2010; and

(2) the increases provided should be applied to the Vehicle Systems portion of the Aeronautics Mission Directorate budget for use in subsonic and hypersonic aeronautical research.

AMENDMENT NO. 153 AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate concerning the care and treatment of children with HIV/AIDS)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING CHILDREN WITH HIV/AIDS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Approximately 2,200,000 million children under the age of 15 are infected with the HIV virus, and 1,900 children worldwide are infected with HIV each day.

(2) In 2004, it was estimated that of the 4,900,000 people newly infected with HIV, 640,000 were children. The vast majority of them were infected through mother-to-child transmission, which includes transmission at any point during pregnancy, labor, delivery, or breastfeeding.

(3) Effective implementation of prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV and care and treatment services in the United States has resulted in the near elimination (less than 2 percent transmission) of mother-to-child transmission of HIV/AIDS. By contrast, in resource-poor settings less than 10 percent of pregnant women living with HIV have access to services to prevent mother-to-child transmission of HIV.

(4) Currently, more than 4,000,000 children worldwide are estimated to have died from AIDS.

(5) In 2004, approximately 510,000 children died of AIDS, resulting in almost 1,400 AIDS deaths in children per day.

(6) According to the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS, if current trends continue by 2010, 3,500,000 of the 45,000,000 people infected worldwide will be children under the age of 15.

(7) At least a quarter of newborns infected with HIV die before the age of one, up to 60 percent die before reaching their second birthday, and overall, most die before they are 5 years of age.

(8) HIV threatens to reverse the child survival and developmental gains of past decades.

(9) Research and practice have shown conclusively that timely initiation of antiretroviral therapy to infants or young children with HIV/AIDS can preserve or restore their immune functions, promote normal growth and development, and prolong life.

(10) There is clear evidence in resource-rich countries that antiretroviral treatment in children is very effective. For example, many children who were infected through mother-to-child transmission in the United States are living with HIV as young adults.

(11) Few programs specifically target the treatment of children with HIV/AIDS in resource-poor countries due to significant challenges in diagnosing and treating infants and young children with HIV. Such challenges include difficulty in diagnosing HIV in infants less than 18 months of age, lack of appropriate and affordable pediatric HIV/AIDS medicines, and lack of trained health care providers.

(12) Children are not small adults and treating them as such can seriously jeopardize their health.

(13) Children should not be forgotten in the fight against the global HIV/AIDS pandemic.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that this resolution assumes that—

(1)(A) assistance should be provided to support the expansion of programs to prevent mother-to-child transmission of HIV as an integral component of a comprehensive approach to fighting HIV/AIDS;

(B) to facilitate the expansion described in subparagraph (A)—

(i) more resources are needed for infrastructure improvements and education and training of health care workers; and

(ii) better linkages between mother-to-child transmission and broader care and treatment programs should be created for women, children, and families who are in need of access to expanded services;

(2) assistance should be provided to support the care and treatment of children with HIV/AIDS, including the development and purchase of high-quality, Food and Drug Administration-approved pediatric formulations of antiretroviral drugs and other HIV/AIDS medicines, including fixed-dose combinations, pediatric-specific training to doctors and other health-care personnel, and the purchase of pediatric-appropriate technologies;

(3) antiretroviral drugs intended for pediatric use should include age-appropriate dosing information;

(4) health care sites in resource-poor countries need better diagnostic capacity and appropriate supplies to provide care and treatment services for children, and additional training is required to ensure that health care providers can administer specialized care services for children; and

(5) pediatric care and treatment should be integrated into the existing health care framework so children and families can be treated simultaneously.

AMENDMENT NO. 182

(Purpose: Expressing the sense of the Senate on the acquisition of the next generation destroyer (DDX))

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 510. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE ACQUISITION OF THE NEXT GENERATION DESTROYER (DDX).

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Quadrennial Defense Review to be conducted in 2005 has not been completed.

(2) The national security of the United States is best served by a competitive industrial base consisting of at least two shipyards capable of constructing major surface combatants.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) it is ill-advised for the Department of Defense to pursue a winner-take-all strategy for the acquisition of destroyers under the next generation destroyer (DDX) program; and

(2) the amounts identified in this resolution assume that the Department of Defense will not acquire any destroyer under the next generation destroyer program through a winner-take-all strategy.

(c) WINNER-TAKE-ALL STRATEGY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''winner-take-all strategy'', with respect to the acquisition of destroyers under the next generation destroyer program, means the acquisition (including design and construction) of such destroyers through a single shipyard.

AMENDMENT NO. 180

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, this amendment would increase the Hope credit to $4,000 and make it available for 4 years of college. The core of the American Dream is getting a college education and I want to make sure that every student has access to that dream. I want to help families who are trying to send their children to college and adults who are going back to school for their first degree or their third.

Our middle-class families are stressed and stretched. Families in my state of Maryland are worried—they're worried about their jobs and they're terrified of losing their healthcare when costs keep ballooning. Many are holding down more than one job to make ends meet. They're racing from carpools to work and back again. But most of all, they don't know how they can afford to send their kids to college. And they want to know what we in the United States Senate are doing to help them.

That's why I want to give every family sending a child to college a $4,000 tuition tax credit. This amendment would give help to those who practice self help—the families who are working and saving to send their child to college or update their own skills.

College tuition is on the rise across America. Tuition at the University of Maryland has increased by almost 40 percent since 2002. Tuition for Baltimore Community College rose by $300 in one year. The average total cost of going to a 4-year public college is $10,635 per year, including tuition, fees, room and board. University of Maryland will cost more than $15,000 for a full time undergraduate student who lives on campus.

Financial Aid isn't keeping up with these rising costs. Pell Grants cover only 40 percent of average costs at 4-year public colleges. Twenty years ago, Pell Grants covered 80 percent of average costs. Our students are graduating with so much debt it's like their first mortgage. The average undergraduate student debt from college loans is almost $19,000. College is part of the American Dream; it shouldn't be part of the American financial nightmare.

Families are looking for help. I'm sad to say, the President doesn't offer them much hope. The Republican budget has all the wrong priorities. President Bush proposed increasing the maximum Pell Grant by just $100 to $4,150. I want to double Pell Grants. Instead of easing the burden on middle class families, the Republican budget helps out big business cronies with lavish tax breaks while eating into Social Security and creating deficits as far as the eye can see.

We need to do more to help middle-class families afford college. We need to immediately increase the maximum Pell Grant to $4,500 and double it over the next 6 years. We need to make sure student loans are affordable. And we need a bigger tuition tax credit for the families stuck in the middle who aren't eligible for Pell Grants but still can't afford college.

A $4,000 tax credit for tuition will go a long way. It will give middle class families some relief by helping the first-time student at our 4-year institutions like University of Maryland and the midcareer student at our terrific community colleges. A $4,000 tax credit would be 60 percent of the tuition at Maryland and enough to cover the cost of tuition at most community colleges. My amendment would help make college affordable for everyone.

College education is more important than ever: 40 percent of new jobs in the

next 10 years will require post-secondary education. College is important to families and it's important to our economy. To compete in the global economy, we need to make sure all our children have 21st century skills for 21st century jobs. And the benefits of education help not just the individual but society as a whole.

To have a safer America and a stronger economy, we need to have a smarter America. We need to invest in our human capital to create a world class workforce. That means making a college education affordable.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, there is a genuine effort going forward to reduce the number of amendments pending before the body. We still have an incredible number of amendments out there—somewhere in the vicinity of 30, at the minimum. At the rate we are going, that is about 8 to 9 hours of voting. It would be helpful if folks would sit down with the leadership on both sides, if they have amendments, and try to determine ways to deal with those and determine if it is necessary to go forward with them, or maybe we can do them in a more expeditious way than to formally vote on them. I hope we can get that sort of assistance.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, just to report to the colleagues, we have five more amendments in this queue. We have five amendments that we are working to try to get approved. We have 23 amendments beyond that.

I make an appeal. There are a number of Senators with multiple amendments. We have 8 Senators that, among them, have 20 amendments. I appeal to those Senators, please work with leadership to try to reduce those amendments. We are working diligently to get, as we have just seen described by the chairman, a series of amendments approved. Let's work and make modifications where necessary, where we can get others handled in that way. If we don't do this, we are going to be here at 3:30 tomorrow morning. So please, let's get these amendments worked out. These are 5-minute votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 225

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 225.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Missouri, [Mr. TALENT], for himself, Mr. THUNE, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. WYDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 225.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide the flexibility to consider all available transportation funding options)

On page 39, lines 8 and 9 strike ''net new user-fee receipts related to the purposes of'' and insert ''receipts to''.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I will just take 30 seconds.

This amendment is endorsed by all the major transportation groups. The budget resolution restricts the transportation funding available to the Finance Committee. Our amendment changes the language to be consistent with past conference reports and budget resolutions. It ensures that transportation funding options are on the table when we consider the highway bill. It doesn't affect the budget neutrality.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, this takes the fund, the purpose of which is to allow the Senate to spend more than the $284 billion but requires that that be genuinely paid for, and turns it into a reserve fund. The pay-fors will become not necessarily illusory but close to that. I don't think it is good policy to do that. I would rather we had a strong statement that if we are going to go over the $284 billion, it is really going to be paid for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 72 Leg.]

YEAS—81

Akaka	DeWine	Mikulski
Allen	Dodd	Murkowski
Baucus	Dole	Murray
Bayh	Dorgan	Nelson (FL)
Bennett	Durbin	Nelson (NE)
Biden	Feingold	Obama
Bingaman	Feinstein	Pryor
Bond	Grassley	Reed
Boxer	Harkin	Reid
Brownback	Hatch	Roberts
Bunning	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Burns	Inhofe	Salazar
Byrd	Inouye	Santorum
Cantwell	Isakson	Sarbanes
Carper	Jeffords	Schumer
Chafee	Johnson	Shelby
Chambliss	Kennedy	Smith
Clinton	Kerry	Snowe
Cochran	Kohl	Specter
Coleman	Landrieu	Stabenow
Collins	Lautenberg	Talent
Conrad	Leahy	Thomas
Cornyn	Levin	Thune
Corzine	Lieberman	Vitter
Craig	Lincoln	Voinovich
Crapo	Lott	Warner
Dayton	Martinez	Wyden

NAYS—19

Alexander	Enzi	McCain
Allard	Frist	McConnell
Burr	Graham	Sessions
Coburn	Gregg	Stevens
DeMint	Hagel	Sununu
Domenici	Kyl	
Ensign	Lugar	

The amendment (No. 225) was agreed to.

Mr. REID. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 243

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the Conrad amendment No. 243. There is 1 minute equally divided.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, this amendment says simply that we ought to repeal the tax that applies to Social Security benefits; that we should do it in a way that does not cut Medicare funding and that does not further increase deficits and debt.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, this is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment. It has no meaning at all, and it is not paid for by any method, so it means nothing. The senior citizen is still stuck with the additional 35-percent tax on their benefits on Social Security.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, 30 seconds off my leader time. This amendment is fully paid for, and it has exactly the same force and effect of law, as does the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 243.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 73 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Akaka	Dole	McConnell
Alexander	Domenici	Mikulski
Allen	Dorgan	Murkowski
Baucus	Durbin	Murray
Bayh	Ensign	Nelson (FL)
Bennett	Enzi	Nelson (NE)
Biden	Feingold	Obama
Bingaman	Feinstein	Pryor
Bond	Frist	Reed
Boxer	Graham	Reid
Brownback	Grassley	Roberts
Burns	Gregg	Rockefeller
Burr	Harkin	Salazar
Byrd	Hatch	Santorum
Cantwell	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Carper	Inhofe	Schumer
Chafee	Inouye	Sessions
Chambliss	Isakson	Shelby
Clinton	Jeffords	Smith
Coburn	Johnson	Snowe
Cochran	Kennedy	Specter
Coleman	Kerry	Stabenow
Collins	Kohl	Stevens
Conrad	Landrieu	Sununu
Cornyn	Lautenberg	Talent
Corzine	Leahy	Thomas
Craig	Levin	Thune
Crapo	Lieberman	Vitter
Dayton	Lincoln	Warner
DeMint	Lott	Wyden
DeWine	Martinez	
Dodd	McCain	

NAYS—6

Allard	Hagel	Lugar
Bunning	Kyl	Voinovich

The amendment (No. 243) was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 241

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on amendment No. 241.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BUNNING. For my 94 colleagues who just voted for that sense-of-the-Senate amendment, they now have a chance to vote for the real thing that actually pays for it. We put instructions in our resolution to the Finance Committee to actually set aside money to pay for this. The amendment my colleagues voted for last time made them feel good, but it did not do anything for our senior citizens and reduce the tax of 35 percent on the Social Security income they get. This is a chance to do just that. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, let us be clear, the Bunning amendment doubles the tax cut, undermines funding for Medicare, and provides absolutely no assurance that the additional tax cut will be used to eliminate the tax on Social Security benefits.

So let's be clear. It doubles the tax cut. It undermines funding for Medicare. It provides no assurance that the money would be used to reduce the tax on Social Security benefits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. CONRAD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 241.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 74 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	DeWine	McConnell
Allard	Dole	Murkowski
Allen	Ensign	Nelson (FL)
Bennett	Enzi	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Frist	Roberts
Brownback	Graham	Salazar
Bunning	Grassley	Santorum
Burns	Gregg	Sessions
Burr	Hagel	Shelby
Byrd	Hatch	Smith
Chambliss	Hutchison	Specter
Coburn	Inhofe	Sununu
Cochran	Isakson	Talent
Coleman	Kyl	Thomas
Collins	Landrieu	Thune
Cornyn	Lott	Vitter
Craig	Lugar	Warner
Crapo	Martinez	
DeMint	McCain	

NAYS—45

Akaka	Dorgan	Lincoln
Baucus	Durbin	Mikulski
Bayh	Feingold	Murray
Biden	Feinstein	Obama
Bingaman	Harkin	Pryor
Boxer	Inouye	Reed
Cantwell	Jeffords	Reid
Carper	Johnson	Rockefeller
Chafee	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clinton	Kerry	Schumer
Conrad	Kohl	Snowe
Corzine	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Dayton	Leahy	Stevens
Dodd	Levin	Voinovich
Domenici	Lieberman	Wyden

The amendment (No. 241) was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, can we get order so we can discuss where we are? We still have a lot of amendments pending and we are going to be here well into tomorrow morning at this rate. It would be very helpful if Members would come forward and agree to either adjust their amendment so they didn't have to have it heard tonight or reach an agreement where we did not have to vote on it. Otherwise, we are heading for the wee hours of tomorrow morning. I know Senator CONRAD had some thoughts on how we might address this.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, there has been excellent cooperation. I thank our colleagues. We have removed at least 80 amendments. But here is where we stand at the moment. We still have 24 or 25 amendments. We need to take a break because we need to have the desk crew take a break. They have worked nonstop. We are going to need to take about a 30-minute break. But to be able to do that and not wind up right back at 3 a.m., because we have made some progress now, we are headed for about 1:45 right now if all the amendments are voted on that are in queue, we have to ask colleagues to please let us know if you can accept a vote on your amendment on a later vehicle. That is the only way we are going to avoid it.

You can do the math yourself: 25 votes, 4 an hour, 6 more hours—that is right back at 2 o'clock in the morning.

So, please, during these next two votes, those who have amendments that do not have to be on this vehicle, come to us and let's see if we cannot work something out.

Senator CLINTON is next up.

AMENDMENT NO. 244, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized on amendment 244.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I send a modified version of the amendment to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The amendment is modified.

The amendment, (No. 244) as modified, is as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $36,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $54,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $7,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $36,000,000.

On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $54,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $7,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $36,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $54,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $7,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 18, line 21, increase the amount by $54,000,000.

On page 18, line 25, increase the amount by $7,000,000.

On page 18, line 16, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 18, line 17, increase the amount by $36,000,000.

On page 19, line 4, increase the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 30, line 16, decrease the amount by $36,000,000.

On page 30, line 17, decrease the amount by $54,000,000.

On page 48, line 6, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 48, line 7, increase the amount by $36,000,000.

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE SERVICES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Although the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention included family planning in its published list of the Ten Great Public Health Achievements in the 20th Century, the United States still has one of the highest rates of unintended pregnancies among industrialized nations.

(2) Increasing access to family planning services will improve women's health and reduce the rates of unintended pregnancy, abortion, and infection with sexually transmitted infections.

(3) Contraceptive use saves public health dollars. Every dollar spent on providing family planning services saves an estimated $3 in expenditures for pregnancy-related and newborn care for Medicaid alone.

(4) Each year, 3,000,000 pregnancies, nearly half of all pregnancies, in the United States are unintended, and nearly half of unintended pregnancies end in abortion.

(5) In 2002, 34,000,000 women--half of all women of reproductive age were in need of contraceptive services and supplies to help prevent unintended pregnancy, and half of those were in need of public support for such care.

(6) The United States also has the highest rate of infection with sexually transmitted infections of any industrialized country. In 2003 there were approximately 19,000,000 new cases of sexually transmitted infections. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (November 2004), these sexually transmitted infections impose a tremendous economic burden with direct medical costs as high as $15,500,000,000 per year.

(7) The child born from an unintended pregnancy is at greater risk of low birth weight, dying in the first year of life, being abused, and not receiving sufficient resources for healthy development.

(8) Each year, services under title X of the Public Health Service Act enable Americans to prevent approximately 1,000,000 unintended pregnancies, and one in three women of reproductive age who obtains testing or treatment for sexually transmitted infections does so at a title X-funded clinic. In 2003, title X-funded clinics provided 2,800,000 Pap tests, 5,100,000 sexually transmitted infection tests, and 526,000 HIV tests.

(9) The increasing number of uninsured individuals, stagnant funding, health care inflation, new and expensive contraceptive technologies, and improved but expensive screening and treatment for cervical cancer and sexually transmitted infections, have diminished the ability of clinics funded under title X of the Public Health Service Act to adequately serve all those in need. Taking

medical inflation into account, funding for the program under such title X declined by 59 percent between 1980 and 2004.

(10) Although employer-sponsored health plans have improved coverage of contraceptive services and supplies, largely in response to State contraceptive coverage laws, there is still significant room for improvement. Half of the 45,000,000 women of reproductive age currently live in the 29 States without contraceptive coverage policies. These women may still find the most effective forms of contraceptives beyond their financial reach due to a lack of coverage.

(11) Including contraceptive coverage in private health care plans saves employers money. Not covering contraceptives in employee health plans costs employers 15 to 17 percent more than providing such coverage.

(12) Approved for use by the Food and Drug Administration, emergency contraception is a safe and effective way to prevent unintended pregnancy after unprotected sex. It is estimated that the use of emergency contraception could cut the number of unintended pregnancies in half, thereby reducing the need for abortion. New research confirms that easier access to emergency contraceptives does not increase sexual risk-taking or sexually transmitted infections.

(13) In 2000, 51,000 abortions were prevented by the use of emergency contraception. Increased use of emergency contraception accounted for up to 43 percent of the total decline in abortions between 1994 and 2000.

(14) Thirteen percent of all teens give birth before age 20. Eighty-eight percent of births to teens age 17 or younger were unintended. Twenty-four percent of Hispanic females gave birth before the age of 20. (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, December 2004).

(15) Children born to teen moms begin life with the odds against them. They are less likely to be ready for kindergarten, more likely to be of low-birth weight, 50 percent more likely to repeat a grade, more likely to live in poverty, and significantly more likely to be victims of abuse and neglect.

(16) Research shows that a range of initiatives, including sex education, youth development and service learning programs, can encourage teens to behave responsibly by delaying sexual activity and pregnancy. Federal tax dollars are best invested in programs with research-based evidence of success.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that this resolution assumes that—

(1) $100,000,000 of the amount provided for under function category 550 (health) for fiscal year 2006 may be used for any or all of the following—

(A) to fund increases in amounts appropriated to carry out title X of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300 et seq.) above amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2005;

(B) to fund legislation that would require equitable coverage of prescription contraceptive drugs and devices, and contraceptive services under health plans;

(C) to fund legislation that would create a public education program administered through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention concerning the use, safety, efficacy, and availability of emergency contraception that is—

(i) approved by the Food and Drug administration to prevent pregnancy; and

(ii) used post-coitally; or

(D) to fund legislation that would permit the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award, on a competitive basis, grants to public and private entities to establish or expand teenage pregnancy prevention programs or to disseminate information to educators and parents about the most effective strategies for preventing teen pregnancy (funds made available under the authority of this subparagraph are not intended for use by abstinence-only education programs);

(2) the prevention programs described in paragraph (1) are cost effective and will achieve savings by—

(A) reducing the number of unintended pregnancies;

(B) reducing the rate of sexually transmitted infections;

(C) reducing the costs to the medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.); and

(D) providing for the early detection of HIV and early detection of breast and cervical cancer; and

(3) the increase in funding described in paragraph (1) is offset by an increase in revenues of not to exceed $200,000,000 to be derived from closing corporate tax loopholes, of which the remaining $100,000,000 (after amounts are expended pursuant to this section) should be used for deficit reduction.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, this is the Clinton-Reid prevention first amendment. What it does is try to put us on record and provide funding for the important goal of preventing unintended pregnancies and abortions. What this amendment does is to increase public health funding for the National Family Planning Program and enact the EPIC bill which says to insurance companies, if you are going to provide insurance coverage for Viagra you should provide insurance coverage for contraception. It increases funding to improve awareness and education about emergency contraception, which is a prevention program, not termination, and finally funds a new teen prevention program.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, this amendment increases taxes by $200 million and raises spending by $200 million and would prevent abstinence-only programs from receiving funds under it. It would also create a mandated insurance coverage which will increase the cost of insurance and create more uninsured individuals today, so I recommend a vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 75 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Akaka	Carper	Dorgan
Baucus	Chafee	Durbin
Bayh	Clinton	Feingold
Biden	Collins	Feinstein
Bingaman	Conrad	Harkin
Boxer	Corzine	Inouye
Byrd	Dayton	Jeffords
Cantwell	Dodd	Johnson
Kennedy	Lincoln	Rockefeller
Kerry	Mikulski	Salazar
Kohl	Murray	Sarbanes
Landrieu	Nelson (FL)	Schumer
Lautenberg	Obama	Snowe
Leahy	Pryor	Stabenow
Levin	Reed	Wyden
Lieberman	Reid	

NAYS—53

Alexander	Dole	McConnell
Allard	Domenici	Murkowski
Allen	Ensign	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Enzi	Roberts
Bond	Frist	Santorum
Brownback	Graham	Sessions
Bunning	Grassley	Shelby
Burns	Gregg	Smith
Burr	Hagel	Specter
Chambliss	Hatch	Stevens
Coburn	Hutchison	Sununu
Cochran	Inhofe	Talent
Coleman	Isakson	Thomas
Cornyn	Kyl	Thune
Craig	Lott	Vitter
Crapo	Lugar	Voinovich
DeMint	Martinez	Warner
DeWine	McCain	

The amendment (No. 244) as modified, was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 187

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I believe my amendment is next in order. I would like to be able to confirm that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New Jersey is at the desk.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, in the last 4 years we have raised the Nation's debt limit three times, from less than $6 trillion to more than $8 trillion. Now we are being asked to add $446 billion of new debt, $1,500 for every man, woman, and child, without debate. My amendment says we ought to have a debate and answer the question after we have discussed it. The issue ought to be debated. Nothing poses a greater threat to our future security. The President said he doesn't think it is right to avoid facing up to tough issues that our children will have to deal with in the future. Let us face up to our responsibilities.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, for the edification of our colleagues, after this vote is completed, we will take a half hour recess to give the staff a rest for a little bit. Then we will be back and voting, I presume, sometime around quarter of 8.

The use of reconciliation on the debt ceiling is a very common procedure. Our colleagues across the aisle, when they were in the majority, used it a number of times. It is an option that should be made available. We have to pay our debt and, therefore, we have to raise that debt ceiling. This is a very typical and appropriate way to handle the debt ceiling should the Finance Committee choose to pursue it. We are just giving them this tool and this option.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered on this amendment.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant journal clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 76 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Akaka	Durbin	Lincoln
Baucus	Feingold	McCain
Bayh	Feinstein	Mikulski
Biden	Harkin	Murray
Bingaman	Inouye	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Jeffords	Obama
Byrd	Johnson	Pryor
Cantwell	Kennedy	Reed
Carper	Kerry	Reid
Clinton	Kohl	Rockefeller
Conrad	Landrieu	Salazar
Corzine	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Dayton	Leahy	Schumer
Dodd	Levin	Stabenow
Dorgan	Lieberman	Wyden

NAYS—54

Alexander	DeWine	McConnell
Allard	Dole	Murkowski
Allen	Domenici	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Ensign	Roberts
Bond	Enzi	Santorum
Brownback	Frist	Sessions
Bunning	Graham	Shelby
Burns	Grassley	Smith
Burr	Gregg	Snowe
Chafee	Hagel	Specter
Coburn	Hatch	Stevens
Cochran	Hutchison	Sununu
Coleman	Inhofe	Talent
Collins	Isakson	Thomas
Cornyn	Kyl	Thune
Craig	Lott	Vitter
Crapo	Lugar	Voinovich
DeMint	Martinez	Warner

NOT VOTING—1

Chambliss

The amendment (No. 187) was rejected.

RECESS

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, it is now our plan to recess until 7:45, at which time we will vote on the Boxer amendment. That is what we will vote on at 7:45. It will be a 10-minute vote and we will hold that 10-minute vote. In other words, there will not be any effort to go past 10 minutes. We will close it out after 10 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent that we recess until 7:45 and at 7:45 we shall vote on the Boxer amendment which has been submitted to both sides.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:15 p.m., recessed until 7:45 p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BURR).

AMENDMENT NO. 257

Mr. GREGG. Is the amendment at the desk?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] proposes an amendment numbered 257.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a point of order in the Senate against any appropriations bill if it allows funds to be provided for prepackaged news stories that do not have a disclaimer that continuously runs through the presentation which says, ''Paid for by the United States Government.'')

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. POINT OF ORDER.

(a) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any appropriations bill if it allows funds to be provided for prepackaged news stories that do not have a disclaimer that continuously runs through the presentation which says, ''Paid for by the United States Government.''.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of ⅗ of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of ⅗ of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, the Comptroller General of GAO tells us that prepackaged news that is put together by Federal agencies is unacceptable and that—I am quoting them—''Americans deserve to know when their Government is spending taxpayer money to try to influence them.''

My amendment simply encourages agencies to add a disclaimer to those prepackaged news stories that says ''Paid for by the United States Government.''

This is very important for the taxpayers to know it is their money that is being spent. I hope and I wish the other side would agree to this amendment. If not, I guess we will have to have a vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, this amendment creates a point of order on language which probably is not able to be given a conciseness that would make it effective. What does ''prepackaging'' mean? It would be virtually impossible to exercise this point of order, and I think it would set a bad precedent for the Senate to create such a point of order.

I oppose the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Mr. GREGG. This will be a 10-minute vote, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 77 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Baucus	Feinstein	Murray
Bayh	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Inouye	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Jeffords	Obama
Boxer	Johnson	Pryor
Byrd	Kennedy	Reed
Cantwell	Kerry	Reid
Carper	Kohl	Rockefeller
Conrad	Landrieu	Salazar
Corzine	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Dayton	Leahy	Schumer
Dodd	Levin	Stabenow
Dorgan	Lieberman	Wyden
Durbin	Lincoln	

NAYS—54

Alexander	DeWine	McCain
Allard	Dole	McConnell
Allen	Domenici	Murkowski
Bennett	Ensign	Roberts
Bond	Enzi	Santorum
Brownback	Frist	Sessions
Bunning	Graham	Shelby
Burr	Grassley	Smith
Chafee	Gregg	Snowe
Chambliss	Hagel	Specter
Coburn	Hatch	Stevens
Cochran	Hutchison	Sununu
Coleman	Inhofe	Talent
Collins	Isakson	Thomas
Cornyn	Kyl	Thune
Craig	Lott	Vitter
Crapo	Lugar	Voinovich
DeMint	Martinez	Warner

NOT VOTING—2

Burns Clinton

The amendment (No. 257) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 259

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I yield a minute to the Senator from California to make a comment on her amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank Senators Gregg, Conrad, Stevens, and Sununu. We are all working together to make sure that our oceans can finally get the attention they deserve. We have a new commission on oceans. Admiral Watkins is working hard on that commission. What we are doing, which has been agreed to on all sides, is simply saying we need to enact a comprehensive, coordinated, integrated national ocean policy that will ensure the long-term economic and ecological health of the U.S. oceans, coasts, and lakes.

I think it is wonderful that we can come together on this, and on the Commerce Committee we will be working to make sure this happens.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask that this amendment be adopted.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 259) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the need for a comprehensive, coordinated, and integrated national ocean policy)

On page 65, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 510. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE, COORDINATED, AND INTEGRATED NATIONAL OCEAN POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The United States Commission on Ocean Policy and the Pew Ocean Commission have each completed and published independent findings on the state of the United States oceans, coasts, and Great Lakes.

(2) The findings made by the Commissions include the following:

(A) The United States oceans, coasts, and Great Lakes are a vital component of the economy of the United States.

(B) The resources and ecosystems associated with the United States oceans, coasts, and Great Lakes are in trouble.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the President and the Congress should—

(1) expeditiously consider the recommendations of the United States Commission on Ocean Policy during the 109th Congress; and

(2) enact a comprehensive, coordinated, and integrated national ocean policy that will ensure the long-term economic and ecological health of the United States oceans, coasts, and Great Lakes.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GREGG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we just had a good example, one amendment cleared and one dropped. We need to do more of that. We have 20 amendments left here, 7 on the other side; that is 27. We have a lot of work to do. We need Senators to be willing to give up some of these amendments. They can offer them at a later time. I ask my colleagues to consider that.

I thank the Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 211

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, the next item will be a 5-minute vote, with 1 minute to speak about it. It is Senator DORGAN's amendment.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this is amendment No. 211. This amendment adds back $1 billion to the Indian accounts. We all know we have a bona fide crisis in health care, housing, and education on Indian reservations in this country. Many of those appropriations have been cut. This amendment restores some of that cut. It is $1 billion, which would be paid for by closing a tax loophole.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, this amendment would raise taxes by $3.25 billion. It is a tax-and-spend amendment. There is absolutely no assurance that any of these funds would go as represented on the amendment. That would be a decision made by the proper authorizing or appropriating committee.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mrs. MURRAY, proposes an amendment numbered 211.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To restore funding for tribal programs and provide necessary additional funding based on recommendations from Indian country and to reduce the deficit.)

On page 3 line 10, increase the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 3 line 11, increase the amount by $600,000,000.

On page 3 line 12, increase the amount by $700,000,000.

On page 3 line 13, increase the amount by $700,000,000.

On page 3 line 14, increase the amount by $700,000,000.

On page 3 line 19, increase the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 3 line 20, increase the amount by $600,000,000.

On page 3 line 21, increase the amount by $700,000,000.

On page 4 line 1, increase the amount by $700,000,000.

On page 4 line 2, increase the amount by $700,000,000.

On page 4 line 7, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.

On page 4 line 16, increase the amount by $589,000,000.

On page 4 line 17, increase the amount by $195,000,000.

On page 4 line 18, increase the amount by $87,000,000.

On page 4 line 19, increase the amount by $66,000,000.

On page 4 line 20, increase the amount by $38,000,000.

On page 4 line 24, decrease the amount by $89,000,000.

On page 4 line 25, increase the amount by $405,000,000.

On page 5 line 1, increase the amount by $613,000,000.

On page 5 line 2, increase the amount by $634,000,000.

On page 5 line 3, increase the amount by $662,000,000.

On page 5 line 7, increase the amount by $89,000,000.

On page 5 line 8, decrease the amount by $316,000,000.

On page 5 line 9, decrease the amount by $929,000,000.

On page 5 line 10, decrease the amount by $1,563,000,000.

On page 5 line 11, decrease the amount by $2,225,000,000.

On page 5 line 15, increase the amount by $89,000,000.

On page 5 line 16, decrease the amount by $316,000,000.

On page 5 line 17, decrease the amount by $929,000,000.

On page 5 line 18, decrease the amount by $1,563,000,000.

On page 5 line 19, decrease the amount by $2,225,000,000.

On page 12 line 15, increase the amount by $135,000,000.

On page 12 line 16, increase the amount by $7,000,000.

On page 12 line 20, increase the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 12 line 24, increase the amount by $41,000,000.

On page 13 line 3, increase the amount by $41,000,000.

On page 13 line 7, increase the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 16 line 15, increase the amount by $330,000,000.

On page 16 line 16, increase the amount by $222,000,000.

On page 16 line 20, increase the amount by $80,000,000.

On page 16 line 24, increase the amount by $14,000,000.

On page 17 line 3, increase the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 17 line 7, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 17 line 16, increase the amount by $80,000,000.

On page 17 line 17, increase the amount by $37,000,000.

On page 17 line 21, increase the amount by $34,000,000.

On page 17 line 25, increase the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 18 line 4, increase the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 18 line 16, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 18 line 17, increase the amount by $270,000,000.

On page 18 line 21, increase the amount by $27,000,000.

On page 18 line 25, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 20 line 16, increase the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 20 line 17, increase the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 20 line 21, increase the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 20 line 25, increase the amount by $18,000,000

On page 21 line 4, increase the amount by $15,000,000.

On page 21 line 8, increase the amount by $14,000,000.

On page 23 line 16, increase the amount by $25,000,000.

On page 23 line 17, increase the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 23 line 21, increase the amount by $8,000,000.

On page 23 line 25, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 24 line 4, increase the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 24 line 8, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 30 line 16, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 30 line 17, decrease the amount by $3,200,000,000.

On page 48 line 6, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.

On page 48 line 7, increase the amount by $589,000,000.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 55, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 78 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Akaka	Durbin	Lincoln
Baucus	Feingold	Mikulski
Bayh	Feinstein	Murray
Biden	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Inouye	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Jeffords	Obama
Byrd	Johnson	Pryor
Cantwell	Kennedy	Reed
Carper	Kerry	Reid
Clinton	Kohl	Rockefeller
Conrad	Landrieu	Salazar
Corzine	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
Dayton	Leahy	Schumer
Dodd	Levin	Stabenow
Dorgan	Lieberman	Wyden

NAYS—55

Alexander	DeWine	McConnell
Allard	Dole	Murkowski
Allen	Domenici	Roberts
Bennett	Ensign	Santorum
Bond	Enzi	Sessions
Brownback	Frist	Shelby
Bunning	Graham	Smith
Burns	Grassley	Snowe
Burr	Gregg	Specter
Chafee	Hagel	Stevens
Chambliss	Hatch	Sununu
Coburn	Hutchison	Talent
Cochran	Inhofe	Thomas
Coleman	Isakson	Thune
Collins	Kyl	Vitter
Cornyn	Lott	Voinovich
Craig	Lugar	Warner
Crapo	Martinez	
DeMint	McCain	

The amendment (No. 211) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, the next amendment will be from the Senator from Wisconsin for 30 seconds.

AMENDMENT NO. 258

Mr. FEINGOLD. I call up amendment No. 258.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD], for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 258.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that savings associated with legislation that reduces overpayments to Medicare Advantage plans is reserved for deficit reduction and to strengthen the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund)

On page 40, after line 8, insert the following:

SEC. ____. RESERVE FUND FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION AND TO STRENGTHEN THE PART A TRUST FUND.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, functional totals, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution upon enactment of legislation that achieves savings under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act by reducing overpayments to Medicare Advantage plans (such as legislation that requires the full amount of savings from the implementation of risk adjusted payments to Medicare Advantage plans to accrue to the medicare program, that eliminates the plan stabilization fund under section 1858(e) of such Act, and that adjusts the MA area-specific nondrug monthly benchmark amount under part C of such title to exclude payments for the indirect costs of medical education under section 1886(d)(5)(B) of such Act), by the amount of savings in that legislation, to ensure that those savings are reserved for deficit reduction and to strengthen the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, in deference to the request of our two floor leaders, I will not ask for a rollcall vote, but I do hope my colleagues will voice their support for this amendment.

This is real deficit reduction. The other side keeps asking us to cut spending. This amendment does just that. This amendment cuts over $20 billion from the Medicare Program and unnecessary overpayments to private Medicare plans.

We have a simple choice: subsidize private health insurance companies or reduce the deficit. The private Medicare plans are successful in bringing costs down and if the senior supposedly wants to choose private plans, then why should American taxpayers pay private companies more money than traditional Medicare?

We heard a lot of talk from the other side about the need to cut spending. This amendment is a fiscally responsible effort to bring down the deficit. I urge my colleagues' support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, it is amazing to me that this is the second time tonight that we have had people who are standing around wanting to change the Medicare Modernization Act, and it does not even go into effect until the 2006. We do not even know that all this money my colleague wants to save will ever be spent in the first place, and if it is spent, it is to bring the plans to rural Wisconsin so that his folks in rural Wisconsin can have the same benefits as people in Florida or Los Angeles. It was a major compromise of this bill. We ought to preserve that compromise because it is for rural America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GREGG. I suggest a voice vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin already suggested a voice vote. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 258.

The amendment (No. 258) was rejected.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, the next amendment is an amendment from the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 203

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am offering a sense-of-the-Senate amendment intended to head off the administration's plans to raid the Crime Victims Fund of more than $1.2 billion. I am joined by Senators KENNEDY, MIKULSKI, FEINGOLD, BIDEN, DURBIN, OBAMA, and DODD on this amendment.

We created this fund under the Victims Crime Act of 1984 to be used for the victims of crime. We made a solemn promise these funds would be there. The budget resolution rescinds all amounts remaining in the fund. It is wrong. We should not be saying your suffering—even though we promised with great fanfare, the President and everybody else promised that your suffering is going to be our concern. We should not say it is no longer that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I suspect under the rules adopted earlier this evening, with the way things are going to be accounted for in the Appropriations Committee, the point of this amendment will be moot.

I suggest a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. OBAMA, proposes an amendment numbered 203.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate in support of full funding and availability of the Crime Victims Fund)

At the end of title V, insert the following:

SEC. ____. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:—

(1) The Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (''VOCA'') was enacted to provide Federal financial support for services to victims of all types of crime, primarily through grants to state crime victim compensation and victim assistance programs.

(2) VOCA created the Crime Victims Fund (''the Fund'') as a separate account into which are deposited monies collected from persons convicted of Federal criminal offenses, including criminal fines, forfeitures and special assessments. There are no general taxpayer generated revenues deposited into the Fund.

(3) Each fiscal year, the Fund is used to support—

(A) Children's Justice Act grants to States to improve the investigation and prosecution of child abuse cases;

(B) victim witness coordinators in United States Attorney's Offices;

(C) victim assistance specialists in Federal Bureau of Investigation field offices;

(D) discretionary grants by the Office for Victims of Crime to provide training and technical assistance and services to victims of Federal crimes;

(E) formula grants to States to supplement State crime victim compensation programs, which reimburse more than 150,000 violent crime victims annually for out-of-pocket expenses, including medical expenses, mental health counseling, lost wages, loss of support and funeral costs;

(F) formula grants to States for financial assistance to upwards of 4,400 programs providing direct victim assistance services to nearly 4,000,000 victims of all types of crimes annually, with priority for programs serving victims of domestic violence, sexual assault and child abuse, and previously underserved victims of violent crime; and

(G) the Antiterrorism Emergency Reserve, to assist victims of domestic and international terrorism.

(4) Just 4 months ago, a strong bipartisan, bicameral majority in Congress affirmed its support for the Crime Victims Fund and increased its commitment to crime victims in the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–405), which establishes Federal crime victims rights and authorized 2 new VOCA-funded victim programs.

(5) Before fiscal year 2000, all amounts deposited into the Crime Victims Fund in each fiscal year were made available for authorized programs in the subsequent fiscal year.

(6) Beginning in fiscal year 2000, Congress responded to large fluctuations of deposits into the Fund by delaying obligations from the Fund above certain amount, as follows:

(A) For fiscal year 2000, $500,000,000.

(B) For fiscal year 2001, $537,500,000.

(C) For fiscal year 2002, $550,000,000.

(D) For fiscal year 2003, $600,000,000.

(E) For fiscal year 2004, $625,000,000.

(F) For fiscal year 2005, $625,000,000.

(7) In the conference report on an omnibus spending bill for fiscal year 2000 (Public Law

106–113), Congress explained that the reason for delaying annual Fund obligations was ''to protect against wide fluctuations in receipts into the Fund, and to ensure that a stable level of funding will remain available for these programs in future years''.

(8) VOCA mandates that ''. . . all sums deposited in the Fund in any fiscal year that are not made available for obligation by Congress in the subsequent fiscal year shall remain in the Fund for obligation in future fiscal years, without fiscal year limitation''.

(9) For fiscal year 2006, the President is recommending ''rescission'' of $1,267,000,000 from amounts in the Fund.

(10) The rescission proposed by the President would result in no funds being available to support crime victim services at the start of fiscal year 2007. Further, such rescission would make the Fund vulnerable to fluctuations in receipts into the Fund, and would not ensure that a stable level of funding will remain available for vital programs in future years.

(11) Retention of all amounts deposited into the Fund for the immediate and future use of crime victim services as authorized by VOCA is supported by many major national victim service organizations, including—

(A) Justice Solutions, NPO;

(B) National Organization for Victim Assistance;

(C) National Alliance to End Sexual Violence;

(D) National Children's Alliance;

(E) National Association of VOCA Assistance Administrators;

(F) National Association of Crime Victim Compensation Boards;

(G) Mothers Against Drunk Driving;

(H) National Center for Victims of Crime;

(I) National Organization for Parents of Murdered Children;

(J) National Coalition Against Domestic Violence;

(K) Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape; and

(L) National Network to End Domestic Violence.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the funding levels in this resolution assume that all amounts that have been and will be deposited into the Crime Victims Fund, including amounts deposited in fiscal year 2006 and thereafter, shall remain in the Fund for use as authorized under the Victims of Crime Act of 1984.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 203.

The amendment (No. 203) was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CONRAD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, the next amendment will be offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

AMENDMENT NO. 169

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, this is one of the most important things we can do to meet the pandemic afflicting Africa right now. The President came up with a great number for bilateral aid. We are still a little short on the global fund. This is to add half a billion dollars to the global fund to make sure we can meet our commitment to provide drugs and services to this pandemic.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am happy to join the Senator from Pennsylvania in a bipartisan effort to attack the deadliest epidemic in modern times. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM], for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. DODD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. STABENOW proposes an amendment numbered 169.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: Reaffirming that the United States maintain a one-to-two ratio for contributions to the Global Fund, that the United States not exceed contributing more than 33 percent of the Global Fund's revenue, and that the United States contribute an additional $500,000,000 to the Global Fund for Fiscal Year 2006, for a total of not less than $3,700,000,000 for all international HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria programs)

On page 9, line 15, increase the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 9, line 16, increase the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 26, line 14, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. UNITED STATES RESPONSE TO GLOBAL HIV/AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS, AND MALARIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The HIV/AIDS pandemic has reached staggering proportions. At the end of 2004, an estimated 40,000,000 people were infected with HIV or living with AIDS. HIV/AIDS is estimated to kill 3,000,000 men, women and children each year. Each year, there are estimated to be 5,000,000 new HIV infections.

(2) The United States was the first, and remains the largest, contributor to the Global Fund.

(3) The Presidential Administration of George W. Bush (referred to in this section as the ''Administration'') has supported language in the Global HIV/AIDS authorization bill that links United States contributions to the Global Fund to the contributions of other donors, permitting the United States to provide 33 percent of all donations, which would match contributions on a one-to-two basis.

(4) Congress has provided one-third of all donations to the Global Fund every year of the Fund's existence.

(5) For fiscal year 2006, the Global Fund estimates it will renew $2,400,000,000 worth of effective programs that are already operating on the ground, and the Administration and Fund Board have said that renewals of existing grants should receive priority funding.

(6) The Global Fund is an important component of United States efforts to combat AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria, and supports approximately 300 projects in 130 countries.

(7) For fiscal year 2006, the President has requested $300,000,000 for the United States contribution to the Global Fund.

(8) Through a mid-year review process, Congress and the Administration will assess contributions to date and anticipated contributions to the Global Fund, and ensure that United States contributions, at year-end, are at the appropriate one-to-two ratio.

(9) Congress and the Administration will monitor contributions to the Global Fund to ensure that United States contributions do not exceed one-third of the Global Fund's revenues.

(10) In order to cover one-third of renewals during fiscal year 2006, and to maintain the one-to-two funding match, the United States will need to contribute an additional $500,000,000 above the President's request for the Global Fund for fiscal year 2006 to keep good programs funded at a level of $800,000,000.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying this budget resolution assume that none of the offsets needed to provide $800,000,000 for the Global Fund will come from international humanitarian assistance programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 169.

The amendment (No. 169) was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SANTORUM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. CONRAD. What is the next amendment in the queue?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only amendment that has been proposed but not disposed of is the Allen amendment.

Mr. GREGG. Is this the Allen amendment relative to NASA?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is correct.

Mr. GREGG. That amendment was agreed to by unanimous consent, as modified, in a tranche of amendments we did earlier this evening. We will get this clarified, Mr. President.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask that we recognize Senator LINCOLN for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 192

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I would imagine that everyone in this body has heard equally as much from their local sheriffs as I have about the problem of methamphetamines across this country, particularly in rural America.

What this amendment does is it takes and restores the funding from the COPS initiative to methamphetamine enforcement and cleanup. We have seen tremendous increases across this great Nation in this destructive drug and what it is doing to rural America.

I compliment some of my colleagues on the other side—Senator COLEMAN and Senator TALENT—who have done a lot of work on this issue. We have good cosponsors on this side.

We pay for this initiative by some of the tax loopholes that did not seem to get closed in the FSC/ETI package. We are glad to work with our colleagues in any way possible to get this funding out to our States, out to our local law enforcement officers. They are having a devastating time trying to address this issue, and I hope my colleagues will take a look at the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. I yield myself a minute off the managers' time. I was under the impression that the Senator's amendment took the funds from 920. Are you saying the Senator's amendment pays for this with an increase in taxes?

Mrs. LINCOLN. We will be more than willing to work with the other side on how we pay for it. It does need to be paid for.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I reserve my time.

Mrs. LINCOLN. We can modify the amendment if the Senator would like.

Mr. GREGG. Why don't we reserve action on the Senator's amendment until we have a couple seconds to talk about it?

Mr. President, I would like to clarify that the Allen amendment has been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment that I have just offered and that the funds necessary to implement this amendment be taken from the 920——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas call up her amendment?

The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN] proposes an amendment numbered 192.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To restore funding to the COPS Methamphetamine Enforcement and Clean Up Program to 2005 levels and to close corporate tax loopholes)

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $21,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $27,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $21,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $27,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $21,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $27,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 23, line 17, increase the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 23, line 20, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 23, line 21, increase the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 23, line 25, increase the amount by $21,000,000.

On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 24, line 4, increase the amount by $27,000,000.

On page 24, line 7, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 24, line 8, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 30, line 16, decrease the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 30, line 17, decrease the amount by $97,000,000.

On page 48, line 6, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 48, line 7, increase the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 48, line 9, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 48, line 12, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. OFFSET FOR INCREASES IN FUNDING FOR THE COPS METHAMPHETAMINE ENFORCEMENT AND CLEAN UP PROGRAM.

It is the sense of the Senate that this resolution assumes that any increases in funding for the COPS Methamphetamine Enforcement Clean Up Program should be offset by increased revenues to be derived from closing corporate tax loopholes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Arkansas, is the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. COLEMAN, listed as a cosponsor?

Mrs. LINCOLN. Senator COLEMAN did ask to be listed as a cosponsor. I ask unanimous consent that both Senator TALENT and Senator COLEMAN be added as cosponsors to my amendment.

Mr. TALENT. Yes, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 192), as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To restore funding to the COPS Methamphetamine Enforcement and Clean Up Program to 2005 levels and to close corporate tax loopholes)

On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 23, line 17, increase the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 23, line 20, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 23, line 21, increase the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 23, line 25, increase the amount by $21,000,000.

On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 24, line 4, increase the amount by $27,000,000.

On page 24, line 7, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 24, line 8, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 26, line 14, decrease the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, decrease the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 26, line 17, decrease the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 26, line 18, decrease the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 26, line 20, decrease the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 26, line 21, decrease the amount by $21,000,000.

On page 26, line 23, decrease the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 26, line 24, decrease the amount by $27,000,000.

On page 27, line 1, decrease the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 27, line 2, decrease the amount by $32,000,000.

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. OFFSET FOR INCREASES IN FUNDING FOR THE COPS METHAMPHETAMINE ENFORCEMENT AND CLEAN UP PROGRAM.

It is the sense of the Senate that this resolution assumes that any increases in funding for the COPS Methamphetamine Enforcement Clean Up Program should be offset by increased revenues to be derived from closing corporate tax loopholes.

Mr. GREGG. I suggest we have a voice vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 192, as modified.

The amendment (No. 192), as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 197 WITHDRAWN

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, in the two matters that were listed, so we have this all straight, my amendment No. 197, which has not been acted on—we passed my amendment 198, which was a sense of the Senate insofar as aeronautics funding which has been adopted—I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 197 be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 253

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask that we consider the Baucus amendment that is pending. Senator BAUCUS

can give us 30 seconds on his amendment and then perhaps we could get it accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. TALENT, proposes an amendment numbered 253.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To support full funding for HIDTAs)

On page 65, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. ____. SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING FUNDING FOR HIDTAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) program encompasses 28 strategic regions, 355 task forces, 53 intelligence centers, 4,428 Federal personnel, and 8,459 State and local personnel.

(2) The purposes of the HIDTA program are to reduce drug trafficking and drug production in designated areas in the United States by—

(A) facilitating cooperation among Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies to share information and implement coordinated enforcement activities;

(B) enhancing intelligence sharing among Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies;

(C) providing reliable intelligence to law enforcement agencies needed to design effective enforcement strategies and operations; and

(D) supporting coordinated law enforcement strategies which maximize use of available resources to reduce the supply of drugs in HIDTA designated areas.

(3) In 2004, HIDTA efforts resulted in disrupting or dismantling over 509 international, 711 multi-State, and 1,110 local drug trafficking organizations.

(4) In 2004, HIDTA instructors trained 21,893 students in cutting-edge practices to limit drug trafficking and manufacturing within their areas.

(5) The HIDTAs are the only drug enforcement coalitions that include equal partnership between Federal, State, and local law enforcement leaders executing a regional approach to achieving regional goals while pursuing a national mission.

(6) The proposed budget of $100,000,000 for the HIDTA program is inadequate to effectively maintain all of the operations currently being supported.

(7) The proposed budget of $100,000,000 for the HIDTA program would undermine the viability of this program and the efforts of law enforcement around the country to combat illegal drugs, particularly methamphetamine.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the spending level of budget function 750 (Administration of Justice) is assumed to include $227,000,000 for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas; and

(2) unless new legislation is enacted, it is assumed that the HIDTA program will remain with the Office of National Drug Control Policy, where Congress last authorized it to reside.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, this is very simple. It is to restore a cut in the HIDTA funding. HIDTA is called the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Administration. This is the major law enforcement mechanism. It covers lots of different law enforcement agencies, in the west, particularly rural areas, to fight methamphetamine. We need the resources to fight methamphetamine. Methamphetamine is probably the largest scourge in many rural parts of America. This is designed to enable us to have the resources to fight methamphetamine in our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I suggest a voice vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, on our side, we want to signal strong support for this amendment, and we can voice vote the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 253.

The amendment (No. 253) was agreed to.

Mr. TALENT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 202

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask that we recognize Senator DAYTON for the purpose of offering an amendment and that Senator DAYTON have 1 minute to describe his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 202 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I recognize that there is a lot going on right now and I apologize for a touch of confusion, but if Senator DAYTON has been yielded 1 minute as a result of a unanimous consent, we ask unanimous consent for 1 minute on our side in opposition.

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

The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAYTON], for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Ms. MIKULSKI, proposes an amendment numbered 202.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide full funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA, part B grants over five years. This amendment is fully offset by restoring the uppermost marginal income tax rate for millionaires only, and by closing corporate tax loopholes. The amendment will also provide for $2.5 billion in deficit reduction over the five-year period)

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $12,100,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $13,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $13,600,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $17,100,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $17,966,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $12,100,000,000.

On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $13,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $13,600,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $17,100,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $17,966,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $12,977,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $13,556,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $14,236,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $14,922,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, increase the amount by $15,600,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $260,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $8,836,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $13,125,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $14,021,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $14,703,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $11,840,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by $4,164,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by $475,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by $3,079,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by $3,263,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by $11,840,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $16,004,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $16,479,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $19,558,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $22,821,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $11,840,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by $16,004,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $16,479,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $19,558,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by $22,821,000,000.

On page 17, line 16, increase the amount by $12,977,000,000.

On page 17, line 17, increase the amount by $260,000,000.

On page 17, line 20, increase the amount by $13,556;000,000.

On page 17, line 21, increase the amount by $8,836,000,000.

On page 17, line 24, increase the amount by $14,236,000,000.

On page 17, line 25, increase the amount by $13,125,000,000.

On page 18, line 3, increase the amount by $14,922,000,000.

On page 18, line 4, increase the amount by $14,021,000,000.

On page 18, line 7, increase the amount by $15,600,000,000.

On page 18, line 8, increase the amount by $14,703,000,000

On page 30, line 16, decrease the amount by $12,100,000,000.

On page 30, line 17, decrease the amount by $73,766,000,000.

At the end of Section 309, insert the following:

SEC. 310. RESERVE FUND FOR THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall, in consultation with the Members of the Committee on the Budget and the Chairman and Ranking Member of the appropriate committee, increase the allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate by up to $12,977,000,000 in new budget authority and $260,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006, and $71,292,000,000 in new budget authority and $50,944,000,000 in outlays for the total of fiscal years 2006 through 2010, for a bill, amendment, or conference report that would provide increased funding for part B grants, other than section 619, under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), with the goal that funding for these grants, when taken together with amounts provided by the Committee on Appropriations, provides 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I thank my cosponsors, Senators DURBIN, MIKULSKI, LIEBERMAN, STABENOW, and AKAKA. My amendment would increase the Federal share of funding for special education to the level of 40 percent of the cost that was promised when IDEA was established almost 30 years ago. Despite the increases that President Bush has proposed and that this Congress has enacted in the last 4 years, that Federal share is still less than half of what was promised back then. My colleagues have before them as a part of the letter that I submitted what the difference is for their respective States. For Minnesota, it is about $250 million. That money would be badly needed and best used by our local school districts.

As a result of the shortfall in Minnesota, and I suspect other States, funds that are supposed to go to regular education get shifted over to cover the shortfall for special education, meaning the quality of education for all of our students goes down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DAYTON. I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, this amendment would add $74 billion in spending and would increase taxes by $74 billion. It comes in the context of the fact that it would actually exceed the authorized level of IDEA as just reauthorized. In addition, it ignores the fact that this President has made a stronger commitment to IDEA than any President in history, especially in comparison to the prior President. This President has increased IDEA funding by 74 percent in his first 4 years in office, and he has made a commitment in this budget to add another $500 million in IDEA. It is obviously a classic tax-and-spend amendment, and I certainly hope my colleagues would defeat it.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. GREGG. I would suggest that this be a 10-minute vote since we had a break in the voting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 202.

This will be a 10-minute vote.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 63, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 79 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Harkin	Murray
Bayh	Inouye	Obama
Biden	Jeffords	Pryor
Boxer	Johnson	Reed
Byrd	Kennedy	Reid
Cantwell	Kerry	Rockefeller
Chafee	Landrieu	Sarbanes
Clinton	Lautenberg	Schumer
Corzine	Leahy	Stabenow
Dayton	Levin	Wyden
Durbin	Lieberman	
Feingold	Lincoln	

NAYS—63

Alexander	DeWine	McCain
Allard	Dodd	McConnell
Allen	Dole	Murkowski
Bennett	Domenici	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Dorgan	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Ensign	Roberts
Brownback	Enzi	Salazar
Bunning	Frist	Santorum
Burns	Graham	Sessions
Burr	Grassley	Shelby
Carper	Gregg	Smith
Chambliss	Hagel	Snowe
Coburn	Hatch	Specter
Cochran	Hutchison	Stevens
Coleman	Inhofe	Sununu
Collins	Isakson	Talent
Conrad	Kohl	Thomas
Cornyn	Kyl	Thune
Craig	Lott	Vitter
Crapo	Lugar	Voinovich
DeMint	Martinez	Warner

The amendment (No. 202) was rejected.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, can I just say for the information of my colleagues—could I have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. The Senate will come to order.

Mr. CONRAD. Can I say for the information of my colleagues, we are getting close now. We are under 10 amendments to go. We are trying to work things out. We have a number of other amendments. I see the chairman is back now. I think there are three more amendments that we could take on a unanimous consent basis, is that not correct?

Mr. GREGG. We can in probably just a few minutes, yes.

Mr. CONRAD. So, for the information of our colleagues, if they will continue to work with us we can reach conclusion at a reasonable time. We have made enormous progress in the last hour, I say to my colleagues. Again, we are at about 10 amendments left. We have a number that we can work out.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 155, 216, AS MODIFIED, 157, AS MODIFIED, 163, 167, AND 154, AS MODIFIED, EN BLOC

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I list the following amendments which have been agreed to. We will ask they be accepted en bloc by unanimous consent: the Gregg-Clinton-Kennedy flu reserve amendment, No. 155; the Snowe-Kerry SBA, as modified, No. 216; the Bayh sense of the Senate on a GAO study of debt, No. 157; the Santorum amendment No. 163, a sense of the Senate on charitable activity; the Chafee clean water, Baucus-Grassley SSA—Social Security Administration—No. 167; the Clinton comparative effectiveness sense of the Senate, No. 154.

I ask unanimous consent those amendments be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 155

(Purpose: To establish a deficit neutral reserve fund for influenza vaccine shortage prevention)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. DEFICIT NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INFLUENZA VACCINE SHORTAGE PREVENTION.

If the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that increases the participation of manufacturers in the production of influenza vaccine, increases research and innovation in new technologies for the development of influenza vaccine, and enhances the ability of the United States to track and respond to domestic influenza outbreaks as well as pandemic containment efforts, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall revise committee allocations for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations of new budget authority and outlays by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, regardless of whether the committee is within its 302(a) allocations, and such legislation shall be exempt from sections 302, 303, 311, and 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, and from section 505 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 (H. Con. Res. 95), if that measure would not increase the deficit for fiscal year 2006 and for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

AMENDMENT NO. 216, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To increase funding for the SBA's programs such as Microloans, Small Business Development Centers, Women's Business Centers, the HUBZone program and other small business programs and to offset the cost through a reduction in funds under function 150 for foreign microloans and other programs)

On page 9, line 15, decrease the amount by $78,000,000.

On page 9, line 16, decrease the amount by $60,000,000.

On page 9, line 20, decrease the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 9, line 24, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.

On page 10, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 14, line 15, increase the amount by $78,000,000.

On page 14, line 16, increase the amount by $60,000,000.

On page 14, line 20, increase the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 14, line 24, increase the amount by $28,000,000.

On page 15, line 3, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 157, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the amount of United States debt that is foreign-owned)

On page 65, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FOREIGN-OWNED DEBT.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller General should each conduct a study to examine the economic impact of United States publicly-held debt that is held by foreign governments, institutions, and individuals. The study should provide an analysis of the following:

(1) The amount of foreign-owned debt dating back to 1980, broken down by foreign governments, foreign institutions, and foreign private investors, and expressed in nominal terms and as a percentage of the total amount of publicly-held debt in each year.

(2) The economic impact that the increased foreign ownership of United States publicly-held debt has had on the ability of the United States to maintain a stable dollar policy.

(3) The impact that foreign ownership of United States publicly-held debt has had, or could have, on United States trade policy.

AMENDMENT NO. 163

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding tax relief to encourage charitable giving incentives)

At the end of title V, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TAX RELIEF TO ENCOURAGE CHARITABLE GIVING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the CARE Act, which represents a part of the President's faith-based initiative, will spur charitable giving and assist faith-based and community organizations that serve the needy;

(2) more than 1,600 small and large organizations from around the Nation have endorsed the CARE Act, and in the 108th Congress the CARE Act had bipartisan support and was sponsored by 23 Senators;

(3) although the CARE Act passed the Senate on April 9, 2003, by a vote of 95 to 5, and the House of Representatives passed companion legislation on September 17, 2003, by a vote of 408 to 13, a conference committee on the CARE Act was never formed and a final version was not passed in the 108th Congress; and

(4) charities around the Nation continue to struggle, and the passage of the incentives for charitable giving contained in the CARE Act would provide significant dollars in private and public sector assistance to those in need.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that a relevant portion of amounts in this budget resolution providing for tax relief should be used—

(1) to provide the 86,000,000 Americans who do not itemize deductions an opportunity to deduct charitable contributions;

(2) to provide incentives for individuals to give tax free contributions from individual retirement accounts for charitable purposes;

(3) to provide incentives for an estimated $2,000,000,000 in food donations from farmers, restaurants, and corporations to help the needy, an equivalent of 878,000,000 meals for hungry Americans over 10 years;

(4) to provide at least 300,000 low-income, working Americans the opportunity to build assets through individual development accounts or IDAs, which can be used to purchase a home, expand educational opportunity, or to start a small business; and

(5) to provide incentives for corporate charitable contributions.

AMENDMENT NO. 167

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the full amount of the President's request for the administrative costs of the Social Security Administration for fiscal year 2006 should be funded)

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FUNDING OF ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS OF SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should approve the full amount of the President's request for the administrative costs of the Social Security Administration for fiscal year 2006, including funds for the implementation of the low-income prescription drug subsidy under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (as added by the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003).

AMENDMENT NO. 154, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate concerning comparative effectiveness studies)

At the appropriate place in title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS STUDIES.

It is the Sense of the Senate that—

(1) the overall discretionary levels set in this resolution assume $75,000,000 in new budget authority in fiscal year 2006 and new outlays that flow from this budget authority in fiscal year 2006 and subsequent years, to fund research and ongoing systematic reviews, consistent with efforts currently undertaken by the Agency for Health Care Research and Quality designed to improve scientific evidence related to the comparative effectiveness and safety of prescription drugs and other treatments and to disseminate the findings from such research to health care practitioners, consumers, and health care purchasers; and

(2) knowledge gaps identified through such efforts be addressed in accordance with the authorizing legislation and with oversight from the committees of subject matter jurisdiction.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, will the chairman, the manager of the bill, yield for a question?

Mr. GREGG. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. I understand in the list you just read was a sense of the Senate by Senator CHAFEE on clean water, is that correct?

Mr. GREGG. That is correct.

Mr. SARBANES. I inform the managers that I have an amendment involving clean water, but I will not offer it.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Senator. That is very helpful.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant Journal clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 217, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment by Senator KOHL dealing with juvenile accountability block grants, No. 217, be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 217) as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To restore $1 billion to juvenile justice and local law enforcement programs funded by the Department of Justice, including the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Program, the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Program, the COPS Program, and the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) Program)

On page 23 line 16, increase the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 23 line 17, increase the amount by $60,000,000.

On page 23 line 21, increase the amount by $140,000,000.

On page 23 line 25, increase the amount by $125,000,000.

On page 24 line 4, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 24 line 8, increase the amount by $75,000,000.

On page 26 line 14, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 26 line 15, decrease the amount by $60,000,000.

On page 26 line 18, decrease the amount by $140,000,000.

On page 26 line 21, decrease the amount by $125,000,000.

On page 26 line 24, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 27 line 2, decrease the amount by $75,000,000.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant Journal clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 155, AS MODIFIED, AND 157, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask that the previously agreed-to Bayh and Gregg amendments be modified with the modifications which are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 154, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GREGG. I ask that it also apply to the Clinton amendment No. 154.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask that we now turn our attention to the Pryor LIHEAP amendment and that we recognize Senator PRYOR for 30 seconds to present that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 213

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 213.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant Journal clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] proposes an amendment numbered 213.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program and reduce the national debt by closing corporate tax loopholes)

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $1,200,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $1,200,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $1,200,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $1,200,000,000.

On page 20, line 16, increase the amount by $1,200,000,000.

On page 20, line 17, increase the amount by $1,200,000,000.

On page 30, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,200,000,000.

On page 30, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,200,000,000.

On page 48, line 6, increase the amount by $1,200,000,000.

On page 48, line 7, increase the amount by $1,200,000,000.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to increase the funding for LIHEAP from $1.8 billion to $3 billion. This amendment is fully offset. LIHEAP has received level funding for more than 20 years, but energy prices have not remained level. They have not remained stable. In fact, they are at all-time highs. We all have stories such as this from our States. Recently, a mother of two from Arkansas turned on her electric oven in order to heat the house, burned the house down, and killed her two daughters. We all have similar stories such as that from around the Nation.

This is an amendment that will help the people who need it most in all of our States.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, this amendment actually increases spending on the program by $1.2 billion. It is a bit excessive, and, therefore, I will oppose this amendment and ask for a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 213) was rejected.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I want to say for the information of Senators that we are now very close. We have six or seven amendments left to do. We are working hard to try to clear some of them. Some of them no doubt will still require votes. We ask for our colleagues' patience. We have, I think, made enormous progress. You will remember when we started this, we were headed for being here until 3 o'clock in the morning. Very substantial progress has been made because of the cooperation of Members on both sides. If we can be patient a few more minutes, we can clear additional amendments and then be prepared to push to the end.

AMENDMENT NO. 254, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant Journal clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG], for Mr. SALAZAR, proposes an amendment numbered 254, as modified.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To restore funding for the payment in lieu of taxes program (PILT), in order to compensate rural counties for deceased tax revenues as a result of non-taxed federally owned county lands. The increase is offset using Function 150)

On page 9, line 15, decrease the amount by $150,000,000.

On page 9, line 16, decrease the amount by $150,000,000.

On page 24, line 16, increase the amount by $150,000,000.

On page 24, line 17, increase the amount by $150,000,000.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent the amendment be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment.

The amendment (No. 254), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. CONRAD. This is another good example of a Senator cooperating, I might add. We got one amendment worked out, he dropped another amendment. This is a very good way to proceed.

I ask the Chair if we could turn our attention to Senator PRYOR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 252, AS MODIFIED

Mr. PRYOR. I call amendment 252, as modified, to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], for himself and Mr. BAUCUS, proposes an amendment numbered 252, as modified.

Mr. PRYOR. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To create a reserve fund for extension of the treatment of combat pay as earned income for purposes of the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit)

At the end of title III, insert:

SEC. _____. RESERVE FUND FOR EXTENSION OF TREATMENT OF COMBAT PAY FOR EARNED INCOME AND CHILD TAX CREDITS.

If the Committee on Finance reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that makes permanent the taxpayer election to treat combat pay otherwise excluded from gross income under section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code as earned income for purposes of the earned income credit and makes permanent the treatment of such combat pay as earned income for purposes of the child tax credit, provided that the Committee is within its allocation as provided under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of budget authority and outlays, the revenue aggregates, and other appropriate measures, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal year 2006 or the total of fiscal years 2006 though 2010.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas wants to proceed.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, amendment 252, as modified, creates a reserve fund for the extension of the treatment of combat pay as earned income for purposes of the earned-income tax credit and the child tax credit. This actually is something the Senate signed off on last year, but it was knocked out in conference. I certainly would appreciate positive consideration for this amendment.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment.

The amendment, (No. 252), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. As the Senator from North Dakota has mentioned, we are moving rather close to completion. There are a couple of amendments still pending on which votes may be required. Hopefully, we can proceed promptly to those and wrap this up also promptly.

AMENDMENT NO. 238, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I suggest the Senator from Michigan has an amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I send modified amendment numbered 288 to the desk for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], for himself, Mr. DEWINE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. BINGAMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 238, as modified.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To promote innovation and U.S. competitiveness by expressing the sense of the Senate urging the Senate Appropriations Committee to make efforts to fund the Advanced Technology Program, which supports industry-led research and development of cutting-edge technologies with broad commercial potential and societal benefits)

In the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.

(a) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Senate Committee on Appropriations should make every effort to provide funding for the Advanced Technology Program in fiscal year 2006.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this amendment is on behalf of Senator DEWINE, myself, Senator LIEBERMAN, and others. We have lost 2.8 million manufacturing jobs in this country in the last 4 years. We have a very modest program called the Advanced Technology Program, which, according to the Department of Commerce, in their publication, which I would be happy to share with those who can come to take a look at it, according to the Department of Commerce, this program has had a result eight times more in technologies developed than the amount of money we have put into the program. It is an eight-time return—multiple—in advanced technologies which is achieved when the Department of Commerce partners with industry.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, this amendment would suggest we continue a program which has certainly outlived its day. It is essentially walking around money for the technology industries, picking winners and losers in the area of commercial products that the Government has no role in doing. It is money that could be better spent on basic research—for example, at the NIH.

I strongly oppose this amendment and hope we will defeat it.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. This is now a sense of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment numbered 238. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 80 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Akaka	Bayh	Boxer
Allen	Biden	Byrd
Baucus	Bingaman	Cantwell
Carper	Johnson	Pryor
Clinton	Kennedy	Reed
Coleman	Kerry	Reid
Conrad	Kohl	Rockefeller
Corzine	Landrieu	Salazar
Dayton	Lautenberg	Sarbanes
DeWine	Leahy	Schumer
Dodd	Levin	Shelby
Dorgan	Lieberman	Snowe
Durbin	Lincoln	Specter
Feinstein	Mikulski	Stabenow
Harkin	Murray	Voinovich
Hutchison	Nelson (FL)	Warner
Inouye	Nelson (NE)	Wyden
Jeffords	Obama	

NAYS—46

Alexander	DeMint	Lugar
Allard	Dole	Martinez
Bennett	Domenici	McCain
Bond	Ensign	McConnell
Brownback	Enzi	Murkowski
Bunning	Feingold	Roberts
Burns	Frist	Sessions
Burr	Graham	Smith
Chafee	Grassley	Stevens
Chambliss	Gregg	Sununu
Coburn	Hagel	Talent
Cochran	Hatch	Thomas
Collins	Inhofe	Thune
Cornyn	Isakson	Vitter
Craig	Kyl	
Crapo	Lott	

NOT VOTING—1

Santorum

The amendment (No. 238), as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I think the RECORD should show that Senator SANTORUM, through no fault of his own, missed the last vote. And I regret that we cannot, through unanimous consent, correct that.

Mr. GREGG. I think that is a very appropriate statement by the Senator from North Dakota, which we all can agree with.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Vermont for an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 237, AS MODIFIED

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk regarding Boys and Girls Clubs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask to send a modification of the amendment to the desk. If they cannot find the amendment at the desk, I ask that it be in order to have the modification be the amendment to be considered. It is amendment No. 237.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant Journal clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] proposes an amendment numbered 237, as modified.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase funding for Boys and Girls Clubs)

On page 23 line 16, increase the amount by $25,000,000.

On page 23 line 17, increase the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 23 line 21, increase the amount by $8,000,000.

On page 23 line 25, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 24 line 4, increase the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 24 line 8, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 26, line 14, decrease the amount by $25,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 26, line 18, decrease the amount by $8,000,000.

On page 26, line 21, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 26, line 24, decrease the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 27, line 2, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this is an amendment to restore funding for the Boys & Girls Clubs of America to their current fiscal year level. From my days as a prosecutor, throughout my career in the Senate, I have seen the great value of Boys and Girls Clubs. This is not a Democratic or Republican issue.

We have a responsibility to make sure that our children are safe and secure. I know firsthand how well Boys and Girls Clubs work and what top-notch organizations they are. When I was a prosecutor in Vermont, I was convinced of the great need for Boys and Girls Clubs because we rarely encountered children from these kinds of programs. In fact, after I became a U.S. Senator, a police chief was such a big fan of the clubs that he asked me to help fund a Boys and Girls Club in his district rather than helping him add a couple more police officers.

In Vermont, Boys and Girls Clubs have succeeded in preventing crime and supporting our children. The first club was established in Burlington 63 years ago. Now we have 20 club sites operating throughout the State in Addison, Chittenden, Orange, Rutland, Washington, Windham and Windsor Counties. There are also four new Boys and Girls Clubs in the works in Winooski, Brattleboro, Barre and Vergennes. These clubs will serve well over 10,000 kids statewide.

As a senior member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I have pushed for more Federal funding for Boys and Girls Clubs. Since 1998, Congress has increased Federal support for Boys and Girls Clubs from $20 million to $85 million in this fiscal year. Due in large part to this increase in funding, there now exist 3,500 Boys and Girls Clubs in all 50 States serving more than 4 million young people.

Because of these successes, I was both surprised and disappointed to see that the President requested a reduction of $25 million for fiscal year 2006. That request will leave thousands of children and their Clubs behind. We cannot allow such a thing to happen.

Last year, Senator HATCH and I worked together to shepherd into law a reauthorization of Justice Department grants at $80 million for fiscal year 2006, $85 million for fiscal year 2007, $90 million for fiscal year 2008, $95 million for fiscal year 2009 and $100 million for fiscal year 2010 to Boys and Girls Clubs

to help establish 1,500 additional Boys and Girls Clubs across the Nation with the goal of having 5,000 Boys and Girls Clubs in operation by December 31, 2010.

If we had a Boys and Girls Club in every community, prosecutors in our country would have a lot less work to do in the courtroom. Each time I visit a club in Vermont, I am approached by parents, educators, teachers, grandparents and law enforcement officers who tell me ''Keep doing this! These clubs give our children the chance to grow up free of drugs, gangs and crime.''

You cannot argue that these are just Democratic or Republican ideas, or conservative or liberal ideas—they are simply good sense ideas. We need safe havens where our youth—the future of our country—can learn and grow up free from the influences of drugs, gangs and crime. That is why Boys and Girls Clubs are so important to our children.

Across the Nation, Boys and Girls Clubs are preventing crime and supporting our children. My amendment will restore funding for the Boys and Girls Clubs of America to the fiscal year 2005 level of $85 million. It provides a full offset at $50 million split evenly for the Boys and Girls Clubs and for deficit reduction by, for example, closing corporate tax loopholes. It also expresses the sense of the Senate on the value of Boys and Girls Clubs in their mission to inspire and enable all young people, especially those from disadvantaged circumstances, to realize their full potential as productive, responsible and caring citizens.

Congress has authorized and appropriated increased levels of funding for the Boys and Girls Clubs of America in each of the last 8 years because of the clubs' proven role in discouraging youth gangs, drug abuse and youth violence. The budget resolution, following the President's lead, reduces funding for Boys and Girls Clubs by $25 million—from $85 million to $60 million—and completely ignores the 5-year authorization for the Boys and Girls Club grant program enacted by Congress and signed by the President in October 2004. A drop to $60 million in the coming fiscal year will likely result in an across-the-board decrease of 30 percent to club pass-thru grants, as well as a 30 percent cut to the overall increase in youth served. In connection with my amendment I have offered to substitute other offsets.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to adopt the Leahy amendment to restore funding by $25 million for the 2006 fiscal year for the Boys and Girls Clubs of America. Our country's strength and ultimate success lies with our children. Our greatest responsibility is to help them inhabit this century the best way possible and we can help do that by supporting the Boys and Girls Clubs of America.

Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be adopted.

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

The amendment (No. 237), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 262

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of Senators GRASSLEY, BAUCUS, ENZI, and KENNEDY, an amendment and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG], for Mr. GRASSLEY, proposes an amendment numbered 262.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate with respect to pension reform)

At the end of title V, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE WITH RESPECT TO PENSION REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The rules for calculating the funded status of pension plans and for determining calculations, premiums, and other issues should ensure strong funding of such plans in both good and bad economic times.

(2) The expiration of the interest rate provisions of the Pension Funding Equity Act of 2004 at the end of 2005 and the need to address the deficit at the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (referred to in this section as the ''PBGC'') demand enactment of pension legislation this year.

(3) Thirty-four million active and retired workers are relying on their defined benefit plans to provide retirement security, and a failure by Congress to reform the defined benefit system will place at risk the pensions of millions of Americans.

(4) Stabilization of the defined benefit pension system and the PBGC may require significant and structural changes in the Employee Retirement and Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, which must be undertaken in a single comprehensive set of reforms.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Senate conferees shall insist on the Senate position expressed in this resolution with respect to PBGC premiums.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 262) was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 161, AS MODIFIED

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, amendment No. 161 is at the desk, with modifications.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE], for himself and Mr. LEAHY, proposes an amendment numbered 161, as modified.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase funding for Child Survival and Maternal Health Programs)

On page 9, line 15, increase the amount by $76,000,000.

On page 9, line 16, increase the amount by $15,000,000.

On page 9, line 20, increase the amount by $34,000,000.

On page 9, line 24, increase the amount by $14,000,000.

On page 10, line 3, increase the amount by $7,000,000.

On page 10, line 7, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 26, line 14, decrease the amount by $76,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, decrease the amount by $15,000,000.

On page 26, line 18, decrease the amount by $34,000,000.

On page 26, line 21, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.

On page 26, line 24, decrease the amount by $7,000,000.

On page 27, line 2, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, today I join my friend and colleague, Senator LEAHY, in offering this amendment that would increase the funding level for the child survival and maternal health program to $400 million.

Basically, by voting for this amendment we will save many lives. It provides money for vaccinations, immunizations, and vitamins that will save lives around the world.

Mr. LEAHY. I join the Senator and urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we now have the DeWine amendment before us.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 161), as modified, was agreed to.

PARITY ASSUMPTION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I begin by complimenting my friend from New Hampshire and the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee on a job well done. As the new Chairman, he has skillfully navigated a difficult course to produce the budget resolution before us today. Congratulations.

I also want to tell him that even though this is his first year as the Budget Committee chairman, he has handled the job like a seasoned veteran.

I would like to raise the issue of mental health parity as the Senate debates the FY 2006 Senate Budget Resolution.

It is my understanding the resolution before us assumes the revenue impact of enacting a mental health parity law at a cost of $1.5 billion over 5 years. However, I want to make sure that this is indeed the case because the assumption I just mentioned is not specifically referenced in S. Con. Res. 18.

Rather, the overall revenue number is such that it assumes Congress will pass mental health parity legislation.

Mr. GREGG. I understand the concern of the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico regarding mental health parity legislation and I would concur with my colleague's assessment. S. Con. Res. 18 does assume the revenue impact of enacting mental health parity legislation.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the distinguished Chairman for his consideration and explanation of this important matter.

ENERGY SAVINGS PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the Budget Committee's attention a great program that saves the Federal Government both money and energy—it is called Energy Savings Performance Contracting or ESPC. Under this public-private initiative, the private sector upgrades our aging federal facilities and military bases with new energy efficient equipment, at no upfront cost to the government. The private sector is then paid back over time with the savings from the government's utility bills. The beauty of this program is that under the law, the energy savings must cover the project costs and also guarantee that there will be additional savings to the government, as codified per the Energy Policy Act of 1992:

H.R. 776

Energy Policy Act of 1992 (Enrolled as Agreed to or Passed by Both House and Senate)

SEC. 155. ENERGY SAVINGS PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 801 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The head'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The head''; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following:

''(2)(A) Contracts under this title shall be energy savings performance contracts and shall require an annual energy audit and specify the terms and conditions of any Government payments and performance guarantees. Any such performance guarantee shall provide that the contractor is responsible for maintenance and repair services for any energy related equipment, including computer software systems.

''(B) Aggregate annual payments by an agency to both utilities and energy savings performance contractors, under an energy savings performance contract, may not exceed the amount that the agency would have paid for utilities without an energy savings performance contract (as estimated through the procedures developed pursuant to this section) during contract years. The contract shall provide for a guarantee of savings to the agency, and shall establish payment schedules reflecting such guarantee, taking into account any capital costs under the contract.

''(C) Federal agencies may incur obligations pursuant to such contracts in finance energy conservation measures provided guaranteed savings exceed the debt service requirements.''

It's a win-win program for the government and taxpayers.

The problem is that under the current CBO budget scoring methodology, the entire contract cost is scored up front and there is no accounting for the guaranteed savings which are required by law. Since these guaranteed savings are not recognized, this program is scored as costing the government money when in reality this is not the case. The Office of Management and Budget views the program as budget neutral, and the program has strong support from the Administration.

This current scoring dilemma for the ESPC program has been problematic in the reauthorization of this valuable program. I respectfully ask that the Budget Committee work with the Congressional Budget Office to resolve this scoring problem for the ESPC program.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I want to thank the Senator from Oklahoma for raising this issue, and I will ask the Budget Committee staff to look into the scoring of the ESPC program with an eye towards accounting for the mandatory savings and thus resolving the matter.

IT/P4P RESERVE FUND

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I commend the chairman and ranking member of the Budget Committee for working with me, and with the chairman of the HELP Committee, as well as with the chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee to include within the budget resolution a reserve fund to provide incentives for adoption of modern information technology to improve quality in health care and for performance-based payments that are based on accepted clinical performance measures that improve the quality of health care.

The goal of this fund is to allow for legislation to create a program through which incentives would be provided in the initial years of the program to encourage health care providers to enhance their use of information technology and improve quality. The fund would achieve deficit neutrality through the savings that will accrue to public programs through better use of information technology and higher quality care. The reserve fund thus requires deficit neutrality over the 5 years of the budget resolution.

It was the intent of all those Members who worked on this proposal to require the program to achieve deficit neutrality over the 5 years of the budget resolution, but not to require deficit neutrality in the initial year of the program or, on a year-by-year basis, in subsequent years. I ask the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee whether what I have just described reflects their understanding of the intent of the program to be established in accordance with this reserve fund.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, the description of the intent of the reserve fund that my colleague from Massachusetts just provided also reflects my understanding and intent in supporting the inclusion of this fund. I believe the intent of the reserve fund would be satisfied by legislation reported by the HELP Committee or the Finance Committee that is not deficit neutral in the initial year or any other single year during fiscal years 2006 to 2010 but that otherwise complies with the conditions of the reserve fund. I do not intend to raise or support a budget point of order raised against such legislation on the basis that it is not deficit neutral in any particular year during fiscal years 2006–2010.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, the description of the intent of the reserve fund offered by my colleagues from Massachusetts and from New Hampshire also reflects my understanding of the intent of including this fund in the budget resolution. I commend the chairman and ranking member of the Budget Committee for their leadership in including this reserve fund in the Senate budget resolution. And I commend my colleagues from New Hampshire and Massachusetts and others for their willingness to work toward this signal of our bipartisan commitment to improving the quality and safety of health care in this country, and to addressing the problem of health care costs. These are critically important issues facing our nation today, and I look forward to continuing our bipartisan dialogue, making the best use of this important reserve fund, and working together on legislation to encourage the adoption of health information technology for quality improvement and to develop performance-based payment systems.

AMENDMENT NO. 204

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I voted in support of Senator SMITH's amendment to strike $14 billion in Medicaid cuts from the budget resolution and instead create a bipartisan Medicaid commission to study how to best reform the program.

Sound policy—not arbitrary budget cuts—should be the driving force for strengthening and improving the Medicaid program. A Medicaid commission could help foster a much-needed dialogue about how to take prudent steps to make this critical safety net stronger and sustainable in the long term.

More than 40 million Americans, including 300,000 West Virginians, rely on Medicaid. In West Virginia, the health care safety net—comprised of hospitals, nursing homes, home health agencies, physician offices, and community health centers—relies heavily on Federal Medicaid funding to care for the poor, disabled, and elderly.

If Medicaid funding is capped at an arbitrary funding level, states, such as West Virginia, will be left to shoulder the burden of increasing health care costs on their own. The health care needs of low-income people do not magically disappear just because there are fewer federal funds made available.

It is my hope that a bipartisan consensus of policies can be reached to best address the challenges confronting the Medicaid program. The passage of the Smith Amendment to establish a Medicaid commission is a constructive first step toward that goal.

AMENDMENT NO. 216

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, on January 20, 2005, President Bush said in his Inaugural speech, ''We will widen the ownership of homes and businesses. . . .'' Two weeks later he turned around and submitted a budget that cut funding for the only agency dedicated to cultivating small business ownership in this country, the Small Business Administration. How much did he cut? 20 percent. This is nothing new. The President's track record is even worse. Since President Bush took office in 2001, he has reduced small business resources available through the SBA by 36 percent, the most of any government agency. You may not think the SBA is important, but, last year alone, through the SBA, more than 88,000 small businesses in this country got loans and venture capital, totaling more than $21 billion. A lot more than that, 1.5 million, turned to the SBA and its partners last year for management counseling so that they could start a business, keep their doors open, or expand their business. Think of the SBA next time you get ice cream from Ben & Jerry's, see a mother with a ''boppy'' baby pillow, take a road trip and see a Winnebago, send a package Federal Express, type on an Apple computer, or swing a Callaway golf club. All these companies were helped by the SBA. Where would these companies have been when they were shut out from financing if the SBA had not existed? Imagine the void in our economy without the taxes they generate and all the people without jobs if those companies didn't exist. SBA more than pays for itself.

The SBA is a good return on the investment for our country. As my colleague from Maine, Senator SNOWE, pointed out at our recent hearing on the SBA's fiscal year 2006 budget, the SBA's budget represents less than 3/100ths of a percent of all Federal spending. And a lot of that funding for the SBA supports emergency loans that help families and businesses when disaster strikes. We are all for fiscal responsibility, but cutting this resource that is so important to our economy is not responsible. Instead of weakening this resource, we should be maximizing it to leverage more businesses and creating more jobs.

Evidently my colleagues agree because tonight they agreed unanimously to adopt a bi-partisan amendment to restore $78 million to the SBA's budget for fiscal year 2006. Senator SNOWE and I both had our own amendments, but in the end we joined together so that we could get a win for small business. I thank the Chair for her cooperation and leadership.

My amendment would have restored $139 million to the SBA, including $42 million in fee relief for borrowers and lenders in the 7(a) Loan Guarantee program; $30 million for microloans and $20 million for microloan technical assistance; $5 million for PRIME; $24 million to restore funding New Markets Venture Capital that was unfairly and unwisely rescinded; $3.6 million for 7(j) contracting assistance to disadvantage small businesses; $2 million for Native American Outreach; $109 million for Small Business Development Centers; a combined $4 million for SBIR FAST and Rural Outreach; $7 million for SCORE; $5 million for the U.S. Export Assistance Centers; $2 million for Veterans Business Outreach; $16.5 million for Women's Business Centers; and $6.5 million for 65 procurement center representatives. That would have raised SBA's funding to $732 million, still far less than the $900 million provided to the SBA 5 years ago. It was a responsible and reasonable increase.

Nevertheless, to get things done, we must reach across the aisle and work together. So, as I said earlier, I joined my colleague of the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee, Chair SNOWE, to pass Senate amendment No. 216. It did not go as far as I would have liked, but it is still a big step in the right direction. As part of the compromise, Senator SNOWE agreed to include $5 million for the PRIME micro business program. The Snowe-Kerry compromise includes: $15 million for Microloan Technical Assistance, which the President recommended terminating; $1.91 million to fund $20 million in microloans, which the President recommended terminating; $5 million for the Program for Investment in Microentrepreneurs, PRIME, which the President recommended terminating, $3 million for the Small Business Innovation Research, SBIR, FAST Program, which the President recommended terminating; $1 million for the SBIR Rural Outreach Program, which the President recommended terminating; $21 million for Small Business Development Centers, increasing funding to $109 million overall; $10 million to fund procurement center representatives, PCRs, in order to hire 100 new representatives; $7.7 million for the HUBZone program, increasing funding to $10 million; $4.5 million for the Women's Business Centers Program, increasing funding to $16.5 million; $3.5 million for U.S. Export Assistance Centers, increasing funding to $5 million; $2 million for the SCORE program, increasing funding to $7 million; $750,000 for Veterans Outreach, increasing funding to $1.5 million; and $500,000 for the 7(j) contracting assistance program, increasing funding to $2.5 million.

These amounts are important to include in the RECORD so that the public knows our intentions. I thank my colleagues, Senators SNOWE, CONRAD, and GREGG, for their help and also their staffs. In advance, I ask my colleagues on the appropriations committee to match our requests.

AMENDMENT NO. 169

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, the HIV/AIDS pandemic has reached staggering proportions. At the end of 2004, an estimated 40 million people were living with HIV/AIDS. Each year, 5 million more people become infected.

The United States has demonstrated important leadership fighting the AIDS epidemic. And this leadership is yielding results. At the end of 2004, an estimated 700,000 people in the developing world were receiving antiretroviral therapy. Many of these individuals were receiving treatment thanks to U.S.-supported bilateral and multilateral programs.

The President's budget request for fiscal year 2006 includes $2.9 billion for bilateral programs for AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. This amendment would maintain full funding for this component of the President's request.

The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria is an important component of U.S. efforts, and supports approximately 300 projects in 130 countries. The United States was the first and remains the largest contributor to the Global Fund.

To balance the U.S. share and encourage contributions from other donors, the administration supported language in the U.S. Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 that links U.S. contributions to the Fund to the contributions of other donors.

Together with Senator DURBIN, I believe Congress should fulfill the commitment implied in the act by matching, on a one-to-two basis, the contributions of other donors. Through a mid-year review process, Congress and the administration should assess anticipated contributions to the Global Fund and ensure that U.S. contributions, at year-end, are at the appropriate one-to-two ratio, and that the U.S. does not exceed 33 percent of total contributions to the fund.

For fiscal year 2005, the Global Fund estimates it will renew $2.4 billion worth of effective programs that are already operating on the ground. The administration and the Global Fund Board have said that renewing existing grants should receive funding priority.

In order to cover one-third of renewals during fiscal year 2006, and to maintain the one-to-two funding match, the U.S. will need to contribute an additional $500 million above the President's request to keep well-functioning programs funded at a level of $800 million.

Senator DURBIN and I consider this number to be the necessary level of funding. Failing to renew grants could cut off life-saving treatments in proven programs.

Senator DURBIN and I firmly believe that funding the global fight against AIDS is a top priority. If adopted by the Senate, this amendment will ensure a level of $3.7 billion for international AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria assistance, including $800 million for the Global Fund.

AMENDMENT NO. 238

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for the second year in a row, the President proposes to completely eliminate the Advanced Technology Program, ATP. Last year, Congress wisely chose to

fund the ATP program at $142.3 million. The bottom line is that the ATP promotes the development of new, innovative products that are made and developed in the United States, helping American companies compete against their foreign competitors and contribute to the growth of the U.S. economy.

I hope Congress will continue to fund this important program in fiscal year 2006. Doing so will help strengthen the technological and economic leadership of America's high technology manufacturing companies that is necessary for them to remain competitive in today's global marketplace. It will also help ensure that the most cutting-edge companies can continue to innovate, expand and create jobs.

My amendment expresses the sense of the Senate calling on the Senate Committee on Appropriations to make every effort to restore funding for the Advanced Technology Program in fiscal year 2006.

Continued ATP funding would encourage public-private cooperation and investment in economically important technology R&D. Through a cost-shared program, the ATP provides grants to support research and development of high-tech, cutting-edge technologies with commercial potential and societal benefits. The ATP focuses on improving the competitiveness of American companies and funds many research and development projects that have the potential to create broad-based U.S. economic benefits and that otherwise may not get developed or that would be developed too slowly to take advantage of market opportunities.

According to one study, the manufacturing sector, more than any other, helps to generate increased economic activity in other industries with every dollar of goods produced generating an additional $1.43 in economic activity in other industries or sectors.

According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, returns for the American people on the ATP, as measured from 41 of the 736 projects—just 6 percent of the portfolio—have exceeded $17 billion in economic benefits, more than eight times the amount invested in ATP.

Manufacturers' investment in innovation account for almost two-thirds of all private-sector research and development. This investment in turn leads to advances in other manufacturing sectors and spillover into nonmanufacturing activities in the United States.

ATP involvement accelerates the development and commercialization of new technologies. Time to market was reduced by 1 year in 10 percent of projects, by 2 years in 22 percent of projects, and by 3 years in 26 percent of projects.

The ATP program supports small business. Over 65 percent of ATP projects have been led by small businesses. This is exceptional given that small businesses lead in the creation of job growth and new technology advancement in our country.

ATP has received applications from 50 States and made awards to high technology businesses in 40 States plus the District of Columbia.

The Biotechnology Industry Organization, BIO, the Industrial Research Institute, the Alliance for Science and Technology Research in America, and the American Chemical Society have expressed support for ATP.

Unfortunately, current funding levels do not meet the demand for ATP. Over 1,000 proposals submitted in 2002 alone yielded enough high quality projects to absorb the total funding available in both fiscal year 2002 and fiscal year 2003. Fiscal year 2004 saw the second highest number of applications for funding in ATP history, 870, but funding was available for only 59 awards.

The ATP is one of the few Federal programs available to help American manufacturers remain competitive in the global economy. This high octane economic development engine should be supported by Democrats and Republicans alike. If we want NIST to continue making these important job-creating ATP awards, we have to fund it.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, nationally we have lost nearly 2.8 million manufacturing jobs since January 2001. In the face of these losses and strong global economic competition, we should be doing all we can to promote programs that help create jobs and strengthen the technological innovation of American companies. Supporting the ATP program is one way to do this.

AMENDMENT NO. 253

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak to an amendment with my good friend and colleague, Senator GRASSLEY, expressing the sense of the Senate on the High Intensity Drug Trafficking area, or HIDTA, program. My amendment assumes that the HIDTA program will be fully funded at $227 million in fiscal year 2006 and that the HIDTA program will remain with the Office National Drug Control Policy, ONDCP, where it was last authorized by Congress to be. Additional cosponsors are Senators LEAHY, BINGAMAN, MURRAY, and TALENT. I would also like to add Senators GORDON SMITH and DEWINE as cosponsors to this amendment. I thank my colleagues for their strong support.

I am proud to offer this much-needed amendment. The proposed budget would cut the HIDTA program by 56 percent, assuming only $100 million for HIDTA. The President's Budget also proposes to shift the program from ONDCP to the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force program within the Department of Justice. Both of these proposals could derail the highly successful HIDTA program.

As many of my colleagues know, methamphetamine is a powerful and highly addictive central nervous system stimulant that is associated with violence and crime. It can cause paranoia, aggression, and mood swings. The byproducts of making meth are highly toxic and flammable and require costly clean ups. They also endanger many children who are exposed when their parents cook meth within the home. Since its inception in 1990, HIDTA has become one of the most effective and comprehensive programs we have to fight meth.

Specifically, a HIDTA designation provides states like Montana with increased resources, information and intelligence to fight methamphetamine use and production. The Federal funding and increased cooperation among Federal, State and local law enforcement frees up state resources that allow, for example, the Montana Department of Justice to better support Montana's rural communities. It provides law enforcement officials with new technology to coordinate their efforts at the local, State, and Federal level.

Montana fought hard and successfully to join the Rocky Mountain HIDTA in 2002. Since that time, Montana has successfully cut the number of meth labs it busts in half. I have been told by law enforcement across my State that the proposed cuts to HIDTA, combined with cuts proposed by the President to other Justice assistance programs like the Byrne and COPS programs, would be a disaster for Montana. It would effectively end drug enforcement in rural Montana and would set the clock back years in our efforts to fight the rapid spread of meth in our state.

Yesterday, I was proud to cosponsor and support Senator STABENOW's amendment to restore funding for our first responder programs, Byrne and COPS. Sadly, that amendment failed. I also proudly supported Senator BIDEN's amendment to fully fund the COPS program. That amendment unfortunately also failed. We must do everything we can to make sure these programs survive and so far Congress is not holding up their end of the bargain.

Although my amendment specifically focuses on the HIDTA program, let me list again what the Montana Board of Crime Control has told me would happen to Montana if the President's fiscal year 2006 budget is enacted:

1. Montana will lose its multi-jurisdiction drug enforcement capacity, including seven multijurisdictional drug task forces. This means that already stretched local law enforcement agencies will have to do what they can to address drug enforcement at the local level, without broader support from the drug task forces.

2. Montana will lose 33 drug enforcement offices throughout the State.

3. Montana will experience a significant increase in drug availability, manufacturing and trafficking and drug-related crime.

4. Montana would experience an increase in clandestine labs that manufacture methamphetamine.

5. Montana would experience a reduction in the amounts of illegal drugs and guns removed from our communities.

6. Montana would experience the elimination of funds for rural law enforcement agencies' manpower, equipment and training.

Again, the above scenario is only the tip of the iceberg. The manufacturing, trafficking, drug addiction and crime will have a ripple effect throughout the State in our public health and correction systems and the courts, negatively affecting public safety and the quality of life in Montana and across the United States.

As the findings in the Baucus-Grassley amendment explain, the HIDTA program encompasses 28 strategic regions, 355 task forces, 53 intelligence centers, 4,428 Federal personnel, and 8,459 State and local personnel. In 2004, HIDTA efforts resulted in disrupting or dismantling over 509 international, 711 multi-State, and 1,110 local drug trafficking organizations. In 2004, HIDTA instructors trained 21,893 students in cutting-edge practices to limit drug trafficking and manufacturing within their areas.

The HIDTAs are successful drug enforcement coalitions that include equal partnership among Federal, State, and local law enforcement leaders. This is what Congress created the HIDTA's to do—to provide coordination of drug enforcement efforts in critical regions of the country. That's why full funding for the HIDTA's is so important, and that's what the first part of the Baucus-Grassley sense of the Senate addresses—assuming that Congress will fully fund the HIDTA program at fiscal year 2005 levels.

The second part of the Baucus-Grassley Sense of the Senate on HIDTA would address the administration's decision to shift the HIDTA program from ONDCP to the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force, OCDETF, program within the Department of Justice. Moving the program from ONDCP to OCDETF is a mistake. The OCDETF program has a different mission and purpose than ONDCP and the HIDTA's. The HIDTA program has worked well at ONDCP and is a complement to the OCDETF mission. I do not understand why the Administration would want to shift it from its Congressionally authorized home within ONDCP.

Montana law enforcement tell me that moving the HIDTA program to OCDETF will do nothing to improve law enforcement capabilities and will undermine the unique partnerships and innovation that the HIDTA program has helped to create nationwide and that have been so successful in curbing the spread of meth in Montana. HIDTA's are about coordination and collaboration. OCDETF is more centrally managed, with an assumed Federal lead, and with a focus on investigation and prosecution—an important mission, but not the same as the HIDTA mission. Additionally, according to the National Narcotics Officers Association, the vast majority of OCDETF's cases originate within HIDTA funded operational task forces. The current organization works; why change it?

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment. I also hope that we can adopt one of the many amendments that would actually increase funding for all Justice assistance programs, like Byrne and COPS, but this amendment is an important step in the right direction.

AMENDMENT NO. 193

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it had been my intent to offer an amendment No. 193, to S. Con. Res. 18, the FY 06, Congressional Budget Resolution, to fully fund the Help America Vote Act, HAVA, P.L. 107–252, by increasing discretionary spending in FY 06 by $822 million. This issue is too important, however, to be relegated to 30 seconds, or less, of debate, and so under the circumstances, I will not offer this amendment to fully fund HAVA today.

However, I want to serve notice to my colleagues, that Congress must act soon to provide funds to the States to finance the mandatory election reform requirements we imposed on the States in HAVA. If not, we will have created an unjustified and unfunded mandate on State and local governments and lost the opportunity to ensure that every eligible American voter has an equal opportunity to cast a vote and have that vote counted in the 2006 Federal elections.

The amendment was supported by a broad coalition of organizations representing the civil rights communities, voting rights groups, disabilities groups, and State and local governments, spearheaded by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and the National Association of Secretaries of State. I am grateful to LCCR and NASS for their consistent leadership in ensuring that Congress, and the President, fulfill our commitment to fully fund the HAVA reforms. I applaud the non-partisan work of the LCCR/NASS Coalition and look forward to continuing to work with them to see this commitment come to fruition.

No civil right is more fundamental to the vitality and endurance of a democracy of the people, by the people, and for the people, than the people's right to vote. In the words of Thomas Paine, ''The right of voting for representatives is the primary right by which other rights are protected.'' To ensure this right, Congress passed the bipartisan Help America Vote Act. At a time when we are spending millions of dollars to ensure the spread of democracy across the globe, we must also remember that building democracy and freedom for every American must begin at home. Ensuring that primary right to vote for all eligible American voters was the bipartisan goal of HAVA.

Nearly two and one-half years ago, the Senate overwhelmingly passed this bipartisan landmark legislation and on October 29, 2002, President Bush signed HAVA into law. At the White House signing ceremony, surrounded by a bipartisan group of Members, President Bush said in a brief speech, ''When problems arise in the administration of elections, we have a responsibility to fix them . . . Every registered voter deserves to have confidence that the system is fair and elections are honest, that every vote is recorded and that the rules are consistently applied. The legislation I sign today will add to the nation's confidence.''

I could not agree more with the President. However, for the second year in a row, while the President's budget assumes millions in funding for democratic elections in foreign countries, the President's budget assumes no funding for elections at home. Our shared bipartisan vision for HAVA as the vehicle to restore the nation's confidence in the results of our elections cannot be realized without the promised funding to the States.

In the aftermath of historic elections in Iraq, it is critical that America take stock of our own decentralized elections systems. There is much we can learn from the Iraqi experiment in democracy that can strengthen the equal opportunity for participation of all Americans in our democracy. In light of the continuing barriers that Americans found at polling places across this Nation in November 2004, we cannot fail to fully fund HAVA. America's ability to promote free societies abroad is inextricably linked to our ability to promote, expand and secure Federal elections at home.

HAVA has been acknowledged as the ''first civil rights law of the 21st century.'' For the first time in our Nation's history, Congress acknowledged the responsibility of the Federal government to provide leadership and funding to States and local governments in the administration of Federal elections. Congress required States to conduct Federal elections according to minimum Federal requirements for provisional balloting, voting system standards, and statewide voter registration lists, including new requirements to prevent voter fraud. Finally, Congress refused to impose an unfunded mandate on States by authorizing nearly $4 billion in payments to States over three fiscal years to implement the HAVA requirements and disability access services.

To date, Congress has appropriated over $3 billion for these purposes and States are currently in varying stages of implementing HAVA requirements to meet the pending 2006 effective date. But Congress has failed to fully fund HAVA and as a consequence, there remains a $822 million shortfall in Federal funds. In addition to the $600 million authorized in FY 05, but not appropriated, Congress has underfunded HAVA by an additional $222 million for a total of $822 million.

To remedy this, the amendment I intended to offer would have increased function 800 by $727 million in BA in FY 06 for election reform requirements

payments to the States, and increased function 500 by $95 million in BA in FY 06 to fund election reform disability access payments to the States. The amendment was fully offset by adjusting the reconciliation savings assigned to the Finance Committee in order to allow for the closing of corporate tax loopholes and provided additional deficit reduction in an equivalent amount in the amount of $822 million.

The absence of these funds will at best impede, or at worst stop, statewide election reforms for the 2006 Congressional elections, the 2008 Presidential elections, and beyond. According to a letter issued by the LCCR/NASS Coalition in support of my amendment, State and local governments cannot enact the requirement reforms on time without full Federal funding. The coalition letter states, in pertinent part: ''Without full federal funding, state and local governments will encounter serious fiscal shortfalls and will not be able to afford complete implementation of important HAVA mandates.''

Similarly, the National Association of Counties, NACO, in a letter dated March 17, 2005, noted that a recent NACO report ''demonstrates that the funds counties have received so far for implementation of the Help America Vote Act are clearly insufficient.'' The letter goes on to conclude that HAVA has ''clearly become an unfunded mandate on the nation's counties.''

Some have expressed concerns that States do not need additional Federal funding, nor should Congress appropriate additional funding, because States still have millions in unspent HAVA funding. This argument is contrary to both the law and the facts. As a matter of law, HAVA does not require States to spend Federal funding by a date-certain within any fiscal year. To the contrary, HAVA merely requires States to comply with specific Federal requirements by certain effective date deadlines, depending upon the timing of the first Federal election in that State. Since the time, place and manner of Federal elections may differ from state to state, HAVA accommodates the diversity of state circumstances by ensuring that States could retain Federal funding without making premature obligations or expenditures and without threats of a Federal recoupment of such funds.

Similarly, HAVA did not mandate a ''one-size'' fits all approach to how States will implement the HAVA requirements or other election reforms. As a result, HAVA contains a savings clause requiring that Federal funds remain available until expended pursuant to 42 USC 15462. As a matter of fact, while some States have unspent HAVA dollars today, it is also a fact that all States are in varying degrees of compliance with HAVA, including enacting state implementing legislation, establishing certain processes such as administrative complaints procedures, contacting or obligating funds for new or retro-fitted voting systems, or otherwise enhancing any number of election-related programs and procedures to improve state-based election administration. At this time, there does not appear to be any State that is fully compliant with HAVA and that also has a significant surplus of funds.

Moreover, the most important requirements in the Act do not have to be implemented by the States until the first Federal elections on or after January 1, 2006. Also, because of the delay in the issuance of the voluntary voting system standards by the Election Assistance Commission, some States have delayed purchases of voting systems and technology until that guidance is issued. Consequently, such States have unexpended funds.

However, that does not lessen the critical need for full funding in fiscal year 2006. Although the FY 06 funds will not be available to the States until October 1, 2005, just 3 months before some States must have these requirements in place, States will be able to issue contracts, obligate funds for programs, and otherwise fully implement real election reforms if Congress signals its intent to provide these necessary funds.

After the concerns raised by the November 2000 general election, Congress made a commitment to the States, and to the voters of this Nation, that we would be a full partner in the conduct of Federal elections. While Congress accomplished much with the passage of HAVA, 4 years later in the November 2004 general election, voters faced many of the same barriers in different forms and new barriers to voting that HAVA promised to remove. After the 2000 November elections, Americans recognized that real election reform changes must be made to ensure the integrity and security of our democracy. We can do better and we must do better. Full Federal funding is critical to ensuring that America will do better.

HAVA began a new era in election law—one where the Federal Government is a supporting partner to help State and local governments, in conjunction with civil rights, voting rights and disability rights organizations, to conduct fair, free and transparent elections in our Nation. HAVA is our collective promise to the American people to fix the problems in our Federal elections.

If we fail to honor our commitment now and provide the States with only partial funding, we may jeopardize the opportunity of the States to implement the most historic and comprehensive election reforms in American history and may ensure that the public's confidence was misplaced in Congress. Full Federal funding is critical to ensuring the integrity and security of Federal elections and the confidence of the American people in the final results of those elections.

It is time to fulfill that promise and we must do so yet this year.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter issued by the coalition of organizations spearheaded by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and the National Association of Secretaries of State dated March 8, 2005 and a letter issued by the National Association of Counties, dated March 17, 2005, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKE ELECTION REFORM A REALITY; FULLY FUND THE ''HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT''

DEAR SENATORS: We, the undersigned organizations, urge you to support full funding for the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) and include $822 million in the upcoming FY06 Senate Budget Resolution. This figure represents the authorized HAVA funds that remain unappropriated.

HAVA, which passed with overwhelming bipartisan support, includes an important list of reforms that states must implement for federal elections. State and local governments have been working on such reforms as improving disability access to polling places, updating voting equipment, implementing new provisional balloting procedures, developing and implementing a new statewide voter registration database system, training poll workers and educating voters on new procedures and new equipment.

To help state and local governments pay for these reforms, HAVA authorized $3.9 billion over three fiscal years. To date, Congress has generously appropriated $3 billion between FY03 and FY04. Unfortunately, while HAVA authorized funding for states for FY05, none was appropriated. The states and localities need the remaining authorized funding to implement the requirements of HAVA, and the federal EAC needs to be fully funded to carry out its responsibilities as well.

States and localities are laboring to implement the requirements of HAVA based on a federal commitment that HAVA would not be an unfunded mandate. State officials have incorporated the federal amounts Congress promised when developing their HAVA implementation budgets and plans. Without full federal funding, state and local governments will encounter serious fiscal shortfalls and will not be able to afford complete implementation of important HAVA mandates. According to a state survey, lack of federal funding for HAVA implementation will result in many states scaling back on their voter and poll worker education initiatives and on voting equipment purchase plans, both of which are vital components to making every vote count in America.

We are thankful that you have seen the importance of funding the work of the Election Assistance Commission in FY06. States, localities and civic organizations look forward to the work products from the EAC that will aid in the implementation of HAVA, e.g., voting system standards, statewide database guidance, and studies on provisional voting, voter education, poll worker training, and voter fraud and voter intimidation.

We thank you for your support of funding for the Help America Vote Act, and we look forward to working with you on this critical issue. Should you have any questions, please contact Leslie Reynolds of the National Association of Secretaries of State at (202) 624–3525 or Rob Randhava of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights at (202) 466–6058, or any of the individual organizations listed below.

Sincerely,

Organizations Representing State and Local Election Officials

Council of State Governments.

International Association of Clerks, Recorders, Election Officials and Treasurers.

National Association of County Recorders, Election Officials and Clerks.

National Association of Counties.

National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials Educational Fund.

National Association of Secretaries of State.

National Association of State Election Directors.

National Conference of State Legislatures.

Civil and Disability Rights Organizations

Advancement Project.

Alliance for Retired Americans.

American Association of People with Disabilities.

American Federation of Labor—Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Asian American Legal Defense & Education Fund.

Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL–CIO.

Asian Pacific American Legal Center.

Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now.

Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law.

Common Cause.

Dēmos: A Network for Ideas & Action.

FairVote: The Center For Voting and Democracy.

Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America.

Jewish Council for Public Affairs.

Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law.

Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

League of Women Voters.

NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund, Inc.

National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

National Coalition on Black Civic Participation.

Project Vote.

Public Citizen.

United Auto Workers.

United States Student Association.

U.S. Public Interest Research Group.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2005.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BOB NEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER DODD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY HOYER,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS MCCONNELL AND DODD AND REPRESENTATIVES NEY AND HOYER: On behalf of county officials across the nation, I would like to reiterate our appreciation for your efforts on behalf of counties in the development of the Help America Vote Act of 2001. As you remember, NACo and other organizations representing state and local government officials supported the Help America Vote Act based on an assumption that the federal government would meet numerous deadlines set forth in the legislation and would provide the full authorized level of funding. Thanks to your leadership, sufficient funding was provided in fiscal years 2003 and 2004. However, no funds were provided for FY 2005 and total funding for the Help America Vote Act remains more than $800 million short of the authorized amount.

Attached is an excerpt from a recent report of the National Association of Counties that demonstrates that the funds counties have received so far for implementation of the Help America Vote Act are clearly insufficient. This excerpt, from a recent snapshot survey conducted by the National Association of Counties on the costs that counties have identified for compliance with unfunded federal mandates, shows that the Help America Vote Act has clearly become an unfunded mandate on the nation's counties.

This funding shortfall is a particular burden for counties because the federal government did not live up to its commitment to issue federal voting systems standards by January 1, 2004. These standards are not expected until later this year; the delay is creating uncertainty surrounding compliance with HAVA and is driving up costs for many counties. We look forward to working with you and your staff to secure additional funding and assist counties in meeting the deadlines in the Help America Vote Act.

Sincerely,

LARRY NAAKE,
Executive Director.

EXCERPT FROM UNFUNDED MANDATES: A SNAPSHOT SURVEY

A report issued in March 2005 by the National Association of Counties based on a snapshot survey conducted during a two-week period from January 26 through February 11, 2005. The full report provides a snapshot of the continuing unfunded mandates burden facing counties on the tenth anniversary of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT

The Help America Vote Act requires most counties in the nation to purchase new voting equipment that permits all voters to cast a secret ballot regardless of disability. The accelerated timetable nationwide and lack of federal standards are driving up the cost for counties to purchase equipment. In addition, counties are working in cooperation with the states to merge existing voter registration databases into a statewide list and to implement new voting procedures, such as provisional ballots.

Thirty six provided information on their costs related to the Help America Vote Act. The counties who responded represent a broad mix of states that have moved forward with reform, those that are nearing compliance and those have not yet budgeted for or issued contracts on voting equipment. Some of the figures that counties provided below do not include the full cost of purchasing voting equipment:

	2003	2004	2005	Population
Cochise County, AZ	$53,626.00	$48,390.00	$36,090.00	122,161
Butte County, CA	40,000.00	850,000.00	2,000,000.00	212,010
Colusa County, CA	3,050.00	9,590.00	46,350.00	19,678
Kern County, CA	5,000,000.00			713,087
Mesa County, CO	19,535.00	157,700.00	124,676	
Brevard County, FL		43,000.00	2,442,500.00	505,711
Escambia County, FL		344,663.00		295,886
Lee County, FL	6,200,000.00	100,000.00	300,000.00	492,210
Polk County, IA		20,000.00	750,000.00	388,606
Scott County, IA		3,500.00	200,000.00	159,414
Idaho County, ID	34,480.00	36,560.00	36,560.00	15,413
Hamilton County, IN			25,000.00	216,826
Lake County, IN			2,120,900.00	487,476
Sedgwick County, KS	44,700.00	29,600.00	29,350.00	462,896
Calvert County, MD		9,300.00	77,158.00	84,110
Anoka County, MN		793,178.00		314,074
Blue Earth County, MN		55,000.00	56,650.00	57,306
Durham County, NC			5,000.00	236,781
Gaston County, NC			21,441.00	193,097
Northhampton County, NC			8,000.00	21,782
Richland County, ND		2,522.00		17,598
Rolette County, ND		7,931.77	0.00	13,732
Ward County, ND		22,225.00	2,825.00	56,721
Williams County, ND	2,368.38	17,757.27	5,000.00	19,316
Clark County, NY		997,566.00	131,825.00	1,576,541
Clermont County, OH			7,110.00	185,799
Montgomery County, OH		300,000.00	2,000,000.00	555,187
Chester County, PA	1,168,935.00	8,208,611.00	1,648,480.00	457,393
Monroe County, PA	10,000.00	44,000.00	45,000.00	154,495
County of Gloucester, VA	1,785.00	1,788.00	58,788.00	36,698
Fairfax County, VA	184,388.00	194,092.00	203,797.00	1,000,405
Prince George, VA		6,783.00	7,340.00	34,305
Kitsap County, WA		8,768.00		240,719
Greenbrier, WV			490,000.00	34,656
Monongalia County, WV		4,000.00		84,370

The highest cost was reported by Chester County, Pennsylvania, which spent in excess of $8 million of its own source revenue on HAVA compliance in FY 2004. Over the three-year period, the total cost for a family of four in Chester County is $96.42. Idaho County, Idaho, is spending $27.92 per family of four. Greenbrier County, West Virginia, is spending $56.56 per family of four in FY 2005. Montgomery County, Ohio, is spending $2.3 million for FY 2004–FY 2005, or $16.57 per person. Taxpayers in Butte County, California, are spending $54.53 per family of four to update their voting equipment over the three-year period and voters in Lake County, Indiana are paying $17.40 per family in FY 2005.

Notes and additions to the data:

Henrico County, Virginia has subsequently reported county funding for FY 2004 of $805,000 for the purchase of new voting equipment. The federal share of the total is $650,000; the state is providing $2 million. The registrar's office also anticipates spending $307,141 in the operating budget for FY

2005 for costs associated with the new voting machines.

The following explanations from individual counties are likely typical of county costs reported in the snapshot survey:

Scott County, Iowa has explained that their data includes $3,500 is a rough estimate of staff time used in the planning process that has not been reimbursed by state or federal funds. The $200,000 figure for FY 2005 is an estimate of the county share of the cost of new machines and software net of federal and state funds.

Polk County, Iowa has indicated that their figure for FY 2004 is associated with administrative costs such as reprinting forms. The figure for FY 2005 represents the county cost, less federal and state reimbursements, for the purchase of accessible voting equipment.

Clermont County, Ohio, has indicated that none of their reported costs are for the actual purchase of equipment. The entire figure is for administrative labor and travel associated with review of proposed equipment except for $300 for printing and processing of provisional ballots.

AMENDMENT NO. 253

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise today and join Senator BAUCUS and our colleagues in offering this Sense of the Senate resolution calling for full funding of the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program.

In all areas the President proposes and Congress disposes, and the budget is no different. While I support the President's efforts to control Federal spending to address the budget deficit, I have concerns about how some of his proposals would affect law enforcement efforts to identify, arrest, and prosecute drug trafficking organizations selling their poison to our kids and grand kids. I think it is critically important that we not hinder their ability to protect citizens, especially from the dangers of drugs.

In particular, the proposal to transfer to the Department of Justice and reduce the funding for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program—also known as the HIDTA program—would have a major impact on drug enforcement efforts. With the continued growth of meth in Iowa and throughout the Midwest, we cannot afford to reduce programs designed to increase cooperation and coordination. Just as modem technology allows our businesses and our citizens to freely move around the country, the criminal element within the United States can take advantages of these same opportunities. That's why it is essential that they be able to work together, across jurisdictions, so that our laws against drug trafficking can be effectively enforced.

Congress provided the Office of National Drug Control Policy with the responsibility for the management—and effectiveness—of the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program. For a relatively modest investment, Federal, State, and local law enforcement have tremendously benefitted from the increased information sharing and improved coordination that HIDTAs create. The task forces created through the HIDTA program can serve as models for initiatives against terrorism, money laundering, and other modem threats to civil society.

This amendment is consistent with the views expressed by the Budget Committee. It is consistent with the views expressed in the legislation introduced last year to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

I hope that all of our colleagues will join us in supporting this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 197

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to join Senator ALLEN in urging the Senate to adopt budget language reinforcing our Nation's commitment to vital aeronautics research. For decades, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has conducted a wide array of aeronautics research programs that have helped ensure our economic and military security and revolutionize the way we travel. NASA's work in aeronautics has captured the spirit of the Wright Brothers, spawning generation after generation of progress. The amendment before us, which I am cosponsoring, will help make certain that progress continues for many years to come.

Members of this body, including me, will fly to their home states later today or tomorrow when we have completed the budget, and when we do, we will benefit from countless innovations first developed in NASA aeronautics programs over the years—efficient jet engines, safe and secure air traffic control networks, advanced de-icing technologies, and so on.

The impact of NASA's work is indeed widespread. The U.S. aviation industry supports over 11 million jobs and contributes $1 trillion in economic activity. Our airlines carry 750 million passengers per year, with that number expected to grow to a billion within 15 years. We ship 52 percent of our exports by air, and in fact, the aviation industry contributes more to the U.S. balance of trade than any other domestic manufacturing industry.

Today we are at grave risk of losing the staff, facilities, and expertise necessary to continue the long history of NASA's aeronautics research programs. We are at risk of essentially allowing the first ''A'' in NASA—the one that stands for aeronautics—to die over the next several years. What a tragedy that would be for the traveling public, for our aviation industries, for our military, and really for our entire economy.

The budget we have before us does not contain specific references to aeronautics funding. Nonetheless, we know of NASA's plans for aeronautics from its fiscal year 2006 budget request. We know that the agency intends to reduce overall aeronautics funding by over 17 percent from fiscal year 2004, dropping another 12 percent by 2009. That is nearly one-third in just 5 years.

The cuts are even more severe within the ''vehicle systems'' account—the portion of NASA's aeronautics program that focuses on making aircraft safer, faster, quieter, more fuel efficient, and dynamic. NASA has announced its intention to cut over 28 percent of its budget in this area relative to fiscal year 2004, with plans to eventually cut even deeper in the out years. What will the practical consequences of these cuts be?

For starters, the cuts mean that all subsonic and hypersonic research will be terminated. This is the research that focuses on designing stronger airframes and better turbine engines—technologies that with just a little work can be taken from the lab and applied directly to functional aircraft, whether commercial or military. As a result, domestic aircraft and engine producers will lack the ability to draw on a body of solid pre-competitive research, while competitors abroad benefit from well financed efforts, such as the European Union's ''Vision 2020'' aeronautics program. Ultimately, the consequence may be the loss of our longstanding global leadership in civil aviation and all the economic benefits that flow from that leadership.

Second, many of the facilities necessary to design and test new aeronautics technologies will likely be closed as a result of budget shortfalls. Wind tunnels and propulsion test facilities are used by government, academia, and industry—often on a pay-for-use basis—and require minimal funding to maintain. A recent RAND National Defense Research Institute determined that over 84 percent of these NASA facilities serve strategic national needs, and concluded that the success of the U.S. aerospace industry ''relies on our workforce and test facility infrastructure . . . and will continue to need to predict airflow behavior over a range of designs.'' If we allow wind tunnels and propulsion labs to close, there will, in fact, be no way to serve these needs.

So these proposed aeronautics cuts are a double threat to the U.S. aviation industry: On the one hand, they get NASA out of the business of subsonic research, and on the other, they may well lead to the closure of the very facilities industry and academia would need to replace that research. There would, of course, be consequences for cross-cutting technologies used by the military and for the scores of Americans employed in these areas. On balance, the overall long-term impact would be devastating.

Instead of focusing on these subsonic and hypersonic aeronautics program areas, NASA intends to focus on ''barrier breaking'' flight demonstrations. These are exciting projects that involve UAVs and aircraft capable of quietly crossing the sound barrier, and they may pay off 15, 20, or 25 years down the road. By then, however, it could be too late for our aviation industry. The language offered by Senator ALLEN today addresses that fact head-on by restoring balance in NASA's aeronautics programs.

We need to step back and re-evaluate where we are with aeronautics research, where we want to be in 5, 10, 15

years, and make a commitment to do what it takes to get us there. A study specifically requested by Congress in the fiscal year 2004 omnibus appropriations bill mapping this course will be unveiled later this month by the National Institute of Aerospace. Just yesterday, the House Science Committee held an important hearing on the direction of aeronautics research.

There is movement on these issues, and we will have opportunities to define our goals as the year progresses. What Senator ALLEN is proposing to do is to say that we must keep all of our options open and our areas of expertise healthy until we are able to come to a conclusion between Congress, the administration, industry, academia, and really our Nation on what our direction will be. Senator ALLEN's language, in essence, ensures that our debate on how to approach aeronautics will not be over before it begins.

AMENDMENT NO. 220

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, the Lieberman-Collins amendment No. 220 provides $855 million to restore cuts to vital first responder programs in the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice, and for port security grants. The amendment provides an additional $565 million for programs that support our first responders, including State homeland security formula grants, Urban Area Security Initiative grants, FIRE Act grants, SAFER grants, Emergency Management Planning Grants, and the Metropolitan Medical Response System. It would restore $140 million for community policing and local law enforcement efforts under the COPS and Byrne Grant programs. It would also provide $150 million for port security grants, ensuring at least the same amount of funding for the Nation's ports as last year.

AMENDMENT NO. 217

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I submitted an amendment to the budget resolution with Senator HATCH, Senator SPECTER, Senator BIDEN, Senator DEWINE, Senator LEAHY, and Senator BAUCUS to restore funding for juvenile justice and local law enforcement programs closer to last year's levels. Our amendment will increase funding for these programs funded by the Department of Justice by $500 million. Specifically, this money will add $173 million to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, OJJDP, budget, $200 million for the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Program and the COPS program, and $127 million to the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area, HIDTA, program. The amendment accomplishes this by raising the functional total for the justice allocation by $500 million offset in function 920, which gives the Appropriations Committee the flexibility to design the exact offsets.

Let me briefly illustrate why we must put money back into these programs. Following the administration's lead, the Senate Budget Committee allocated $187 million to the OJJDP budget, which is about $173 million less than what we appropriated last year. I am particularly disturbed that the Senate budget resolution assumes complete elimination of the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant program, JABG, which received $55 million last year. JABG provides funding for intervention programs that address the urgent needs of juveniles who have had run-ins with the law.

The Budget Committee seems to feel that the JABG program is ineffective. An example from my home State of Wisconsin proves otherwise. Using Federal dollars from the JABG program, the Southern Oaks Girls School, a juvenile detention center outside of Racine, WI, built a new mental health wing to provide much-needed counseling services for the girl inmates. The administrator of this school cites a 56 drop in violent behavior since the new mental services have been offered. This is just one example of JABG's many successes, a record that supports keeping JABG alive and well-funded.

The same is true of title V Local Delinquency Prevention Program, the only Federal program solely dedicated to juvenile crime prevention. The Senate budget assumes a $50 million cut to title V, penny pinching now that will cost us dearly in the future. According to many experts in the field, every dollar spent on prevention saves three or four dollars in costs attributable to juvenile crime. And who can put a dollar value on the hundreds, even thousands of young lives turned from crime and into productive work and community life by the juvenile crime prevention programs supported by title V?

Following the President's lead, the Senate Budget Committee also drastically cuts the programs most important to state and local law enforcement. Congress appropriated a little more than $700 million last year in both discretionary and formula funds for the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant program. The budget before us assumes no funding for this program at all. Byrne grants pay for State and local drug task forces, community crime prevention programs, substance abuse treatment programs, prosecution initiatives, and many other local crime control programs.

Talk to any police chief or sheriff back in Wisconsin and they will tell you that the Byrne program is the backbone of Federal aid for local law enforcement. Do we really want to walk away from a program with more than 30 years of success supporting our local police chiefs, sheriffs, and district attorneys?

The COPS program is another victim of this budget. The budget assumes $118 million for the COPS program. That is down from $388 million last year. What is worse is that, within the COPS program, popular initiatives like the COPS Universal Hiring Program and the COPS Technology Grants Program are zeroed out entirely. We should remember that just 3 years ago, the overall COPS program received more than a billion dollars. Of that amount, $330,000,000 was for the hiring program that helped provide police officers for towns in Wisconsin like Ashland and Onalaska. Another $154,000,000 was for the COPS technology program that helped fund critical communications upgrades in cities, like Milwaukee and Madison and many other cities, not only in Wisconsin, but across the Nation.

Almost 3 years ago, I asked Attorney General Ashcroft him why the COPS program was being cut. He answered that that the COPS program was a ''good thing'', that it ''worked very well'' and that it had been one of the ''most successful programs'' we have ever had. I call on the Senate to heed our former Attorney General's words and restore funding for COPS in our budget.

Finally, The Senate budget assumes cuts in the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas, HIDTA program from $227 top $100 million. The HIDTA program is a vital collaboration between Federal, State and local law enforcement to combat drug trafficking through intelligence-gathering and cooperation. This proposed cut in the overall HIDTA program threatens the future of smaller HIDTAs like the one in Milwaukee, a program that has been extremely successful in stemming crime.

The downward spiral of juvenile justice and local law enforcement funding is a disturbing budget trend with ugly real world implications. As a result of the Byrne, COPS, JABG, HIDTA and title V programs, we have enjoyed steadily decreasing crime rates for the past decade. But, if we do not, at a minimum, maintain funding for crime fighting, we cannot be surprised if crime again infests our cities, communities, and neighborhoods.

The budget assumes more than $1.2 billion will be cut from what it would take to fully fund OJJDP, the Byrne Grant Program, COPS, and HIDTA at last year's level adjusted for inflation. We restore $500 million of that, not enough to make these important crime fighting programs whole, but enough to keep them functioning and working to keep our communities and families safe. Though some of us would prefer an even higher increase, my amendment represents a step in the right direction. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 214

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the Snowe-Wyden amendment. I am proud to cosponsor this amendment to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate for the lowest prescription drug prices in Medicare.

Americans pay the highest drug prices in the world. Americans pay, on average, two-thirds more than the Canadians, 80 percent more than the Germans, and 60 percent more than the

British. While drug companies argue that they need high prices in America in order to fund research and development for new drugs, drug companies spend more on marketing, advertising, and administration than they spend on research.

Our seniors deserve a Medicare prescription drug benefit that gets the best prices for their medication. But the Medicare prescription drug law actually prohibits the Federal Government from negotiating with drug companies for lower prices. This is a missed opportunity and a waste of taxpayers' dollars.

In light of the growing concerns over the rising cost of this benefit—$57 billion more than originally expected—every effort should be made to save our seniors and taxpayers dollars.

This amendment requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to use the tremendous purchasing power of the 41 million Medicare beneficiaries to assist the private drug plans in getting the lowest price for seniors. The savings provided by this amendment would go to pay for deficit reduction.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense effort to lower prescription drug prices and reduce the deficit.

AMENDMENT NO. 172

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the Harkin amendment. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this amendment, which preserves funding for Perkins career and technical education for the next 5 years. While the Administration has determined that Perkins is ineffective, I rise today to defend Perkins and highlight its proven effectiveness in my home State of Wisconsin.

Perkins provides over $24 million in education and job training to Wisconsin students. These funds are allocated between the Wisconsin Technical College System and the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

Over the past 5 years, 97 percent of Wisconsin's high schools have participated in the federally funded Perkins career and technical education programs. This includes over 98 percent of 11th and 12th grade students, as well as secondary special students in the State. As the result of this investment in career and technical programs, 96 percent of Wisconsin students completing high school career and technical education programs graduate, compared to the State's overall graduation rate of 91 percent.

The Wisconsin Technical College System and its 16-member colleges receive $13 million in Perkins funding to reach 25,000 students statewide. Students who qualify for Perkins-funded services are those most in need of assistance to ensure their future success in the workforce. Many are academically and economically disadvantaged. Some have disabilities, are single parents or have limited English proficiency. These students are provided counseling, disability support services, services related to increasing students enrolled in non-traditional occupations, remedial instruction, and transition services that help students successfully move from K–12 education to technical colleges and from technical colleges to the workforce.

Our technical colleges have demonstrated success helping their students meet these unique challenges. Six months after graduation, 91 percent of graduates are employed with an annual median salary of over $30,000. Five years after graduation, 97 percent are employed making nearly $36,000 a year. These graduates positively contribute to their communities and meet the needs of local businesses.

The loss of Perkins funding would significantly weaken our Nation's educational quality and economic competitiveness. This amendment is fully offset and provides deficit reduction. I urge my colleagues to support Senator HARKIN's amendment to ensure that students in Wisconsin and elsewhere continue to benefit from Perkins to compete in the 21st century economy.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I was pleased to join with my colleague Senator CHAFEE in sponsoring a sense of the Senate resolution which sought to restore the Clean Water State Revolving Funds to the fiscal year 2004 enacted level of $1.35 billion.

For the past 2 years, Senators CRAPO, JEFFORDS, and I, along with other Members of this body, have offered successful amendments to the budget resolution on the Senate floor seeking to boost funding for this program from $1.35 billion to $3.2 billion.

Unfortunately, these amendments were not accepted by the conference committee for fiscal year 2004, and there was no budget resolution in fiscal year 2005.

There is a tremendous need for increased funding for wastewater treatment infrastructure improvements throughout the country. As we underscore in this resolution, in 2002 the Congressional Budget Office estimated a spending gap for clean water needs between $132 billion and $388 billion over 20 years. This year we are proposing a very modest amendment simply to hold the line.

All States will be affected by the President's proposed cut in spending, a cut of 33 percent from the fiscal year 2005 enacted funding and a cut of 46 percent from the 2004 enacted level.

This cut will have a devastating impact on the ability of States and communities to continue upgrading their wastewater infrastructure and to meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act.

This request to restore the funding has broad bipartisan support: 41 Senators joined me in a letter seeking this restoration.

Americans overwhelmingly believe that clean and safe water should be a national issue and a national priority. Protecting our Nation's water is an essential Federal role, not just a State and local responsibility.

In a recent poll, nearly three-quarters of Americans agreed that ''clean and safe water is a national issue that requires dedicated national funding.'' More than two-thirds think Federal spending to ensure clean and safe water is more important than tax cuts. Across the Nation, our wastewater systems are aging. Some systems currently in use were built more than a century ago and have outlived their useful life.

Many communities cannot meet water-quality goals with their current systems. The American Society of Civil Engineers recently released its 2005 Report Card for America's Infrastructure and gave Wastewater systems a D minus, down from a D 2 years ago.

Obviously, I would like to see a significant increase in these clean water State revolving funds, which have been a highly effective means for improving wastewater treatment for communities across the Nation. However, at a minimum, I urge a simple restoration of the funding to the 2004 enacted level.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, my colleague, Senator ENZI, and I filed our amendment dealing with the defined benefit plan reform proposals in this budget. The amendment provides the necessary flexibility with respect to revenues and outlay savings between our two committees.

Unfortunately, a last-minute objection from staff on the other side sidetracked our amendment. We will pursue this amendment in the conference on the resolution.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, yesterday I inadvertently missed a vote on an amendment to increase funding for AMTRAK by $1.4 billion. The amendment would have been paid for by closing corporate tax loopholes. If I were present I would have voted yea.

AMTRAK is important to Arkansas. By shifting the AMTRAK funding burden to States we are doing a real disservice to those people in rural America who rely on rail service. And without adequate assistance, I fear we will witness a rapid decrease in Amtrak's performance and infrastructure, and the end of rail service for my State.

I think it should be a goal of AMTRAK to achieve economic viability and I am open to discussions on how best to achieve that goal. But in this budget we should not ignore their funding needs or the needs of our rail passengers and State and local governments. I commend Senator ROBERT BYRD for this amendment and I regret having inadvertently missed this vote.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, had I been present for vote number 66, amendment No. 230 sponsored by Senator COLEMAN, to restore funding for Community Development Block Grants and other programs, I would have voted in favor of the amendment.

Due to the rapid scheduling of amendments at this time, I was unable to be here for that vote. However, my

position with respect to CDBG funding is crystal clear. In fact, I was a cosponsor of the Sarbanes amendment to restore CDBG funding, which unfortunately failed on a 50–50 vote.

Although I preferred the offset in the Sarbanes amendment, I nonetheless would have voted for the Coleman amendment as well. CDBG provides critical funds to many communities in my State. It is one of the Federal Government's most effective neighborhood privatization programs. I am please that the Coleman amendment passed this body today, and I will continue to work in the Senate to ensure that the President's proposed cuts are not enacted into law.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the Budget resolution before us.

Let's start with the revenue reconciliation instructions. We have already seen many amendments to raise taxes and I am sure we will see more. But there is another tax increase on the horizon. I am referring to the tax increase our constituents will feel in their pocketbooks and wallets if we fail to extend current tax law.

The so-called ''tax cuts'' the other side keeps referring to is really nothing more than just keeping current tax law. There are over 40 provisions that American families and employers have come to rely on that will expire at the end of this year if we do nothing.

The $70 billion in reconciliation that this resolution calls for is needed to prevent a massive tax increase. This is about provisions in current law that are important to our constituents and to our economy. We cannot afford to allow them to expire and therefore be raised.

Let's take a look at the items that the Finance Committee, which I serve on, will examine this year. There is the R&D tax credit. This is an important provision of the Tax Code that spurs innovation and new technologies and one that I and most others here support.

In fact, the bill introduced in the Senate in the last Congress to make this provision permanent had 40 cosponsors, including 22 Democrats. It will cost $7 billion to extend this provision alone for the 5 years of this budget.

Then there is the deduction for tuition expenses that will cost $10 billion to extend for 5 years. And we need to address the ability of taxpayers to deduct their State sales taxes from their Federal taxes. This will cost $2 billion for just 1 year.

We have a temporary, 1-year fix for the alternative minimum tax that will cost $30 billion.

Other items that expire this year include: the work opportunity and welfare-to-work tax credits, mental health parity, a provision regarding military pay and the earned income tax credit, a deduction for teachers who buy classroom supplies, the wind energy tax credit, oil and gas tax provisions, tax credit bonds for school renovations. I could go on and on.

Again, over 40 provisions in total will expire this year. Let me be clear, these are not new tax proposals. This is simply current law. If we do not extend these provisions we will cause a substantial increase in the tax bills of American families and businesses.

Our Finance Committee needs every cent of the $70 billion in the reconciliation instruction to make that happen. And that is even before we turn our attention to the dividends and capital gains tax provisions that have been important to our economy. I will push hard to extend these through the end of the budget window.

The amendments we have seen the last few days also deal with ''closing tax loopholes'' to get so-called ''corporate cheats''. I serve on the Senate Finance Committee and I can tell my colleagues that no one is more committed to closing tax loopholes than Chairman GRASSLEY.

In fact, the last tax bill we passed, the Jobs bill, had tens of billions of dollars in tax loophole closers. If any doubts that CHUCK GRASSLEY will take every opportunity to shut down tax cheats, then I suggest they go talk to him and look at the record on this issue.

And for the record, it has been a Republican Congress and President that has gone after these loopholes and tax cheats in the Finance Committee.

In addition to the over 40 tax extenders I referred to, we also have other priorities, such as the tax title of the Energy bill and charitable provisions in the Care Act. Charities do such important work in America and offer incredible compassion. They touch lives in ways the Government never can.

And if we want to be energy independent and less dependent on foreign sources, then we need to encourage the development of energy alternatives for the cleaner burning of fuels, such as clean coal technologies.

So I hope we can avoid getting caught in the rhetoric that calls the reconciliation instruction ''unnecessary.'' It is absolutely necessary if we are to prevent a massive tax increase. And it is especially vital when our economy is showing real signs of continuing solid growth.

I also want to address some of the complaints that we have heard about the horrible so-called ''cuts'' in Medicaid spending that the president asked for and we assumed in this budget.

Medicaid spending is projected to grow $1.112 trillion in the next 5 years. The president's plan would call for a spending increase of $1.098 trillion over 5 years.

Notice that I said a spending increase of more than $1 trillion. That works out to an annual growth rate of 7.2 percent. On what planet is an increase of 7.2 percent a year a cut? Let's get honest about the complaints we are hearing. What we are hearing are complaints that an increase of 40 percent in 5 years is just too little. Think about that: 40 percent.

All we are asking of the Medicaid program, as we hand them a more than $1 trillion funding increase, is to cut out $14 billion in abuse and waste. I don't understand how anyone can say with a straight face that it is impossible to save less than 2 percent of the budget of any program over a 5-year period. It absolutely can be done. We just need to have the will to do it.

We absolutely must get a handle on entitlement and mandatory spending because the numbers are alarming. By 2030 Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security spending alone will be 13 percent of GDP. Unless we reform entitlement spending, we simply cannot continue on our current path.

This budget is a first step, a very small first step, toward beginning to address the entitlement spending that threatens to overburden our economy.

I support this budget before us. It recognizes the realities of our world with the need to limit spending and extend current tax law to create jobs and keep America on the road to economic recovery. I congratulate Chairman GREGG on crafting a strong budget and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to express my support for the concurrent budget resolution presently before the Senate.

I want to start by congratulating Senator JUDD GREGG, the new chairman of the Budget Committee, along with the other members of that committee, for accomplishing the difficult task of putting together and reporting to the Senate a budget resolution that begins to address our spending and deficit challenges in a modest yet significant way.

As with many of my fellow Utahns, I am very concerned about the large and persistent deficits with which our Federal Government still wrestles. I continue to hear from constituents who seem discouraged that the Government has not been able to find more success in bringing the budget into balance, particularly after the several years of surplus we enjoyed in the latter part of the last decade.

Many Utahns have written to me to express their concerns that this generation is leaving a huge and growing burden on our children and grandchildren, one that perhaps will be too onerous for them to bear. As a longtime advocate of fiscal responsibility in families and in Government, I understand and agree with these concerns. The deficit and the mountain of public debt owed by the Federal Government do matter, and will make life harder for Americans in the future.

And so, those of us from Utah share a collective frustration that this budget does not make more progress toward cutting the deficit.

As I examine the budget resolution, however, I am struck by the fact that we, as a nation, are still facing turbulent conditions that seem to defy our

best efforts to control our fiscal destiny. As we get farther and farther from the monumental events of the early part of this decade that have shaped our current landscape in so many ways, perhaps it is becoming easier to think that things are slowly returning to normal in our country.

But we need to remember that this Nation is still at war, and we still face tremendous challenges in protecting our homeland from further terrorist attacks. These needs are paramount and eclipse even the importance of balancing the budget. This budget resolution reflects these facts and provides for increases, although a relatively modest 4.1 percent growth in defense and homeland security spending.

At the same time, the budget places a virtual freeze on the growth of the remainder of discretionary spending accounts. This is in stark contrast to recent years, where such spending has grown at a relatively high rate. I believe this nondefense/homeland security freeze is a very important feature of this budget. Even though this restraint is rather modest, it is being met with a great deal of concern from many who had hoped to see more growth in the programs that fall under this category.

The budget also makes some small progress in bringing mandatory spending under control. Over the 5-year budget period provided by this resolution, this type of spending growth is cut by $32 billion. Although this is just a fraction of the growth in entitlement spending projected over this period, it is significant that this budget represents the first attempt to cut mandatory spending growth since 1997.

The results of these changes on the deficit are not dramatic, but they are noteworthy. The President set a goal last year to cut the deficit for fiscal year 2004, which was $521 billion, or 4.5 percent of GDP, in half within 5 years. The budget resolution before us projects this goal being met in fiscal year 2008 with a deficit of $258 billion that year, and falling to $208 billion by 2010. In relative terms, the deficit is projected to be 1.8 percent of GDP by 2008 and just 1.3 percent by 2010. While still too large, these deficits are certainly more manageable than those of recent years.

To meet these goals, the resolution provides some pretty tough discretionary spending caps for the next three fiscal years, and retains the pay-as-you-go rule from the fiscal year 2004 budget resolution.

Some of my colleagues are questioning the need for the budget to provide for approximately $70 billion in tax relief over the next 5 years. We need this money set aside to prevent tax increases that would be damaging to our growing economy.

Specifically, two provisions that have shown to be very important to increasing Federal revenue growth and helping the economy to recover are set to expire at the end of 2008. These are the reduced tax rates for dividend income and capital gain income that were enacted as part of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

If Congress allows these lower tax rates to expire, we would, in effect, be placing a significant tax increase on the economy. Capital gains rates would increase from a maximum of 15 percent to 20 percent, and the tax rate on dividends would leap from 15 percent to as high as 35 percent.

There is no doubt that these tax rate reductions, combined with the other tax cuts we passed in 2001, 2002, and 2003 have contributed to the recovery of the economy. After declining for 3 years, 2001–2003, Federal collections began increasing again in 2004, rising by 5.5 percent that year. For the current fiscal year, 2005, revenues are projected to jump by an impressive 9.4 percent. Moreover, revenues are expected to increase by an average of 6.4 percent each year until the end of the decade. This demonstrates to me the wisdom of our earlier decisions to cut taxes to get the economy growing again.

Allowing tax rates to increase might seem to some to be a smart way to fight the deficit, but I believe these revenue trends illustrate that such a move would be counterproductive and exactly the wrong thing to do. Therefore, it is very important that this budget include the reconciliation instructions that provide the opportunity for the Finance Committee to report the legislation that will prevent these tax cuts from expiring.

I look forward to working my colleagues on the Finance Committee in crafting a bill to extend both the dividends and capital gains tax rate reductions, as well as extending other important tax provisions that expire later this year.

While this budget resolution perhaps does not go as far as I would like to see in reducing the deficit and addressing spending growth, it is probably as strong as we can make it. I also recognize that this resolution has to garner a majority of votes in both the Senate and the House for it to take effect. Each one of my colleagues also has his or her own ideas of what would be the best combination of spending priorities for this coming fiscal year. In the end, what counts is what we can get a majority of us to agree upon the lowest common denominator.

Given the circumstances, the balances achieved in the budget resolution may well be the best we can do. It is not perfect, but it is a start, and it deserves our support.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, for the past few years I have been advancing a concept that embodies fiscal responsibility, a concept that—if enacted—would be a sure sign to hard-working Americans that the Federal Government is serious about fiscal discipline.

Federal spending is at an all time high, now topping $20,000 per household, and that does not include spending from state and local taxes. This is the highest level of federal spending since World War II.

The Federal Government is now spending $2,292,000,000 per year on discretionary and mandatory spending, including Social Security.

Mr. President, $2.292 trillion is a lot of money. My Kansas constituents often say: ''I don't mind paying my taxes, but make sure my hard-earned money gets spent wisely.''

Does Federal spending need to be so high? We would all agree that the Federal Government has an essential role to play in various capacities, but are taxpayers getting the most out of every dollar sent to Washington? Again, I ask, does the Federal Government really need $20,000 per American household in order to operate?

And what real safeguards do we have in place to ensure that these $2.292 trillion are being spent wisely?

I am proud to have been elected to serve my constituents on a platform of reducing wasteful Federal spending and reforming Government. After 10 years though, I can testify that it takes a great deal of effort to keep a positive attitude. Balancing the budget, reducing Federal spending and returning taxpayer dollars to the families that earned them is hard work.

The reason for the difficulty in achieving success, in what would seem to be an obvious thing to do—reducing government waste and prioritizing spending—is that the specific interests trump the general interest on Capitol Hill.

For instance, there is a general interest to discourage smoking, and we spend many taxpayer dollars both to this end and on the treatment of lung cancer; however, taxpayer dollars are also still spent to subsidize tobacco because there is such specific interest pressure to keep tobacco subsidies alive.

The budget we are debating cuts the deficit in half in 5 years. I think we should balance the budget in seven years, but to be effective, we must work within the parameters of the system.

Systems matter, and to get solid reform accomplished you must have an approach that recognizes this reality. The problem with our current system—with the specific interest crowding out the general—is that it makes reform very difficult. Former Senator Phil Gramm taught me this truth in the Senate.

I believe that we need a new systematic approach to spending in Congress. This whole week, amendment after amendment has been offered on the Senate floor; generally speaking, each one of these amendments has the voice of a particular specific interest behind it. After all of the specific interest issues are raised, I will be happy if we can just cut the deficit in half in five years.

We need to create another mechanism, which will allow for the general

interest to overcome the specific. Therefore, I put forward a new systematic approach.

Over the last few years, I have developed the Commission on the Accountability and Review of Federal Agencies, CARFA Act, which is a systematic approach.

Last year, we had a bipartisan hearing on the measure, in which all witnesses supported this new concept. In this year's version of the bill, we are incorporating some of the suggestions made at that hearing.

CARFA would take all of the Federal Government agencies and programs and put them under the review of a bipartisan commission—the members of which are appointed by both Congress and the White House.

The commission would review Federal agencies and programs, and present draft legislation to the Congress to realign or eliminate duplicative, wasteful, outdated, and failed agencies and programs.

Each house of Congress would get one vote on the bill—up or down—without amendment.

For example, if the commission finds 563 programs that are duplicative, wasteful, or already have accomplished their purpose and recommends their realignment or termination, then the Congress would vote—up or down—without amendment to realign or eliminate all of them or keep all of them. And you get only one vote—one vote in the House and one vote in the Senate—to send it forward to the President.

It is a systematic approach to address the specific interests dominating the debate in Washington.

The CARFA approach tries to get at the issue and create a systematic approach by giving the general interest a voice in the system. So now you have these 563 or 284 programs, and people come up to me and say: ''Well, what if you've got an agriculture program that has some benefit to Kansas, that you want to help and keep?''

Then, I look at the program and see that it does help Kansas, but I only get one vote and there are all of these other programs that I really do think need to be eliminated. And it makes the overall goal of balancing the Federal budget more achievable.

I am pleased that, once again this year, the chairman of the Budget Committee has seen the need for this measure and recognized how vitally important it is, as he has included a sense of the Senate calling for a commission along the lines of CARFA.

It is my hope that we will be able to work with the leadership this year and see the new CARFA systematic approach become a reality.

Mr. STEVENS. The amendment to strip development in ANWR from the budget yesterday ignores the outlook for the global consumption of oil. I am pleased that the Senate took a proactive approach to our current energy crisis, and voted to keep ANWR in the budget.

After listening at length to the statements of those opposed to responsible development on Alaska's North Slope, I was struck by the lack of concern over the national security implications of our dependence on foreign oil.

The global outlook for oil consumption is sobering, and it validates our decision yesterday to increase our domestic production by opening ANWR. One of the most serious areas of concern is the projected increase in China's oil consumption, which is set to grow at staggering rates.

China's economy is doubling every 8 to 10 years. This level of growth is expected to continue for at least 25 years.

To do this, China will need access to an increasing supply of oil. Milton Copulos, the President of the National Defense Council Foundation, told our House colleagues yesterday that fueling this economic growth will require ''so much oil . . . that the ability of current suppliers to produce it may be stretched to the breaking point.''

Jeffery Logan, Senior Energy Analyst and China Program Manager for the International Energy Agency, testified that, the average Chinese citizen consumed only one fourteenth of the oil consumed by the average American in 2004, but Chinese consumption is poised to increase rapidly.

Mr. Logan noted that in late 2003 China surpassed Japan to become the world's second largest petroleum consumer. He said:

> In 2004, Chinese demand expanded nearly 16 percent to 6.83 million barrels per day . . . [but] Domestic crude output in China has grown only very slowly over the past five years . . . Imports now account for 40 percent of Chinese oil demand.

To put this in perspective, Chinese oil consumption was responsible for 40 percent of the growth in global oil demand over the past four years. This trend will continue and China's consumption is projected to rise from 5.56 million barrels per day in 2003 to 12.8 million barrels in 2025.

Mr. Logan told the subcommittee that eventually China's ''import dependency'' will reach 75 percent stressing an already tenuous world oil supply.

Milton Copulos explained the consequences of this increase in Chinese consumption. He said:

> Under the best circumstances, the competition for oil generated by the explosive economic growth in Asia will serve to put a tremendous upward pressure on prices, driving them well above the current $50 plus per barrel average. OPEC officials have said oil prices could rise to as much as $80 a barrel and they may well be correct.
>
> Under the worst circumstances, . . . the competition for oil could lead to armed conflict—particularly with China.

I remember well the days of the 1970's oil embargo, and I agree with Mr. Copulos that, ''America is heading head-long into a disaster. Today our situation is far worse in 1973.''

I also agree with his assessment that:

> The simple truth is that America's energy endowment is more than sufficient to provide for all of our needs, both today and in the future. The only real shortfall that we have is a shortfall of the political will to find innovative ways to fully utilize the resources we are blessed with.

Mr. Copulos discussed several areas where having the political will to take action could help turn our situation around. As an Alaskan, I am proud that our state can play a key role in the solutions he proposed.

The reality that some people do not want to face is the world is changing. China's economy is growing at a staggering pace, and without new domestic production, our country will face unimaginable competition for oil. ANWR is part of the solution to this looming crisis, and I am pleased Congress has finally had the political will to face this challenge and take proactive steps to prevent it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this budget, like the President's budget, reflects the wrong priorities. This budget short changes public services such as education and health care for all Americans in order to further cut taxes mainly for the wealthiest Americans. This budget resolution is starkly out of touch with the vast majority of working families in Michigan and across the United States. The American people deserve better.

To create the impression that the budget cuts the deficit in half over the next 5 years, it simply leaves out several major expenses. These omissions include the cost of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the cost of the personnel added to the Army and Marines and the cost of reforming the alternative minimum tax. Leaving these costs out of the budget paints an incomplete picture of the deepening Federal deficit and the damage being done to the Nation's fiscal outlook.

If the deficit continues to expand at its current rate, by 2015, each American's share of the debt will be at least $30,000. The bigger the deficit grows, the more likely it is that we will face rising long-term interest rates and slower economic growth. This will make it more expensive to buy a house, pay for college or pay off credit card debt. This is an unfair burden to pass on to our children and grandchildren.

The President's tax cuts are a major cause of our Nation's swing from a record budget surplus into an increasingly deep deficit ditch. Yet this resolution seeks $71 billion in additional tax breaks most of which are for the wealthiest Americans. The cornerstone of these proposed tax cuts is the extension of the capital gains and dividend tax cuts. These tax cuts would overwhelmingly benefit the wealthiest among us.

Largely as a result of its reckless tax cuts, this budget would actually increase, rather than decrease, the deficit. But this budget resolution, such as the President's budget, attempts to conceal the damage it is doing to the Nation's fiscal outlook by using 5-year projections instead of the customary

10-year numbers. Hidden just beyond the 5-year budget window is the exploding cost of the tax cut proposals and its growing effect on the deficit.

I am disappointed that the Senate did not adopt the Feingold-Chafee amendment to reinstate pay-as-you-go rules that would require both entitlement spending increases and tax cuts to be fully paid for or face a 60-vote point of order in the Senate. The pay-as-you-go rule, like the one which was successful in the 1990s, would have helped restrain the deficit without unduly harming critical public services.

I am pleased that the Senate rejected severe cuts to the Medicaid Program in a crucial vote earlier today. This is a victory for the 53 million children, pregnant women, elderly and disabled who rely on Medicaid to meet their health care needs. It is also a victory for the people that make our health care delivery system work.

Still the budget plan which is before the Senate today fails to address some of our Nation's most pressing problems, such as the loss of millions of manufacturing jobs, cuts in education funding, and environmental protection.

I am also saddened that the Senate rejected an amendment to continue to protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. We have a responsibility to promote a balanced energy plan that invests in America's future and protects our environment, not one that damages our protected lands. Rather than drilling in our pristine wilderness, the United States should be investing in alternative sources of power, renewable energy programs and fuel efficient automotive technology to improve fuel economy without harming our environment.

This budget slashes funding for vital programs for working families in order to extend massive and fiscally irresponsible tax cuts that significantly lower the Nation's revenue and explode the deficit. These are the wrong priorities for America. I cannot support it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this budget does not adequately protect children. That is why I filed an amendment to help lift millions of children out of poverty. I will plan to offer this amendment at the next appropriate time.

In the last 4 years, over 4 million of our fellow citizens have fallen into poverty. Nearly 36 million Americans live below the poverty line; 3 million more Americans live in hunger or on the verge of hunger today than in the year 2000.

Today, nearly 13 million children live in poverty in the United States. It is shameful that in the richest and most powerful nation on Earth, nearly a fifth of all children go to bed hungry at night. Poverty is a moral issue, and we have a moral obligation to address it.

Current policies are failing, and it is time to take a stronger stand. We should set a national goal of reducing child poverty by 50 percent within a decade and to eliminate it entirely as soon as possible after that. To help meet this commitment, we should enact a one percent surtax for income over $1 million. This surtax, paid by our wealthiest citizens, will raise $3.5 billion this year, and more in subsequent years, to meet the needs of our most vulnerable citizens.

The amendment will create a child poverty elimination fund with a board to oversee the fund, and design the child poverty elimination plan.

We know how to achieve this goal. All it requires is the will, and the leadership, to do it. Prime Minister Tony Blair made a commitment to do so in Britain, and they have begun to reach the goal. Their approach is to support both parents and children. They have pledged to increase employment opportunities, raise incomes for those who work, increase support for those who cannot work, and improve public services for children and families.

It is time for America to make a similar commitment, and give real hope, real opportunity and real fairness to children and families mired in poverty in communities in all parts of our country.

We cannot continue to look the other way while millions of our fellow citizens work hard, play by the rules, and still cannot escape a lifetime in poverty.

Everywhere we look, the current budget is a nightmare for those who need our help the most. It cuts the Women, Infants, and Children Program, which provides health information and nutritious meals to low income pregnant women and their children. It cuts food stamps. It cuts Medicaid. It cuts low-income housing. It cuts low-income education. That is unacceptable. And yet the White House pretends it has an anti-poverty agenda. Nonsense. This budget is not anti-poverty, it is anti-poor.

As the wealthiest country on Earth, we are blessed with great abundance. In the powerful words of the Gospel, ''To whom much is given, much is required.'' That should be our national commitment to every American living in poverty today. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about a program very important to the children and families of Hawaii, as well as those who reside in other parts of the United States, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program. This program provides funding through a competitive grant process to fund ''centers that provide extended learning opportunities for students and related services to their families.''

The afterschool hours, those from 3 p.m. to 6 p.m., are a venturesome time for the youth of our country. Many school age children are unsupervised during these 3 risky hours. Many of them lack constructive activities such as sports or other school or community sponsored programs. Those who lack such activities become vulnerable to mischief or even danger whether they are the victim of a crime or the perpetrator. Whether they are considering the use of tobacco, alcohol or drugs, or doing a myriad of other activities detrimental to their well-being, they would be better served in supervised afterschool activities, the kind of activities supported by the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program.

According to FightCrime, an organization of law enforcement professionals representing all 50 states, ''Being unsupervised after school doubles the risk that 8th graders will smoke, drink alcohol or use drugs.'' They also report a study in Hawaii which noted an 84-percent drop in criminal convictions among school-aged males involved in quality afterschool programs funded by the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program.

Afterschool programs can provide a critical link to positive growth for many of these students. The academic support and socialization provided by them will help many at-risk youth. These programs can provide that extra bit of help to enable children to succeed, in academics, and in life. This is what we are talking about, and this is just what this program provides.

The President's own evaluation system, the PART analysis, says that this program gets ''high scores for purpose, planning and management.'' This program was part of the President's signature education initiative, the No Child Left Behind Act, and is authorized at $2.25 billion for fiscal year 2006. Sadly, the President's fiscal year 2006 budget funds afterschool programs at the level-funded amount of $0.999 billion, less than 45 percent of its authorized level. In my own State of Hawaii, this underfunding results in more than 8,800 school-age children not being able to take advantage of programs to help with their education, character development or physical fitness, nor provide programs to ensure a safe environment during the afterschool hours.

The Dodd amendment to S. Con. Res. 18 attempts to address this funding shortfall. I am glad to be a cosponsor, and I thank him and the other members of the Afterschool Caucus, of which I am a part, for the leadership in trying to restore funding for this essential program.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I am in strong opposition to this budget. As I have listened to the arguments of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in favor of the budget, I am reminded of the Indian parable of the blind men and the elephant. Each could feel only one portion of the elephant, so each came to wildly different—and wildly inaccurate—conclusions as to what it was.

Similarly, it is hard for me to believe that those who are supporting this budget are looking at the whole picture. How can they call this budget fiscally responsible, when it would increase deficits $130 billion over where

they would be if we did nothing at all? How can they brag that the budget tackles the difficult issue of entitlement reform, when nowhere is there mention of Social Security and Medicare, our two largest entitlement programs?

How can they refer to this as a blueprint for Congressional action, when it leaves out major spending and tax initiatives that we know the leadership wants to pursue: funding for the Iraq war beyond 2006; the cost of fixing the alternative minimum tax; the multi-trillion dollar cost of the President's plan to privatize Social Security?

No one can defend this budget as a reasonable or complete response to the serious fiscal challenges this country faces. No one can defend this budget as accurately reflecting the priorities of our nation—for on those grounds, it is indefensible.

The President—along with Alan Greenspan and countless other wise pundits—have focused our attention on the severe budgetary consequences of the coming retirement of the baby boomers. Entitlements are growing at an unsustainable rate—and the time to address their growth is now.

Congress should act to strengthen Social Security now, rather than wait for the moment of crisis. Social Security can pay full benefits for another 40 or 50 years. After that—even if nothing is done—Social Security could still pay 70 to 80 percent of promised benefits. But if we act sooner rather than later, Social Security's long-term financial imbalance can be fixed through relatively modest adjustments. At the same time, we need to recognize that growing budget deficits will strain our ability to sustain not just Social Security, but other important programs like Medicare and Medicaid. We need to look at the entire Federal budget and act to bring these deficits under control so we can preserve programs that will put a strain on our budget in coming years.

How—given the President's crusade to ''save'' Social Security with private accounts, given the coming retirement of the Baby Boom—can this budget ignore Social Security and Medicare? Not a dollar assumed saved from either. Not a penny paid back to the Social Security trust fund. Not even an acknowledgement of the huge cost of the President's plan to divert Social Security payroll taxes into private accounts. Either this budget is incomplete or it is insincere.

I suppose we should be relieved not to see any provision made in the budget for the President's proposed private accounts. The President has chosen to make Social Security his top domestic priority, but so far he has only proposed the idea of private accounts, which he admits would do absolutely nothing to improve Social Security's finances. Borrowing to pay for the transition cost would add up to $5 trillion to the national debt. And because the President has taken all other options off the table, the private accounts would require massive benefit cuts to achieve solvency.

Obviously, Social Security reform—or entitlement reform in general—is not a priority to those who support this budget. And obviously, continued tax cuts financed with reductions in important government programs and with debt are. The budget puts on the fast track $70 billion in tax cuts—and not one penny of offsets. In fact, the Senate rejected Senator FEINGOLD's amendment, which I supported, that would have prohibited using debt to finance this sort of raid on the Treasury.

Instead, the Senate chose to expedite tax cuts that would disproportionately affect the wealthy. The budget facilitates the extension through 2010 of tax cuts on capital gains and dividend income. Nearly half of this will benefit households with incomes in excess of $1 million; in contrast, only 12 percent of the cuts will benefit families with incomes under $100,000. It is fiscal irresponsibility in truest form, to speed tax cuts through the Senate that will directly add to our growing deficit. In addition, the $70 billion figure includes permanent estate tax repeal. This provision, despite the fact that its true effect won't be felt until 2011, carries with it a price tag of more than $9 billion—$9 billion that will truly benefit the wealthiest Americans.

And while the budget finds plenty of room to reward millionaires with billion dollar tax cuts, it nickels and dimes the government programs the average American family relies on.

American seniors pay the highest drug prices in the world. Our seniors deserve a Medicare prescription drug benefit that gets the best prices for their medication. But the Medicare prescription drug law actually prohibits the Federal government from negotiating with drug companies for lower prices. This is a missed opportunity and a waste of taxpayers' dollars. Now, in light of the growing concerns over the rising cost of this benefit—more than $57 billion than originally expected—every effort should be made to save our seniors and taxpayers dollars. We missed a golden opportunity in the Budget today to accept an amendment that I was proud to cosponsor and require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to use the tremendous purchasing power of the 41 million Medicare beneficiaries to assist the private drug plans in getting the lowest price for seniors. The savings provided by this amendment would have gone to pay for deficit reduction. Unfortunately, this commonsense effort to lower prescription drug prices and reduce the deficit was rejected.

However, I do applaud my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for having the courage to stop the proposed $15 billion cut to Medicaid. Stopping these drastic cuts will ensure that thousands of poor families, disabled Americans and the elderly get the proper medical care they need. The proposed $15 billion Medicaid cut would have translated to a loss of $300 million for Wisconsin. It would be extremely difficult for Wisconsin and other states to absorb a cut of this magnitude while continuing to provide the level of services 53 million Americans depend on. Now, there should be a thorough discussion about how Medicaid can work better to serve low-income Americans. But we should never force arbitrary cuts in Medicaid without first taking the time to consider the future efficiency and operation of the Medicaid program. Medicaid is an essential source of health care for millions of our Nation's most vulnerable citizens, and any changes to the program should be driven by informed, reasoned policy and not by arbitrary budget targets. I am pleased to have cosponsored the amendment that passed the Senate to protect Medicaid from these drastic cuts.

We have a continuing responsibility to meet the health care needs of our children, families, and elderly. But—even with the improvement in the Medicaid policy, the cuts proposed in this budget do not match those needs. Older Americans Act programs are level funded even as our population ages and the need for services grows. LIHEAP funding is cut by $182 million as more families and seniors face higher energy costs. Funding for health professions training has been reduced by 64 percent at a time when we face health care workforce shortages. And funding for rural health programs has been slashed by 80 percent when rural areas are in desperate need of adequate health resources.

Perhaps the worst failure of this budget—it fails our nation's children. This budget proposes the first cut in education spending in a decade. Yet again, this budget fails to fully fund No Child Left Behind, leaving the Act underfunded by $39 billion since enactment. It fails to set special education on a glide path to full funding—it is slated to be nearly $4 billion short of what was authorized four months ago. This budget should reflect our values and needs in education. It clearly does not.

This budget still fails to fulfill our commitment to our veterans. The American people made a promise to our men and women in uniform that when they had completed their service, the Veterans Administration would be there to help them meet their health care needs. When we made that commitment, it was not conditional, and it did not involve high fees. Today we seem to be slowly changing the terms of service. We now say to our veterans that they will have to wait months for an appointment, and some veterans are of such low priority to the system that they may never receive care at all. I supported an amendment that would have bridged the funding gap between the President's budget and the funding level that the veterans' groups believe is necessary. Unfortunately, Senator AKAKA's amendment was not agreed to.

With that ''no'' vote, the Senate made a decision that some veterans did not deserve the benefits they had been promised.

I am also disappointed over the funding levels for transportation in this bill. I am especially disappointed that the Senate did not remedy the shortfall in funding for Amtrak. I was proud to cosponsor an amendment that would have fully funded Amtrak's basic needs at a level of $1.4 billion. The President's budget zeroed out funding for Amtrak, providing only $360 million to the Surface Transportation Board—and that would only be provided if Amtrak is forced to shut down in the Northeast Corridor. What the Administration fails to recognize, is that ridership in other areas of the country has increased; in Wisconsin, this means that 540,000 used Amtrak this past year. To force these 540,000 people onto our overcrowded roads and airports would be irresponsible, and I hope the Senate will reconsider before the end of the fiscal year.

While I am glad that we put the Senate on record opposing cuts to the Community Development Block Grant program, it is up to the Appropriators to decide whether to reverse the $2 billion cut in this vital program. CDBG and the 17 other federal community and economic development programs which the Administration proposed consolidating in the Commerce Department provide funds that are critical to meeting the needs of distressed and underserved communities. In my state of Wisconsin, at least 19 entitlement communities and many other smaller communities across the state are slated to lose millions of dollars if we do not stand firm and reverse this proposal.

I also regret that the Senate has decided to open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil drilling. In the past bipartisan group of senators came together to protect this fragile ecosystem, but this year we failed to beat back drilling. By using the budget rules in a new, and some would say questionable, way a place that had been set aside as too valuable to be spoiled by drilling was opened to potential environmental degradation. The real tragedy here is that the oil we get from ANWR will have no impact on the price of oil. There is simply not enough oil in Alaska to have any real impact on the worldwide price. We have decided to risk irrevocable environmental damage but gained no additional control over our thirst for foreign oil. Until we aggressively address our domestic demand for oil, we will never be able be able to end our dependence on OPEC.

Following the administration's lead, the Senate Budget Committee allocated $187 million to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, OJJDP, budget, which is about $173 million less than what we appropriated last year. I am particularly disturbed that the Senate Budget Resolution assumes complete elimination of the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Program, JABG, which received $55 million last year. JABG provides funding for intervention programs that address the urgent needs of juveniles who have had run-ins with the law.

The same is true of Title V Local Delinquency Prevention Program, the only federal program solely dedicated to juvenile crime prevention. The Senate budget assumes a $50 million cut to Title V—penny pinching now that will cost us dearly in the future. According to many experts in the field, every dollar spent on prevention saves three or four dollars in costs attributable to juvenile crime. And who can put a dollar value on the hundreds, even thousands of young lives turned from crime and into productive work and community life by the juvenile crime prevention programs supported by Title V?

Following the President's lead, the Senate Budget Committee also drastically cuts the programs most important to state and local law enforcement. Congress appropriated a little more than $700 million last year in both discretionary and formula funds for the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Program. The Budget before us assumes no funding for this program at all. Byrne grants pay for state and local drug task forces, community crime prevention programs, substance abuse treatment programs, prosecution initiatives, and many other local crime control programs.

The COPS program is another victim of this budget. The Budget assumes $118 million for the COPS program—that is down from $388 million last year. What's worse is that, within the COPS program, popular initiatives like the COPS Universal Hiring Program and the COPS Technology Grants Program are zeroed out entirely. We should remember that just three years ago, the overall COPS program received more than a billion dollars. Of that amount, $330,000,000 was for the hiring program and roughly $154,000,000 for the COPS technology program that helped fund critical communications upgrades in cities—like Milwaukee and Madison—and many other towns—like Ashland and Onalaska—across Wisconsin and the nation.

Finally, the Senate budget assumes cuts in the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas, HIDTA, program from $227 to $100 million. The HIDTA program is a vital collaboration between federal, state and local law enforcement to combat drug trafficking through intelligence-gathering and cooperation. This proposed cut in the overall HIDTA program threatens the future of smaller HIDTAs like the one in Milwaukee—a program that has been extremely successful in stemming crime.

The downward spiral of juvenile justice and local law enforcement funding is a disturbing budget trend with ugly real world implications. As a result of the Byrne, COPS, JABG, HIDTA and Title V programs, we have enjoyed steadily decreasing crime rates for the past decade. But, if we do not, at a minimum, maintain funding for crime fighting, we cannot be surprised if crime again infests our cities, communities, and neighborhoods.

That is why I offered an amendment with Senators HATCH and BIDEN to restore this dramatic loss of juvenile justice and local law enforcement funding. Cuts to these programs total more than $1.2 billion. Our amendment restores $1 billion of that—not enough to make these important crime fighting programs whole, but enough to keep them functioning and working to keep our communities and families safe.

For rural America, this budget leaves so much to be desired that it's hard to know where to begin. If you assume the President's vision on discretionary spending is carried out, as this budget proposes, basic agricultural research will be slashed beyond recognition. Rural housing, rural development and conservation will suffer. Nutrition for kids and food stamps for the working poor will be on the chopping block. And the fundamental fabric of rural America will be put at risk.

A budget is a statement of who we are as a nation. I do not believe we are a country that takes from the poor and sick to make the rich richer. I do not believe we are a country that steals from our children's future to indulge ourselves today. I do not believe we are a country that ignores threats to our prosperity and stability. I do not believe we are who this budget says we are, and I will vote against it.

Let me make one final point. Often, we hear that it would be irresponsible for Congress to reject a budget. Not this year. If we reject this budget,—if we do nothing at all—deficits will be $130 billion less than had we acted. A vote against the budget is a vote for deficit reduction. It is also a vote for responsible accounting, for honoring our commitments to our seniors and our children, for compassion towards those who are hungry, sick, or just struggling to raise a family in an uncertain world. For that reason, I will vote against this budget, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, to govern is to choose. Nowhere are our priorities and our values made clearer than in the budgets we write here every year.

In these times, we face many tough choices. This budget ducks them all. It chooses the powerful over those without a voice. It chooses to reward wealth instead of work. It chooses the present over the future. It chooses debt and borrowing over sound finance.

This budget rejects the very rules that brought our budget into balance just a few years ago. It ducks our duty to take responsibility for our choices, and sends the bill to our children and grandchildren.

I will vote against this budget, and I urge my colleagues to reject it, too.

Just 4 years ago we were considering the first budget of the new Bush administration. At that time, we could

look forward to a decade of budget surpluses, totaling $5.6 trillion.

We were paying down the national debt, and with every dollar accumulating in surplus, we were making our future stronger. Social Security funds were not being spent, as they are today, to fund the other functions of Government. Interest payments on the debt were shrinking, not growing.

With the impending retirement of the Baby Boom generation, with the need to educate and train a workforce to take on the world of the 21st Century, we were doing the right thing—saving for challenges we could see coming.

But instead of seeing those surpluses as an opportunity to get our house in order, instead of increasing our national savings by paying down the debt, the incoming administration insisted on a course that has resulted in the most dramatic reversal in our Nation's finances in our history.

The record at that time is full of warnings that tax cuts of that magnitude would make it difficult, if not impossible, to meet the known challenges ahead, much less any surprises that history could throw at us.

We were assured that the surpluses had to go, that we had all the money we needed to deal with recession, national security threats, natural disasters—anything we might have to face. We would be able to balance the budget, put money away for the surge in retirees, and meet every threat and challenge.

A lot of us did not buy it. The record is full of warnings about the long-term damage of massive tax cuts without regard for our future obligations.

But those tax cuts were passed. And more tax cuts followed every year, in time of economic boom, in time of recession, in peacetime, in wartime, when our budget was in surplus, and increasingly, as our budget deficits grew. Regardless of the situation, regardless of the facts, more tax cuts.

In the face of all the challenges we face, we are now running our Government on a level of revenue not seen since the 1950s. A 21st Century superpower, on a 1950s budget.

By the time they expire, the tax cuts we have put into law over the last 4 years will cost almost $2 trillion.

But we will be asked to extend those cuts past their expiration. Not to do so, we are told, would be a tax increase. But those expiration dates were chosen to make the tax cuts look smaller. Extending those cuts will raise the total cost to over $5 trillion through 2015.

That should cause serious people to stop and think. We are now engaged in an open-ended global war on terror, in a shooting war and reconstruction in Iraq. Security challenges from domestic threats to nuclear proliferation will continue to demand additional resources.

Medicare and Medicaid are facing real crises, driven by an aging population and rising health care costs. Social Security has a long term funding problem that will have to be confronted, the sooner the better.

As the global economy brings billions of new workers and customers into its scope, our country is in a real fight to protect and create good-paying jobs. That means strengthening our schools and universities, increasing research and innovation, investing in 21st Century infrastructure. All of that takes money.

This budget chooses to ignore those priorities. In fact, it cuts the resources we need to meet those challenges.

But it does not touch a dime of the $5 trillion the tax cuts will cost if they are all extended. Not a moment's pause, not a penny reconsidered.

The President constantly reminds us that the world has changed profoundly in the past four years. That is true. He tells us that we face unprecedented challenges. That is also true.

But his budget, the budget before us today, ignores those truths. It continues the most reckless budget policies I have seen in my 30 years in the Senate. Those policies have taken us from the strongest fiscal position we have known to the brink of the abyss. There is no way under these policies that we will ever get out of debt again.

We are now debating the most basic priorities of our Government. The budget document we will vote on today will be the statement of this Senate on what we value, and what I we do not value.

I am sorry to say that the most basic premise of this budget, is wrong. This budget protects tax cuts for those who need them least, and cuts the health care, housing, and education of those who need the most.

It protects the largest tax cuts in our history, in the face of the largest deficits we have ever seen.

The priorities in this budget are wrong. I do not think they are the priorities of the vast majority of people in this country. I know that they are not my priorities.

Time and again during the week of debate, we have tried to provide funding for some priorities, and to reduce the money going to others.

During this debate, I offered an amendment to restore money for the COPS program that has put 100,000 policemen on the streets of our country. To cover those costs, I proposed closing loopholes used by corporations who move overseas to avoid paying taxes. But that amendment was voted down. Cops versus corporate tax breaks. Cops lose.

I voted to provide money for our veterans' health care, so sorely needed in these times. To pay for that, I was ready to close tax those tax loopholes. That amendment was voted down. Veterans versus corporate tax breaks. Veterans lose.

I voted to increase funding for first responders, our first line of defense against terrorism here at home. It was paid for by closing those loopholes. That amendment was rejected. Fighting terrorism versus corporate tax breaks. First responders lose.

I voted restore money for our national passenger rail system that carries 25 million people a year, for which not a dime has been put into this budget. But that amendment was voted down. Passenger rail versus corporate tax breaks. Passenger rail loses.

These and many other examples reveal the real priorities of this budget. Nothing makes that clearer than the outright rejection of the kind of common sense budget rules that helped us balance the budget during the 1990s.

Facing deficits of historical size, with no end in sight, most folks would consider it just common sense to set up some rules to rein this problem in. If you want to cut taxes, then cut spending to match. If you want to increase spending, you have to raise taxes to match.

Pay-as-you-go rules would require us to make tough choices, to take responsibility for our choices, and not just add to the mountains of debt we will dump on our children.

But not only does this budget reject those rules, it actually makes it easier to go deeper into debt, by protecting tax cuts, in time of record deficits. Senator FEINGOLD and Senator CARPER both offered amendments to correct that, and both amendments were rejected.

This budget is not just irresponsible, it is openly hostile to any attempt to make us live within our means.

This budget fails to address our most basic needs in these difficult times. It ducks our responsibility to pay for our own decisions. It does not reflect our Nation's priorities.

I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting it.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, today I rise to express my views on our budget and the priorities and ideas I believe we must focus on as a nation. First, I want to reiterate my extreme disappointment in President Bush's budget with respect to how it affects our rural communities. While reducing our Nation's historic deficit is essential, the burden and sacrifice shouldn't rest disproportionately on the backs of rural America—all Americans should share the burden. In my opinion, the President's budget relies too heavily on working families in rural America to make sacrifices while the President continues to advocate additional tax cuts for the ultrawealthy.

We have to find a responsible way for all Americans to share in this burden, and I think that my constituents stand ready to accept their share of that sacrifice. However, I am not going to ask the working families of this country to shoulder the entire burden. Rural programs are often the first programs on the chopping block, yet these are among the most important to our local communities and the economies they support. Our spending cuts must be balanced even if it requires rolling back the tax cuts for the ultrawealthy.

I have a long standing commitment to rural America and our Nation's farmers and I understand the challenges they face to maintain and strengthen their way of life. That is why I am so disappointed that this President has decided, through his budget, that our farmers and our rural communities are no longer a priority for him and his Administration.

I would like to take a few moments to focus on five areas where I believe the President failed rural America. The first area that the President's budget has come up short is with respect to rural law enforcement.

The President's budget cuts close to $1.9 billion in funding for local and state law enforcement and first responders. These cuts will be particularly crippling to rural law enforcement and inhibit a wide range of services including their ability to combat Arkansas' growing methamphetamine problem.

The President's budget includes a 27 percent cut, totaling approximately $455 million, in first responders funding. These cuts would hinder critical state and local efforts to protect our communities by making less funding available for the preparedness of first responders and citizens, public health, infrastructure security and other public safety activities. I am particularly concerned with how these cuts would affect the amount of federal Homeland Security funding provided to small and rural states such as Arkansas.

The President's budget includes a $215 million cut which would force rural fire departments to cut back on equipment purchase, safety training, fire prevention programs, and the purchase of new vehicles. These grants are especially important to Arkansas' rural and volunteer fire departments. Since 2001, the FIRE Act grant program has provided vital resources to many of Arkansas' 900 fire departments, 85 percent of which are voluntary. Since last Spring, more than 180 awards have been granted to Arkansas fire departments, totaling over $12 million.

Also, the President's budget proposes eliminating the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, which was budgeted at $536.5 million last year. I am deeply concerned with the elimination of this important program because it would significantly impact the ability of Arkansas law enforcement to combat the state's growing meth problem. The existence of 19 Drug Task Forces, funded by the Byrne Grants, are especially crucial in a state like Arkansas, which was recently ranked third in the nation, per capita, in terms of the number of meth labs seized and has recently seen the number of labs seized per year exceed 1,200.

The President's budget includes an 80 percent cut, totaling approximately $489 million, in COPS funding. Since Congress created this successful initiative with my support in 1994, the COPS Programs has assisted Arkansas law enforcement agencies in reducing violent crime across the state. In doing so, it has helped counties throughout Arkansas hire additional officers for community policing and homeland security activities by helping provide for their salaries and benefits. Since 1998, the Drug Enforcement Administration has used COPS funds for the training and certification of 379 state and local law enforcement officers as of June, 2004.

I want to make a special note of the fact that this budget cuts the COPS Methamphetamine Enforcement and Clean-Up by $32.5 million. These cuts would be greatly felt in Arkansas, where the use of methamphetamine is growing and has become the #1 priority for my state's drug law enforcement. COPS funding provided for the clean up and disposal of hazardous wastes found at 810 meth lab sites seized by Arkansas state and local law enforcement in 2003, and funded the cost which totaled more than $1.39 million.

The President's budget includes a 49 percent cut, totaling approximately $186 million, in Juvenile Justice Programs. These cuts would dramatically weaken the Juvenile Justice System, whose funds support state and local efforts to prevent juvenile delinquency and address juvenile crime. The President also seeks the elimination of the Juvenile Accountability Block Grants, JABG, which was funded by Congress in FY 2005 at $55 million. All of these cuts will significantly hamper rural law enforcement.

The second area where this President's budget short changes rural America is in healthcare. At a time when 45 million Americans are uninsured, the President's budget eliminates 28 important health programs, which total $1.369 billion. Two of the most important programs for rural health are Medicaid and the Area Health Education Centers or AHECs.

With respect to Medicaid, Arkansas will lose more than $560 million in Medicaid dollars over the next 10 years under the President's cuts. In 2010, Arkansas will lose more than $55 million. Mr. President, these cuts would cause more than 5,700 Arkansas seniors and 22,000 children to lose their healthcare coverage.

One of the most devastating cuts affects Arkansas' Area Health Education Centers. Arkansas has six such centers. The President's budget would eliminate these vital centers for health and health education.

The third area where this budget fails rural America is in regard to education. The President has proposed cutting education funding by $530 million nationwide. Such a funding cut would hurt rural school districts in Arkansas that rely on federal dollars such as Title I, which provides services to low income students. The President's cuts to Title I could affect more than 28,000 Arkansas children.

Arkansas school districts are already struggling to meet the demands of the new No Child Left Behind law, which the President has never fully funded, so now is not the time to cut such vital funding. I note with special interest that the President's budget proposes extending the No Child Left Behind law to high schools at the expense of eliminating 48 programs, including all the vocational and technical education programs, education technology state grants, GEAR UP, Safe and Drug-Free Schools initiatives and the Communities State Grants, TRIO Talent Search and Upward Bound programs.

This budget proposes funding Arkansas' program at $128 million, nearly $90 million less than what the No Child Left Behind Law calls for. This budget proposes funding Arkansas' After School program at $12 million below what No Child Left Behind mandates. This could affect more than 15,000 Arkansas children. On top of that the President's budget cuts IDEA funding by more than $37 million.

The fourth area where this budget fails rural America is in relation to economic development. The President's budget would drastically cut economic initiatives relied on by Arkansas' rural communities. The economic development initiatives specifically benefit communities in Arkansas of 3,000 or fewer residents.

The President's budget restructures how Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program grants are allocated. Last year, CDBG alone was funded at $4.8 billion. The President proposes to consolidate CDBG with 17 other local assistance programs and fund the entire group at $3.71 billion. This would make it more difficult for Arkansas' Department of Economic Development to compete for this type of funding. These cuts could severely impair the state's ability to provide grants to Arkansas' rural communities. In addition, this move would directly impact the 14 entitlement cities that receive CDBG funds (cities include: Bentonville, Conway, Fort Smith, Jonesboro, Rogers, Texarkana, Fayetteville, Hot Springs, Jacksonville, Little Rock, North Little Rock, Pine Bluff, Springdale, and West Memphis). CDBG funds have been used for a variety of projects in Arkansas, including senior citizen centers, public health facilities, childcare facilities, affordable housing rehabilitation and construction projects, and rural fire stations.

The fifth area where this budget fails rural America is with respect to agriculture. The fine print of the President's budget includes drastic cuts in farm and commodity programs that are vital to Arkansas' farmers. The President's proposed cuts would break a firm promise the Federal government has made to American farmers and ranchers. Furthermore, the President's proposed cuts in Food Stamps will severely impact rural Arkansans.

The President did not have to propose cuts in these programs. The entire farm bill is one-half percent of the Federal budget. Yet, he chose these cuts

that endanger entire communities in rural America. He chose to protect tax cuts for the ultra wealthy above our working farm families who are the backbone of rural America.

This should be a wake up call to the heartland of this country—many of whom supported President Bush's re-election. These programs have huge impacts on the quality of life in our rural communities. From his recent proposal to privatize Social Security, to these devastating cuts in his budget—the President has made it abundantly clear that he's going after working families in rural America.

Unfortunately, the FY 2006 Senate budget resolution we are debating today is only marginally better than the President's request. In my opinion, this resolution doesn't reflect the values and priorities of my state or the nation. The proposal before us ignores critical needs in my state and in rural communities across our nation. Specifically, the resolution, like the President's budget, would cut funding for Veterans, for education and training, for local law enforcement, for transportation and for agriculture and nutrition programs.

I am pleased we have made some improvements in the budget presented by the President during consideration in the Senate but unfortunately I believe the burden imposed by this budget still falls disproportionately on the backs of working families, especially those in rural communities throughout Arkansas and the nation.

Even though I am compelled to oppose the budget before the Senate today, I will continue to stand up for the priorities that are critical to the citizens of my state during the appropriations process ahead.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the President is setting a course that jettisons sound stewardship of fiscal policy and that ignores America's real needs, from education to first responders, and this budget resolution largely facilitates that reckless course.

Iraq's needs fare well in the President's spending priorities, but America's needs deserve to fare better. In record time, the administration's policies already have converted record surpluses into record deficits, and if these new policies are enacted, the worst is yet to come. More tax cuts for the wealthy, more borrowing, more deficits, and fewer investments in the priorities that really count in the everyday lives of America's families and communities.

We hear a lot in this town about ''compassionate conservatism.'' We hear speeches about declining family values and the breakdown of the traditional family. And we hear about streamlining Government and making it run more like a business based on cost-benefit analysis.

But the truth is, this budget before the Senate today is neither compassionate nor conservative. On the one hand it slashes, freezes, or totally eliminates funding for programs that help the poorest and the most vulnerable Americans, and on the other it uses smoke and mirrors to conceal the creation of a federal deficit larger than any other in our Nation's history.

This is a difficult time for many Americans, and this budget will only make things worse. Fifteen million American households cannot find affordable housing, yet this budget would force housing costs onto state and local governments.

Forty-four million Americans do not have health insurance, yet the budget that was brought to the floor would force the costs of Medicaid right back onto our cash-strapped State and local governments. I am pleased that we were able to soften this crushing blow to our states' Medicaid programs—for now—with a successful amendment. But there will be determined efforts to undo that vote at every step of the legislative process that lies ahead.

At a time when American companies are forced to hire from abroad because the students here lag behind in math and science skills, this budget would eliminate education programs by the dozen and severely underfund No Child Left Behind programs and funding for low-income schools. Perhaps most disturbingly, as we see more and more young troops coming back from Iraq and Afghanistan in need of long term medical and psychological care, this budget would dramatically reduce benefits and services to veterans.

I recently received a letter from a charitable organization that I believe does great work, Catholic Charities USA, describing their views on the proposed budget. I think it will surprise many members what they say. I ask unanimous consent that March 8, 2005, Catholic Charities letter addressed to me be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 8, 2005.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
U.S. Senate, 433 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY: On behalf of Catholic Charities USA, I urge you to support budget priorities for FY2006 that will strengthen the capacity of states, localities, and private agencies to protect and assist the poorest and most vulnerable members of our society.

Although our economy has recovered somewhat from the economic recession that began in late 2000, increasing numbers of Americans ate facing significant hardship. Unemployment remains high, as over 9 percent of the working population is either unemployed or underemployed, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Poverty rates are rising again, and 35 million people—including 12 million children—are now living under the federal poverty line.

For millions of families, the difficulties presented by the weak economy have been exacerbated by other challenges. Fifteen million American households cannot find affordable housing, while forty-four million people in the U.S. lack health insurance. High housing costs, unexpected health costs, chronic illnesses aggravated by inconsistent health care—these and other factors contribute to the economic instability experienced by many families.

We at Catholic Charities USA are witness to the human toll of the failure to address these problems adequately. For instance, our agencies, which provide food, shelter, and other forms of emergency assistance to 4.5 million people annually, are reporting strong increases in requests for emergency assistance, especially among families with children. According to the U.S. Conference of Mayors, our experience is not unique. Their 2004 survey of 27 cities revealed that requests for emergency food and shelter increased 14 and 6 percent, respectively.

We therefore urge you to produce a budget that will protect funding for critical services and supports to help the millions of families struggling to achieve stability and self-sufficiency. Every decision of economic policy, including the setting of national budget priorities, must be judged in light of its impact on those who do not share in the abundance of the American economy. At a time when the United States is spending more on defense and homeland security, a question arises about who will pay for it. It should not be our nation's poorest citizens. We therefore ask you to support the following budget priorities:

Place a priority on investments in federal programs that protect and support low-income families and other vulnerable populations. Funding for many poverty programs was already cut or frozen in 2005. Others, such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG), and the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) have been frozen since 1996. Congress should address the budget deficit in a fair and balanced way maintaining investments in our children, protecting programs assisting seniors and persons with disabilities, and enhancing our national security.

Oppose the inclusion of Medicaid cuts in fiscal year 2006 budget reconciliation: Medicaid provides essential health coverage to over 50 million of our most vulnerable low-income children, working families, seniors, and people with disabilities. Neatly every state has already enacted painful cuts to its Medicaid program, including eligibility levels, services, and provider payments, and many states are facing deep Medicaid cuts again this year. Federal funding reductions would force states to implement even deeper cuts further restricting eligibility, eliminating or reducing critical health benefits, and cutting or freezing provider reimbursement rates. As a result, state Medicaid funding cuts could add millions more people to the ranks of the uninsured who would go without care, endangering their own health and public health.

The budget resolution should not place arbitrary caps on discretionary spending. The Administration has proposed statutory rules to cap discretionary spending over the next five years at its proposed 2006 spending levels. Such caps would require cuts of $200 billion in spending for domestic programs over

the next five years, including funding for education, veterans' health care, rental assistance, utility assistance, and childcare. Such cuts would have a devastating impact on agencies and communities that are already struggling to meet the basic needs of vulnerable citizens.

We ask that Congress not attempt to balance the federal budget through reductions in discretionary programs assisting low-income families. Because domestic discretionary spending constitutes only 16 percent of the federal budget, even deep cuts in these programs would offer little help with the federal deficit, while sharply reducing assistance to families struggling to meet their basic needs.

If Pay-As-You-Go (PAYGO) rules are included in budget reconciliation, they should be balanced. If Congress chooses to reinstate PAYGO provisions, we urge that they be implemented in a neutral manner that does not encourage revenue reductions at the expense of critical programs serving the nation's most vulnerable families. Under the President's proposed PAYGO rules, entitlement program increases would have to be offset by entitlement reductions elsewhere. In contrast, tax reductions would require no offsets in the federal budget. This unbalanced policy would unfairly burden programs such as Medicaid that provide families with critical assistance, and would likely fail to achieve significant deficit reductions.

We recognize that Congress is faced with many difficult choices. In your deliberations, please remember those who have the fewest choices.

Respectfully,

FR. LARRY SNYDER.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what does this charitable religious group ask? Less funding for family planning efforts? No. More tax cuts for the wealthy? No. Tougher bankruptcy standards to help credit card companies? No. Class action relief for big corporations? No. Yet those have been the White House's and the Congress's priorities so far this year, and those are their priorities in this budget. But what this charitable religious group convincingly asks that we do is far different. They ask for the following: They ask Congress and the President to make a higher priority in the budget of federal programs that protect and support low-income families and other vulnerable people in our society. Oppose the inclusion of Medicaid cuts in Fiscal Year 2006 budget reconciliation. The budget resolution should not place arbitrary caps on discretionary spending. And if pay-as-you-go rules are included in budget reconciliation, they should be balanced.

Now, these sound like reasonable proposals that would help the neediest among us. Those sound like priorities that would benefit the 35 million people—including 12 million children—now living below the federal poverty line. These proposals truly sound compassionate.

Some claim that the cuts in this budget are steps toward fiscal responsibility. But anyone who looks closely at this budget will see that any semblance of fiscal responsibility is lost because this budget leaves out a number of Governmental costs in the outyears. It leaves out the costs of ongoing U.S. responsibilities in Iraq and Afghanistan. It leaves out the cost of any repair of the alternative minimum tax system. It leaves out the cost of extending the President's tax cuts. And most incredibly, it leaves out any of the expected $4.5 trillion in costs for the President's plan to privatize Social Security. With these costs factored in to the equation, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office predicts that by 2012, the United States deficit will reach $527 billion, making each family's share of the debt an astonishing $85,967.

I take very seriously this warning from the Government Accountability Office in their February 2005 report titled ''21st Century Challenges: Reexamining the Base of the Federal Government:''

Absent significant changes on the spending and/or revenue sides of the budget, these long term deficits will encumber a growing share of federal resources and test the capacity of current and future generations to afford both today's and tomorrow's commitments. Continuing on this unsustainable path will gradually erode, if not suddenly damage, our economy, our standard of living and ultimately our national security.

This budget will plunge the United States into red ink as far as the eye can see. We have an obligation to be honest about the true costs of our budget to the people who are paying for it. If we continue to follow this path of fiscal irresponsibility, we will be leaving our children and grandchildren with a debt that they cannot possibly begin to afford. We need to turn around the massive loss in total revenues that we have seen during the Bush years. We need to strengthen our current Social Security system so that less money is drained from the trust fund. And we need to realign our budget priorities with the real needs of the American people and discard these politically motivated budget cuts.

I may be seen in this town as a progressive Senator from Vermont, but I have a conservative message for my colleagues today. We cannot continue down this reckless path of financial irresponsibility that we have been led down for the past four years. We need to get our fiscal house in order. Foreign investors are growing weary of our record debt. Our sons and daughters in uniform—including those in our National Guard and Reserves—are in harm's way overseas and need to be properly equipped and to have the health insurance they deserve. And essential programs for disadvantaged people across the country are being slashed to squeeze out more money for tax cuts to the wealthiest among us. This is not the American way. We are a more compassionate people than this budget resolution assumes we are.

The American people deserve better than fiscal and budget policies such as these, and I will vote against this budget resolution.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, much to my amazement, and I suspect that of the Senator from North Dakota, we are at the end of this exercise.

I will yield to the Senator from North Dakota for a closing comment. Before I do that, I want to thank the staffs on both sides, the majority staff and the Democratic staff. They have done exceptional work under extremely intense, very difficult conditions. They have worked night and day for weeks on this, and now in the last few days they have been going 24 hours a day.

I also thank the members of the staff of the Senate for their extreme courtesy and extraordinary professionalism. Amendments have been thrown at them in an aggressive way, and they have handled it well. We thank them for their professionalism.

I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, very briefly, I thank Senator GREGG for the tone he set not only in committee, but on the floor. I thank his staff for their professionalism and cooperation. We have gotten to know them and have worked closely with them and have enjoyed the experience.

I thank Members of the Senate who worked cooperatively. Just hours ago, we could have been faced with being here until 3 o'clock in the morning. Senators on both sides of the aisle really cooperated to allow us to complete business at this hour.

With all of that said, I urge Members to oppose this budget resolution. As I read it, this budget would increase the deficit by over $200 billion over and above what would happen if we just put this entire Government on autopilot. In addition, as I read this budget, it increases the debt each and every year by over $600 billion.

Mr. President, this is at a time when we already have record deficits and soaring debt and are increasingly vulnerable to the decisions of foreign central banks, as we have increased our borrowing from them by nearly 100 percent in just 3 years.

Finally, I don't think this budget has the right priorities for America. This has a dramatic cut in the COPS program, virtually eliminating it. It has cuts in things like firefighters grants and, at the same time, substantial tax cuts for the very wealthiest among us, a tax cut of more than $35,000 for millionaires in 2006 alone. That is at a time when we are reducing funding for a whole series of national priorities, including veterans and education beyond what was authorized.

Again, let me conclude by thanking colleagues on both sides for the professionalism with which this debate has been conducted.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, let me add a note of appreciation to the majority leader and the assistant leader on our side and the Democratic leader and his assistant leader. They have done an exceptional job of helping us on the bill.

Let me especially thank the Senator from North Dakota for the expeditious and fair way this bill was handled. It

was, in large part, due to his extraordinary effort. I thank him for that. I thank his staff, led by Mary Naylor, and I thank Scott Gudes of my staff and the extraordinary team I have for the great work they have done.

This is not the perfect bill, not the bill I would choose had I controlled the magic wand. But it is a bill that is in the middle of the process, and, hopefully, it will evolve into a better bill as we go through the process.

I hope colleagues will join in passing it, as it is our obligation as a Government that we have a budget in order to guide the Government as we go forward.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CONRAD. We will not end until the leader has worked things out, but the chairman was concluding his statement.

Mr. GREGG. My verbosity obviously got the best of me. I was concluded, and I thought it was an excellent conclusion. I appreciate the input of the Senator from Nevada. He brought it to an end at the appropriate time. I hope we can move forward.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank my staff very much for an extraordinary effort. Thank you very much.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we cannot leave until the majority leader gets on the floor. We have to find out what we are going to do when we get back here.

Mr. BIDEN. We can check the RECORD. Let's vote.

Mr. REID. Does the leader have an idea what we are going to do when we get back?

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, through the Chair, we are going to have a busy session when we get back. I would love to continue our discussion. We have a number of issues such as patient safety, and we have a couple of district judges that we need to do. We will see how far we get with welfare reform. We can have a busy 3 weeks.

Mr. REID. Tuesday will be our first vote?

Mr. FRIST. Tuesday would be our first vote, if we vote Tuesday. We would not vote on the first Monday back.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may I inquire of the distinguished majority leader, will there be a session tomorrow?

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I have not had a full discussion with the Democratic leader about a session tomorrow. We can either have a discussion now or during the vote. We will discuss during the vote whether or not we will have a session.

Mr. BYRD. If we are not going to have a session, my first inquiry would be, how many days will the RECORD remain open for statements?

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, through the Chair, in response to how many days the RECORD will be open, we will work that out as well during the vote.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, upon the conclusion of the vote, I may be recognized to make some statements for the RECORD.

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

The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 81 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	DeMint	Martinez
Allard	Dole	McCain
Allen	Domenici	McConnell
Bennett	Ensign	Murkowski
Bond	Enzi	Roberts
Brownback	Frist	Santorum
Bunning	Graham	Sessions
Burns	Grassley	Shelby
Burr	Gregg	Smith
Chambliss	Hagel	Specter
Coburn	Hatch	Stevens
Cochran	Hutchison	Sununu
Coleman	Inhofe	Talent
Collins	Isakson	Thomas
Cornyn	Kyl	Thune
Craig	Lott	Vitter
Crapo	Lugar	Warner

NAYS—49

Akaka	Durbin	Murray
Baucus	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Biden	Harkin	Obama
Bingaman	Inouye	Pryor
Boxer	Jeffords	Reed
Byrd	Johnson	Reid
Cantwell	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Carper	Kerry	Salazar
Chafee	Kohl	Sarbanes
Clinton	Landrieu	Schumer
Conrad	Lautenberg	Snowe
Corzine	Leahy	Stabenow
Dayton	Levin	Voinovich
DeWine	Lieberman	Wyden
Dodd	Lincoln	
Dorgan	Mikulski	

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), as amended, was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BENNETT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the narrow 51–49 vote on the budget resolution we just passed reveals the delicate balance that our leadership forged between spending restraints and the funding priorities of the American people. On the one hand, there is a clear need to dry up the red ink which threatens to plague our children, their children and generations to come. As the author of the Balanced Budget Constitutional amendment I am clearly aware of the need to maintain fiscal discipline.

At the same time, I also have a responsibility to the citizens of UT to make certain that important programs in our state receive the funding they need to operate on a sound basis.

Today, we cast many difficult votes which forced us to choose between those two competing priorities. One of those votes was on the Smith Medicaid amendment. I am extremely concerned about the $60 billion reduction in proposed spending growth for Medicaid in the President's budget. At the same time, it is important to note that even under the President's budget, Medicaid is projected to grow about 7 percent per year.

I feel that it is incumbent upon the Finance Committee and its members, Secretary Mike Leavitt and the President to work with States and communities to ensure that we preserve the safety net Medicaid offers to the elderly, the disabled and the low income. I have pledged to Chairman CHUCK GRASSLEY and Secretary Leavitt that I will work with them to ensure that there is adequate funding for this vital program. I am very concerned that we do right by this program which helps so many, many Utahns each year. We can't allow it to be torn apart.

Another difficult amendment facing the Senate today was the amendment offered by Senator NORM COLEMAN to restore funding in the budget for the Community Development Block Grant program, CDBG. As my colleagues are aware, I wrote to the Budget Committee and urged strongly that they include adequate room for the appropriators to fund the CDBG program. I was very disappointed that funding was not reflected in the budget reported by the Senate Budget Committee.

I consider the Community Development Block grant program to be an effective tool and an extremely important program for communities throughout the State of Utah. I feel it is important to note that the purpose of the Budget Resolution is to set out the framework for the FY 2006 priorities which will determine the allocations provided to each of the Appropriations Subcommittees. We all know it is very difficult to begin the appropriations process without having a budget in place to guide our work. Whether or not the final budget agreement which emerges from the House-Senate conference includes an explicit funding reference for the CDBG or not, action will turn to the Appropriations Committee which has the full authority, and indeed the responsibility, to provide funding for this program.

Let me make it perfectly clear to the communities in Utah that I will not drop my fight to secure adequate funding for the CDBG.

I want to assure my colleagues that my votes on the budget today do not reflect any lessened commitment on my part to the CDBG, Medicaid or other vital programs in UT.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the budget resolution that the Senate just voted on.

This budget is irresponsible and takes the country in the wrong direction. It adds to our Nation's debt, continues to slash taxes for those in our Nation who least need tax breaks, and would enact massive cuts in critical domestic priorities. And it is for these reasons that I was unable to support this budget resolution.

The budget of the United States is a declaration of our Nation's moral priorities. It is a statement of where our Nation is now, and where we aim to be, years down the line. On all of these counts, this budget fails to reflect this Nation's values.

I know that Members of this body have strong differences on our budget priorities, but I think that we can all agree on the following two items. First, that our Nation is currently experiencing record-high deficits.

Second, that these deficits are impeding our ability to meet our needs in education, transportation, communication, health care, national security, and homeland security. There are strong views on both sides on how we got here. I believe that our change from record surpluses to record deficits was not an accident, nor was it a product of unforeseen events, but was a direct result of the fiscal policies pursued by the current administration. This result was not unforseen, not unexpected, and in some corridors even desired since there are those who have told us that deficits are ''good'' on the theory that chronically high deficits will preclude what they consider to be unwise and wasteful government spending, by which they mean spending on education, transportation, research and development, among other priorities.

Unfortunately, the budget that just passed does not in good faith address our record deficits. In fact, it worsens our Nation's fiscal health. This budget is a continuation of the reckless and unfair policies that have been pushed forward by this administration since its first days in office, and by its supporters in Congress. The majority's budget resolution would make deficits and debt worse, not better as they have claimed. Over the next 5 years, this budget proposal would increase deficits by $130 billion over what they would be under current law. And while the majority claims to be cutting the deficit in half with this budget resolution, I am afraid that that this assertion is false. This budget resolution actually leaves out large and significant costs, and in so doing masks the true size of the deficit.

The reality of the fact is that when omitted costs are factored in, such as the 10-year cost of AMT reform, $770 billion, and ongoing war costs, $380 billion, the operating deficits will remain above $500 billion and climb to $569 billion in 2010. These figures do not include the President's Social Security privatization plan, which would likely add an additional $4.4 trillion over 20 years to the national debt.

To make matters worse, by failing to provide estimates of the effects of its proposals beyond 2010, this budget resolution, obscures the fact that its tax cuts would increase the deficit by a much larger amount in the second 5 years—2011 through 2015—than in the first 5 years—2006 through 2010. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the tax cuts proposed in the budget would increase the deficit by another $1.4 trillion from 2011 through 2015.

The national debt would continue to skyrocket under this budget resolution. In 2001, when President Bush took office we were actually having serious conversations about paying off the national debt by 2008. Under this budget resolution, including the costs of AMT reform and ongoing war costs, we will see the publicly held debt go from its current level of $4.3 trillion to at least $5.9 trillion by 2008. In 2001, this would have seemed inconceivable. This budget resolution also includes a reconciliation instruction for a $446 billion debt increase which means that a debt increase could happen in an expedited manner without affording the Senate full and proper consideration. While there was an amendment to remove the reconciliation instruction on the debt increase, it unfortunately did not pass.

Over the past few years, the administration has told us that figures like the deficit and the national debt are merely numbers that have little impact on Americans' lives. This is yet another reflection of an administration out of touch with reality.

What will be the ultimate result of our record budget and trade deficits? Higher interest rates on small business loans, families' mortgages, and education loans. These amount to a tax hike on working families and small businesses.

Americans may wonder, how does their government finance these deficits? The answer is that our government does much what many families or businesses do when faced with bills they can't pay—we borrow money. The money our government spends has to come from somewhere—and with each passing year, more and more of it comes from foreign nations.

Since President Bush took office, foreign debt holdings have increased almost 100 percent. We now owe $700 billion to Japan, $200 billion to China, and $69 billion to South Korea. This makes us more vulnerable to the decisions of foreign central bankers since they can decide that it's time to collect their debt—and we will have to pay up. If this were to happen, the implications for our economy would be catastrophic.

The majority had an opportunity this week to truly tackle the skyrocketing deficit—by restoring a strong pay-as-you-go rule, PAYGO, that would require any new mandatory spending or tax legislation to be paid for, or require 60 votes to pass. In 1983, I was one of the first Senators to offer a pay-as-you-go budget. It is smart budgeting; it works. One major reason why we were able to move from deficit to surplus in the 1990s is because we had a strong PAYGO rule. Unfortunately, the majority refused to support this important amendment this week, thereby sending a message that it is okay that we continue to drown in deficits.

As I said at the outset, the budget that the Senate just passed is not just a fiscal document. It is a statement about the majority's values. And just as this budget is fiscally irresponsible, it is also morally irresponsible.

This budget will cause pain and debilitation to working families throughout our country. In essence this budget tells working families that they need to do more with less. This budget tells them that as a nation we just do not have money to buy new computers for schools, to provide better health care, to provide services to the poor, the sick, the frail, and the elderly. This is appalling, but what makes it even more so is that at the same time, this budget turns around to the affluent of this country and gives more to them. This budget finds room to include tax cuts for millionaires, but does not have enough for the needs of middle-class families.

Despite record deficits and debt, and despite our efforts to address this, the budget before us provides for another $70 billion in tax cuts over 5 years using the ''reconciliation'' process which is a fast-track process that ensures that such legislation would need 51, rather than 60 votes to pass. ''Reconciliation'' was originally established to ensure fiscal responsibility, and here the majority is now using it to extend the tax cuts on dividends and capital gains. These tax breaks, which would average $35,000 a year, would disproportionately go to households that have incomes in excess of $1 million, a group that constitutes only 0.2 percent of all households.

Such policies will bankrupt the country and unfairly place the burden on the backs of middle-class workers. I strongly believe that this budget sets us on a dangerous course when we consider the challenges we face in the coming years.

In the global economy of the 21st century, America faces ever-increasing competition from foreign nations. How we fare in that competition will be a direct consequence of our willingness to make concrete investments in the capabilities of our greatest and most abundant resource: the American people.

Investing in the American people begins with ensuring each and every American receives a quality education. A quality education—beginning when a child is only a few years old, and continuing through college and beyond—is the key that opens the doorway to a lifetime of opportunity. Our competitors—nations like India and China—have realized that. They are making serious investments in the intellectual capacity of their citizens.

What are we doing?

One in every three programs slated for elimination in the President's budget are education programs. Aside from the eliminations, No Child Left Behind is underfunded by $12 billion, special education is underfunded by $3.6 billion, and afterschool programs are underfunded by $1.25 billion. How does the administration expect schools to raise the level of achievement for students without the resources needed to do it?

In today's global economy, we can ill afford to give our children any less than the best education available. As I have said many times before, education may be expensive but ignorance costs even more.

I was also appalled when I saw how little this budget provides for concrete investments in scientific progress.

In real terms, the total Federal R&D portfolio would decline for the first time since 1996. Total Federal support of research—basic and applied—would fall 0.6 percent to $54.8 billion.

The proposed Federal Research and Development portfolio in fiscal year 2006 is $132.3 billion, 0.6 percent or $733 million above this year's funding level, far short of the $2.2 billion increase needed to keep pace with inflation.

In many respects, I feel as if those who wrote this budget have forgotten the lessons of history. If we look at the groundbreaking scientific innovations over the past two centuries, we learn that an overwhelming number of them have been inextricably linked to real investments this Nation has made in research and development.

Where will we see the next great scientific achievement? Will it be here in the United States? Or will it be in China? Or England? Or Japan? Or Italy? The answer to that question lies in our willingness to make the right choices. Unfortunately, this budget does just the opposite.

While the budget contains an overall shortfall in R&D funding, I am pleased, however, that an amendment that was introduced by our colleague Senator GEORGE ALLEN and myself was accepted and included in the budget resolution. The budget had proposed to cut over $700 million out of NASA's Aeronautics budget over the next five years. Our amendment increases subsonic and hypersonic aeronautics research and development funding by $1.58 billion over 5 years, with an offset.

Aerospace and aviation are important assets for America and for my home State of Connecticut. In addition to its obvious national security benefits, the aeronautics industry makes a critical contribution to our Nation's economic growth and standard of living. We cannot continue to just give the minimum to aeronautics research and development if we want to be able to effectively compete in aeronautics and in the world economy. Acceptance of this amendment is a step forward in demonstrating that the United States is committed to our aviation and aeronautics industry and innovation.

If I listed every area in which this budget fails our Nation, I would be here much longer than my allotted time. But I would like to quickly outline just a few more of the critical priorities that this budget has shortchanged in order to provide tax cuts for millionaires:

Veterans funding would by cut by $14.5 billion. This administration constantly preaches the rhetoric of supporting our troops, yet it has consistently come up short when it comes to meeting the needs of those who have made great sacrifices for our freedoms.

Just as this budget fails those who protected our freedoms abroad, it endangers those who keep us safe here at home. It cuts firefighter assistance grants—grants that have helped fire departments buy new trucks, safety equipment, radios, hazmat suits—by 31 percent. It cuts funding for the COPS program—which supports police officers throughout our nation—by 96 percent.

We have known since the first roads of the Roman Empire that the fate of nations hinges in many respects on their ability to move people, goods, and services as efficiently as possible. Yet this budget cuts $15.9 billion in transportation funding.

Reductions in natural resource and environmental programs would total $29 billion over five years. This budget also fails to protect the Arctic refuge from drilling.

The budget also cuts child care assistance for 300,000 children through 2009. It is absurd to be cutting child care assistance for struggling parents at the same time that the President proposes that more low-income parents work longer hours. It is not just absurd, it is irresponsible. If you want welfare reform, you simply must have child care, as well.

This budget would terminate the Community Services Block Grant, leaving working poor families affected by the President's budget cuts with nowhere to turn for assistance.

I know that we can do better than this budget. Actually, we must do better, so that we can truly move our country forward, and do what is best for families everywhere.

HORIZON MINERS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Smithers, WV, is a town of 904 residents on the banks of the Kanawha River, just outside of the state capitol of Charleston. Last October some 1,500 active coal miners and retirees, along with their wives, their children, their families, sat inside a hot and crowded gymnasium trying to cope with how, in a few short weeks, their lives had been turned upside down.

Two months earlier, a bankruptcy judge whom they had never met, and who resides in another state, vitiated their collective bargaining agreement. In West Virginia, this judge cost 270 active miners their jobs, and, along with 1,270 retirees and their dependents, rescinded their health benefits. These folks gathered in that gymnasium trying to understand what had happened and what could be done.

They are the Horizon miners. They are good, strong people. They devote themselves to their labors, and take pride in their work. They are committed, hardworking individuals who contribute much and ask for nothing more than simple fairness. And so imagine how they are made to feel, the anguish, frustration, and betrayal they are made to feel, when they learn the health benefits they labored for, the job security they I toiled for, has been taken away.

One can hardly blame these workers for feeling as though the world has ganged up on them. Their former employer, Horizon Natural Resources, for which they loyally worked for many years, had lobbied intensely in bankruptcy court to eliminate the health benefits of its own employees. In a U.S. court, where every honest man should expect a fair shake from an impartial judge, these workers were betrayed by the judicial system.

The judge, with the rap of a gavel, vitiated the 1992 Coal Industry Retiree Health Benefit Act, legislation passed by the Congress and signed by the President, to provide qualified coal miners with guaranteed health benefits, a promise dating back to President Harry S. Truman's pledge to John L. Lewis in 1946. One judge overturned a 60-year-old promise that had been codified by the Congress and endorsed by three Presidents. It was a disgraceful, shameful act.

These Horizon coal miners, betrayed by their employer, beguiled by the courts, now turn to their elected representatives in the Congress for help. And, thanks in large part to the efforts of Congressman NICK RAHALL and Senators ROCKEFELLER and SPECTER, the Senate is in a position to get something done.

Building on Senator ROCKEFELLER's efforts, Senator SPECTER has introduced legislation to help the Horizon miners. I urge the Judiciary Committee to take a careful look at that legislation. I urge the committee to hold hearings, and to listen to the plight of those coal miners and their families affected by Horizon's bankruptcy. This is an issue that affects not just the Horizon coal miners, but workers across the Nation who have seen their pension and health benefits taken from them.

It is happening across West Virginia. It is happening across the Appalachian region. It is happening in Indiana, Kentucky, and Illinois. In West Virginia, it is affecting elderly workers who are near retirement. What security they had is gone. What they had been promised, they have no time to get back. In such circumstances, it is incumbent upon the Congress to take action.

I urge the Finance Committee, as well as the Judiciary Committee, to consider these issues. I urge both committees to hold hearings and solicit