

Strickland	Tiaht	Weldon (PA)
Sullivan	Tiberi	Weller
Sweeney	Turner	Westmoreland
Tancredo	Upton	Whitfield
Tanner	Viscolosky	Wicker
Taylor (MS)	Walden (OR)	Wilson (NM)
Taylor (NC)	Walsh	Wilson (SC)
Terry	Wamp	Wolf
Thomas	Wasserman	Wynn
Thompson (MS)	Schultz	Young (AK)
Thornberry	Weldon (FL)	Young (FL)

NAYS—106

Ackerman	Johnson (IL)	Petri
Andrews	Johnson, E. B.	Ramstad
Baird	Jones (OH)	Rangel
Baldwin	Kelly	Rothman
Bass	Kildee	Rush
Becerra	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sabo
Blumenauer	Kirk	Sánchez, Linda
Boswell	Kucinich	T.
Capps	Leach	Sanchez, Loretta
Cardin	Lee	Sanders
Case	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Castle	LoBiondo	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano
Cooper	Maloney	Shays
Cummings	Markey	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	McCollum (MN)	Smith (NJ)
DeGette	McDermott	Smith (WA)
Delahunt	McKinney	Solis
Dingell	McNulty	Stark
Doggett	Meeke (NY)	Stupak
Ehlers	Menendez	Tauscher
Engel	Michaud	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	Millender-	Tierney
Farr	McDonald	Towns
Filner	Miller, George	Udall (CO)
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Moore (WI)	Udall (NM)
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Van Hollen
Grijalva	Napolitano	Velázquez
Hastings (FL)	Oberstar	Waters
Hinchea	Obey	Watson
Hoekstra	Olver	Watt
Holt	Owens	Waxman
Honda	Pallone	Weiner
Inslee	Pastor	Wexler
Jackson (IL)	Paul	Woolsey
Johnson (CT)	Payne	Wu

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Burton (IN)	Saxton
-------------	--------

NOT VOTING—18

Baca	Hostettler	McGovern
Davis, Jo Ann	Hyde	Miller, Gary
Emanuel	Istook	Myrick
Gutierrez	Johnson, Sam	Radanovich
Harman	Jones (NC)	Reyes
Hefley	Koibe	Roybal-Allard

□ 0504

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed her vote from "nay" to "yea." So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VACATING ORDERING OF YEAS AND NAYS ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 633, HONORING HELEN SEWELL ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the ordering of the yeas and nays on House Resolution 633 be vacated to the end that the Chair put the question de novo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY)

that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 633.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1932, DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 640, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 1932) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 202(a) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 640, the conference report is considered read.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have a plan to reform the government and achieve savings. We present that plan to the House.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. We have before us a conference report that everybody should understand there has really been no conference in which House and Senate Democrats have had any meaningful role.

Our objection to this bill begins with its title: The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005. Let us be honest, this bill does not reduce the deficit. When this reconciliation bill with spending cuts is paired with its counterpart, the reconciliation bill with tax cuts, the deficit is actually increased, not decreased; and the increase in the deficit gets worse when you add, as I think you should, the \$50 billion in other tax cuts passed by the House over the last few months.

At the outset, the proponents of this bill called it necessary in order to help pay for hurricanes Katrina and Rita. That has proven to be a false claim, too. This bill has nothing to do with paying for Katrina. It has everything to do with facilitating further tax cuts. This bill comes out of a budget resolution that calls for a total of \$106 billion in new and additional tax cuts, \$70 billion reconciled, \$36 billion unreconciled.

So the spending cuts in this bill are really just the first step in a three-step process. Step two will come when the tax cuts reconciliation bill emerges from conference. When these two bills are paired, the result will be a deficit bigger by about \$60 billion over 5 years.

Then there is a third step. There is an increase in the national debt pending, an increase in the national debt ceiling of \$781 billion necessary to accommodate budgets like the 2006 budget being passed here tonight. This increase was deemed approved when the Republican budget resolution passed the House several months ago.

Over the last 4 fiscal years, to make room for budgets of the Bush administration and budgets that have been passed by the majority in this House, we have had to raise the legal debt ceiling of the United States by \$3.15 trillion to accommodate those budgets.

Once upon a time, the purpose of reconciliation was to rein in the deficit; but as you can see from the charts I am about to put up, and I knew this was just what you wanted me to serve you for breakfast this morning, more numbers and more charts, so I did not dis-

appoint. First of all, when you put this chart up, you can see what the debt increases have been over the last 4 or 5 fiscal years: \$3.15 trillion. As Casey Stengel said, "If you don't believe it, you can look it up." \$3.15 trillion.

Next, let me show you what reconciliation in past years has accomplished as opposed to what reconciliation this year will accomplish in terms of reducing the deficit. In past years, for example the Bush budget summit in 1990, the deficit reduction due to reconciliation was \$482 billion. In the Clinton budget in 1993, the deficit reduction due to reconciliation was \$433 billion. In the balanced budget agreement of 1997, reconciliation produced savings of \$118 billion over 5 years. This bill saves nothing. It aggravates and worsens the deficit.

Now, it is fair to ask: Why have the Republicans, those who put this budget together, why have they put spending cuts in one bill and tax cuts in another bill? Why did they not just combine the two so we could keep tabs on everything with one reconciliation bill? Which is typically what we have done in the past.

Well, there is a reason for this hiatus between spending cuts and tax cuts. The spending cuts made by this bill will hit the young, the old, the sick, and the poor, and hit them rather hard. The savings realized from these spending cuts will help offset tax cuts for top-bracket taxpayers. Our Republican colleagues want to avoid that connection, so they have produced two separate bills, one for tax cuts, and then a little later on, one for spending cuts.

Who bears the brunt of these bills? Single mothers still do. Despite some moderation in the effect of the cuts that were proposed originally, single mothers still take about a \$2 billion hit. Students struggling to pay for their college education. The hit on student loans is \$12.7 billion. The sick and the poor, whose only access to medical care is Medicaid. Medicaid still suffers a hit of \$7 billion.

So these cuts have been moderated in the conference with the Senate, but