

bus station by the vanload, where they head elsewhere in the U.S. The number of "absconders"—those who never appear for deportation—is over 90 percent of those released, a number now estimated to be approaching 75,000. Already the number of OTMs captured and released is more so far this year, then for all of last year.

The Southern Border is being left utterly unprotected, and there is the real possibility that terrorists can—or already are—exploiting this series of holes in our law enforcement system along the southern border. These are the things we know. There is no way of even guessing how many others are entering the country, but who are not passing through the hands of government law enforcement officers, so Mr. OBEY's instructions to our appropriators is extremely timely.

This is a clear and present danger inside the United States, and the number of released illegal immigrants not returning for deportation grows by the hundreds each week. This is willfully ignoring a complex problem that undermines our national objective: to take the war to the enemy so we do not have to fight the war on terror inside our country. It is little wonder that private citizens are taking the law into their own hands to try to stem the tide of OTMs coming into our country. But private militias—operating without the color of law—is not the answer. We must secure our borders so private citizens do not feel the need to do so.

Our budget reflects the values and priorities of the American people. Consider what the 2005 budget did not include:

The Intelligence Reform bill that became law in December, 2004, mandated 10,000 Border Patrol agents over 5 years, 20,000 annually. The President's budget funded 210 BP agents, the senate added 1,050 agents. The House must stand up and add the full 2,000.

Intelligence Reform mandated an increase of 8,000 beds in detention facilities annually for the next 5 years, still not nearly enough to hold all those coming in the U.S. . . . yet the President's budget proposal provides for only about 1,900 new detention space beds—over 6,000 beds short of the congressional mandate passed in December, 2004. We can add all the Border Patrol agents we want, but without a place to hold these OTMs, the problem remains.

Grants to reimburse local law enforcement officers that also hold illegal immigrants for the federal government were slashed, adding to the problem. I was a law enforcement officer in my previous life. If we don't have the border officers to stop the OTMs crossing the border . . . if we don't have the room to hold the ones we catch . . . if we don't put our money where our mouth is, we are sending a dangerous signal to those who may wish to do us harm. Until we send a signal that those who cross our borders illegally . . . until we send a signal that when we catch you we will hold you until you are deported . . . until we honestly face the amount of money it will take to deal with these things, OTMs will continue to flock to the U.S.

We must send that signal today. Homeland security must be about the security of our people and our property, it cannot be budget driven as it is today.

Lastly, as a fiscal conservative and member of the Armed Services committee, I know it is ultimately the responsibility of Congress—not

the Administration—to properly spend money on military operations. To that end, I thank our Ranking Democrat on appropriations for including in this motion a provision requiring future funding for our military operations to be included in the President's budget.

All the money we appropriate here is the people's money and we must be good stewards of it. To rush through special bills to fund the military when committees of jurisdiction have not had the opportunity to review the bills is an abdication of our responsibility.

I encourage the members to support this motion to instruct our conferees on the Supplemental appropriations bill to include funding for border security and to require further military funding requests move through our regular authorization process for the fullest scrutiny by the authorizing committees.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the grounds that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5:30 p.m. today.

□ 1737

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. NUSSLE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the

Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MS. HERSETH
Ms. HERSETH. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Herseth of South Dakota moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 95 be instructed, to the maximum extent possible within the scope of the conference—

(1) to recede to the following findings of the Senate: (A) Medicaid provides essential health care and long-term care services to more than 50 million low-income children, pregnant women, parents, individuals with disabilities, and senior citizens; and (B) Medicaid is a Federal guarantee that ensures the most vulnerable will have access to needed medical services;

(2) to strike reconciliation instructions to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and recede to the Senate by including language declaring that a reconciliation bill shall not be reported that achieves spending reductions that would (A) undermine the role the Medicaid program plays as a critical component of the health care system of the United States; (B) cap Federal Medicaid spending, or otherwise shift Medicaid cost burdens to State or local governments and their taxpayers and health providers; or (C) undermine the Federal guarantee of health insurance coverage Medicaid provides, which would threaten not only the health care safety net of the United States, but the entire health care system;

(3) to recede to the Senate on section 310 (entitled "Reserve Fund for the Bipartisan Medicaid Commission") of the Senate amendment; and

(4) to make adjustments necessary to offset the cost of these instructions without resulting in any increase in the deficit for any fiscal year covered by the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH).

Ms. HERSETH. Madam Speaker, to explain the motion, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The House-passed budget directs the Committee on Energy and Commerce to cut spending on programs within its jurisdiction by \$20 billion over 5 years. The vast majority of this \$20 billion in spending cuts, if not all of it, will likely fall on Medicaid. I and many of my colleagues in this body strongly oppose this language.

The majority of our counterparts in the Senate apparently share some of our concerns. The Senate approved an amendment by Senators SMITH and BINGAMAN to strike reconciliation instructions in the Senate budget that would have directed the Committee on Finance to cut spending by \$15 billion over 5 years, which all would have been from Medicaid. The Senate amendment