



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 2002

No. 33

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Sylvia Sumter, Unity of Washington Church, Washington, D.C. offered the following prayer:

Let us come together. O Heavenly and most gracious Creator, God, we acknowledge Your presence and blessed Spirit, for You alone are omnipotent, full of truth, love and mercy; and we are a Nation under Your righteousness and justice. As we seek Your countenance, let the light of Your infinite wisdom be the guiding force for the Members of this Congress and the work of the United States House of Representatives. Grant that they may endeavor to do Your will for the absolute goodness and blessing of this great land.

May each one work from the place that is the highest and best within them for the good of all in our Nation, and may they be abundantly blessed in so doing. May the light of God surround them; may the love of God enfold them; may the power of God protect them; and may the presence of God watch over them, for wherever You are, all is well. And so it is. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 351, nays 55, answered "present" 1, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—351

Abercrombie	Carson (IN)	Fletcher	Inslee	Mica	Royce
Ackerman	Carson (OK)	Foley	Isakson	Millender-	Ryan (WI)
Akin	Castle	Forbes	Israel	McDonald	Ryun (KS)
Allen	Chabot	Ford	Issa	Miller, Dan	Sanchez
Andrews	Chambliss	Frank	Istook	Miller, Gary	Sanders
Armey	Clayton	Franklin	Jackson (IL)	Miller, Jeff	Sandlin
Baca	Clyburn	Frelinghuysen	Jefferson	Mink	Sawyer
Bachus	Coble	Frost	Jenkins	Mollohan	Saxton
Baker	Collins	Galleghy	John	Moran (KS)	Schiff
Baldacci	Combest	Ganske	Johnson (CT)	Moran (VA)	Schrock
Baldwin	Conyers	Gekas	Johnson (IL)	Morella	Scott
Balleguer	Cooksey	Gephardt	Johnson, E. B.	Murtha	Sensenbrenner
Barcia	Cox	Gibbons	Johnson, Sam	Myrick	Serrano
Barrett	Coyne	Gilcrest	Jones (NC)	Nadler	Shaw
Bartlett	Cramer	Gilman	Kanjorski	Napolitano	Shays
Barton	Crenshaw	Gonzalez	Kaptur	Neal	Sherman
Bass	Crowley	Goode	Keller	Nethercutt	Sherwood
Becerra	Cubin	Goodlatte	Kelly	Ney	Shimkus
Bentsen	Culberson	Gordon	Kennedy (RI)	Northup	Shuster
Bereuter	Cummings	Goss	Kerns	Norwood	Simmons
Berkley	Cunningham	Graham	Kildee	Nussle	Simpson
Berman	Davis (CA)	Granger	Kilpatrick	Obey	Skeen
Berry	Davis (FL)	Graves	Kind (WI)	Olver	Skelton
Biggert	Davis (IL)	Green (TX)	King (NY)	Ortiz	Slaughter
Bilirakis	Davis, Jo Ann	Green (WI)	Kingston	Osborne	Smith (MI)
Bishop	Davis, Tom	Greenwood	Kirk	Ose	Smith (NJ)
Blumenauer	Deal	Grucci	Kleczka	Otter	Smith (TX)
Blunt	DeGette	Hall (OH)	Knollenberg	Owens	Smith (WA)
Boehler	DeLauro	Hall (TX)	Kolbe	Pallone	Snyder
Boehner	DeLay	Hansen	LaFalce	Pascarell	Solis
Bonilla	DeMint	Harman	LaHood	Pastor	Souder
Bonior	Diaz-Balart	Hart	Lampson	Paul	Spratt
Bono	Dicks	Hastings (WA)	Langevin	Payne	Stearns
Boozman	Doggett	Hayes	Latham	Pelosi	Stenholm
Boswell	Dooley	Hayworth	LaTourrette	Pence	Stump
Boucher	Doolittle	Heger	Leach	Peterson (PA)	Sullivan
Boyd	Dreier	Hilleary	Lee	Petri	Tanner
Brady (TX)	Duncan	Hinojosa	Levin	Pickering	Tauscher
Brown (FL)	Dunn	Hobson	Lewis (CA)	Pitts	Taylor (NC)
Brown (SC)	Dunn	Hoeffel	Lewis (KY)	Pombo	Thomas
Bryant	Edwards	Hoekstra	Linder	Portman	Thornberry
Burr	Ehlers	Holden	Lofgren	Price (NC)	Thune
Burton	Emerson	Holt	Lowey	Pryce (OH)	Thurman
Callahan	Engel	Honda	Lucas (KY)	Putnam	Tiberi
Calvert	Eshoo	Houley	Lucas (OK)	Quinn	Toomey
Camp	Etheridge	Horn	Luther	Radanovich	Towns
Cannon	Evans	Hostettler	Lynch	Rehberg	Turner
Cantor	Everett	Houghton	Maloney (CT)	Reyes	Upton
Capito	Farr	Hoyer	Maloney (NY)	Reynolds	Velazquez
Capps	Ferguson	Hulshof	Manzullo	Riley	Vitter
Cardin	Flake	Hunter	Mascara	Rivers	Walden
		Hyde	Matsui	Rodriguez	Walsh
			McCarthy (MO)	Roemer	Wamp
			McCarthy (NY)	Rogers (KY)	Watson (CA)
			McCollum	Rogers (MI)	Watt (NC)
			McCrery	Rohrabacher	Watts (OK)
			McGovern	Ros-Lehtinen	Waxman
			McHugh	Ross	Weiner
			McInnis	Rothman	Weldon (FL)
			McIntyre	Roukema	Whitfield
			McKeon	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (NM)
			Meehan		
			Meek (FL)		
			Meeks (NY)		

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1005

Wilson (SC)	Woolsey	Wynn
Wolf	Wu	Young (FL)

NAYS—55

Aderholt	Hinchey	Pomeroy
Baird	Jackson-Lee	Ramstad
Borski	(TX)	Sabo
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Schaffer
Brown (OH)	Kennedy (MN)	Schakowsky
Capuano	Kucinich	Strickland
Condit	Larsen (WA)	Stupak
Costello	Larson (CT)	Taylor (MS)
Crane	Lewis (GA)	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	LoBiondo	Thompson (MS)
English	Matheson	Tiahrt
Filner	McDermott	Udall (CO)
Fossella	McNulty	Udall (NM)
Gillmor	Menendez	Visclosky
Gutknecht	Miller, George	Waters
Hastings (FL)	Moore	Watkins (OK)
Hefley	Oberstar	Weller
Hill	Peterson (MN)	Wicker
Hilliard	Phelps	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—27

Barr	Fattah	Shows
Blagojevich	Gutierrez	Stark
Buyer	Lantos	Tauzin
Clay	Lipinski	Terry
Clement	Markey	Tierney
Deutsch	Platts	Traficant
Dingell	Rush	Weldon (PA)
Doyle	Sessions	Wexler
Ehrlich	Shadegg	Young (AK)

□ 1024

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

REVEREND SYLVIA SUMTER

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, please join me in welcoming the Reverend Sylvia Sumter, the Senior Minister at Unity Church here in Washington, D.C., and today's guest Chaplain.

It is most fitting that in this month dedicated to recognizing the many accomplishments of women, this Chamber is blessed by the words of a truly inspirational woman. Entering into a nontraditional vocation, Reverend Sumter has excelled, and has become a role model for women everywhere who wish to assume pastoral duties.

Prior to coming to Washington, D.C., Reverend Sumter served as the Chairperson of Communication Studies and Skills for the Unity School of Religious Studies in Unity, Missouri. Reverend Sumter has traveled around the country conducting workshops and seminars, as well as serving as guest

speaker at churches, institutions of higher learning, and professional and business organizations, as she held her constant commitment preaching her faith in God, and empowering her gender.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Reverend Sumter for all of her accomplishments in her field, and to thank women throughout the world for those agendas and vocations they espouse to advance the status of women every day.

URGING GOVERNMENT OF UKRAINE TO ENSURE A DEMOCRATIC, TRANSPARENT, AND FAIR ELECTION PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 339, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 339, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 1, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—408

Abercrombie	Calvert	Duncan
Ackerman	Camp	Dunn
Aderholt	Cannon	Edwards
Akin	Cantor	Ehlers
Allen	Capito	Emerson
Andrews	Capps	Engel
Armey	Capuano	English
Baca	Cardin	Eshoo
Bachus	Carson (IN)	Etheridge
Baird	Carson (OK)	Evans
Baker	Castle	Everett
Baldacci	Chabot	Farr
Baldwin	Chambliss	Fattah
Ballenger	Clayton	Ferguson
Barcia	Clement	Filner
Barr	Clyburn	Flake
Barrett	Coble	Fletcher
Bartlett	Collins	Foley
Barton	Combest	Forbes
Bass	Condit	Fossella
Becerra	Conyers	Frank
Bentsen	Cooksey	Frelinghuysen
Bereuter	Costello	Frost
Berkley	Coyne	Gallely
Berman	Cramer	Ganske
Berry	Crane	Gekas
Biggert	Crenshaw	Gephardt
Bilirakis	Crowley	Gibbons
Bishop	Cubin	Gilchrest
Blumenauer	Culberson	Gillmor
Blunt	Cummings	Gilman
Boehlert	Cunningham	Gonzalez
Boehner	Davis (CA)	Goode
Bonilla	Davis (IL)	Goodlatte
Bonior	Davis, Jo Ann	Gordon
Bono	Davis, Tom	Goss
Boozman	Deal	Graham
Borski	DeFazio	Granger
Boswell	DeGette	Graves
Boucher	Delahunt	Green (TX)
Boyd	DeLauro	Green (WI)
Brady (PA)	DeLay	Greenwood
Brady (TX)	DeMint	Grucci
Brown (FL)	Deutsch	Gutknecht
Brown (OH)	Diaz-Balart	Hall (OH)
Brown (SC)	Dicks	Hall (TX)
Bryant	Doggett	Hansen
Burr	Dooley	Harman
Burton	Doolittle	Hart
Buyer	Doyle	Hastings (FL)
Callahan	Dreier	Hastings (WA)

Hayes	McCarthy (NY)	Sabo
Hayworth	McCollum	Sanchez
Hefley	McCrery	Sandlin
Herger	McDermott	Sawyer
Hill	McGovern	Saxton
Hilleary	McHugh	Schaffer
Hilliard	McInnis	Schakowsky
Hinchev	McIntyre	Schiff
Hinojosa	McKeon	Schrock
Hobson	McKinney	Scott
Hoefel	McNulty	Sensenbrenner
Hoekstra	Meehan	Serrano
Holden	Meek (FL)	Sessions
Holt	Meeks (NY)	Shaw
Honda	Menendez	Shays
Hooley	Millender-McDonald	Sherman
Horn	Miller, Dan	Sherwood
Hostettler	Miller, Gary	Shimkus
Houghton	Miller, George	Shuster
Hoyer	Miller, Jeff	Simmons
Hulshof	Mink	Simpson
Hunter	Mollohan	Skeen
Hyde	Moore	Skelton
Inslee	Moran (KS)	Slaughter
Isakson	Moran (VA)	Smith (MI)
Israel	Morella	Smith (NJ)
Issa	Myrick	Smith (TX)
Istook	Nadler	Smith (WA)
Jackson (IL)	Napolitano	Snyder
Jackson-Lee	Neal	Solis
(TX)	Ney	Souder
Jefferson	Northup	Spratt
Jenkins	Norwood	Stearns
John	Nussle	Stenholm
Johnson (IL)	Oberstar	Strickland
Johnson, E. B.	Obey	Stump
Johnson, Sam	Oliver	Stupak
Jones (NC)	Ortiz	Sununu
Jones (OH)	Osborne	Sweeney
Kanjorski	Ose	Tancredo
Kaptur	Otter	Tanner
Keller	Owens	Tauscher
Kelly	Oxley	Taylor (MS)
Kennedy (MN)	Pallone	Taylor (NC)
Kennedy (RI)	Pascarell	Terry
Kerns	Pastor	Thompson (CA)
Kildee	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)
Kilpatrick	Pence	Thornberry
Kind (WI)	Peterson (MN)	Thune
King (NY)	Peterson (PA)	Thurman
Kingston	Petri	Tiahrt
Kirk	Phelps	Tiberi
Kleczka	Pickering	Tierney
Knollenberg	Pitts	Toomey
Kolbe	Platts	Towns
Kucinich	Pombo	Turner
LaFalce	Pomeroy	Udall (CO)
LaHood	Portman	Udall (NM)
Lampson	Price (NC)	Upton
Langevin	Pryce (OH)	Velazquez
Larsen (WA)	Putnam	Visclosky
Larson (CT)	Quinn	Vitter
Latham	Radanovich	Walden
LaTourette	Rahall	Walsh
Leach	Ramstad	Wamp
Lee	Rangel	Waters
Levin	Regula	Watkins (OK)
Lewis (CA)	Rehberg	Watson (CA)
Lewis (GA)	Reyes	Watt (NC)
Lewis (KY)	Reynolds	Watts (OK)
Linder	Riley	Waxman
LoBiondo	Rivers	Weimer
Lofgren	Rodriguez	Weldon (FL)
Lowe	Roemer	Weller
Lucas (KY)	Rogers (KY)	Wexler
Lucas (OK)	Rogers (MI)	Whitfield
Luther	Rohrabacher	Wicker
Lynch	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (NM)
Maloney (CT)	Ross	Wilson (SC)
Maloney (NY)	Rothman	Wolf
Manzullo	Roukema	Woolsey
Markey	Royal-Allard	Wu
Mascara	Royce	Wynn
Matheson	Ryan (WI)	Young (AK)
Matsui	Ryun (KS)	Young (FL)
McCarthy (MO)		

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—25

Blagojevich	Gutierrez	Payne
Clay	Johnson (CT)	Rush
Cox	Lantos	Sanders
Davis (FL)	Lipinski	Shadegg
Dingell	Mica	Shows
Ehrlich	Murtha	
Ford	Nethercutt	

Stark
Sullivan

Tauzin
Thomas

Traficant
Weldon (PA)

LOOPHOLES IN GUN SAFETY LAWS
MUST BE CLOSED

reasons the students love and respect her.

Congratulations, Ms. Menesini, on your award, and thank you for your dedication to the children of Nevada and for the future of our Nation.

□ 1047

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2739. An act to amend Public Law 107-10 to authorize a United States plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the annual summit of the World Health Assembly in May 2002 in Geneva, Switzerland, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 68-541, as amended by Public Law 102-246, the Chair, on behalf of the Republican Leader, in consultation with the Democratic Leader, appoints Tom Luce, of Texas, as a member of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board for a term of five years.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The Chair will entertain 10 one-minutes on each side.

CONGRATULATING RYDER SYSTEM, INC., AND GREGORY T. SWINTON ON RECEIPT OF 2002 GREEN CROSS FOR SAFETY AWARD

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Ryder Systems, a leader in supply chain and transportation management, and especially its President and Chief Executive Officer, Gregory T. Swinton. The National Safety Council has selected Ryder and Mr. Swinton to receive the Council's 2002 Green Cross for Safety.

This award is given for exemplary commitment to workplace safety and corporate citizenship. Mr. Swinton is the first supply chain and transportation executive to receive this honor. Since joining Ryder in 1999, Mr. Swinton has identified safety as one of the company's top five goals.

Please join me in congratulating and recognizing the wonderful safety standards that Ryder has achieved, and most especially Gregory T. Swinton for his commitment to recognizing the importance of safety in our workplace.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my deepest sympathy to the families of the Reverend Larry Penzes and Eileen Tosner. Both were fatally shot last week during a 9 a.m. mass at Our Lady of Peace Church in Lynbrook, Long Island. My heart is with the parishioners, the clergy and staff of Our Lady of Peace who witnessed this brutal violence.

However, what is equally disturbing is that this could have been prevented. The assailant had a history of mental health problems. However, he was able to purchase a rifle several days before the attack because most States do not provide mental health records to FBI NICS database.

According to the General Accounting Office, for every 75,000 people who attempt to buy a gun, only one was denied through NICS based on the mental health criteria. This is one of the loopholes in our gun safety laws that must be closed.

Gun violence wreaks havoc in our lives in various ways, not the least of which is the loss of safe places in our communities. If we are not safe in our churches, our schools, our trains, where are we going to be safe?

I urge this body to seriously consider the havoc gun violence creates in our society. Better yet, consider its effect on your community. It can happen anywhere.

RECOGNIZING KIM MENESINI,
D.A.R.E. EDUCATOR OF THE
YEAR FOR NEVADA

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the effort of Ms. Kim Menesini, who was recently named the D.A.R.E. Educator of the Year for Nevada.

As a resident of Nevada for 25 years and as a teacher in Lyon County for over 20 years, Ms. Menesini has remained committed to ensuring that her students not only learn how to read and write and do the basic mathematics, but also how to just say "no" to drugs and alcohol.

Ms. Menesini has been involved with the Nevada D.A.R.E. drug program for more than 10 years, because this program tries to help kids build strength through self-esteem and offers them alternatives to saying "no" to drugs and alcohol.

According to Lyon County Deputy Sheriff Patrick Marble, Ms. Menesini's fifth grade students at Sutro Elementary School in Dayton, Nevada, know that she will support and guide them in a positive and loving way. There are

PROPOSED BUDGET OPENS SOCIAL
SECURITY LOCKBOX

(Mrs. THURMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Social Security and the President's budget. As we all know, the budget resolution is going to come to the House today, and I think it is very important that we highlight what the budget will do to Social Security.

Not too long ago, I stood up here with over 400 of my Democratic and Republican colleagues and voted for a lockbox for Social Security. We made a promise to the American people that we would not spend any Social Security dollars on anything but Social Security.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is just what the Republican budget resolution does. It spends \$1.6 trillion of Social Security dollars to fund other things like the tax cuts. That is not my analysis, that is Congressional Budget Office analysis. Instead, we should be doing something to address the impending baby-boomer retirement.

I invite my Republican colleagues to sit down with myself and the rest of the Democrats to develop a sound plan for the future of Social Security and the rest of the budget. We need a plan that preserves Social Security, not one that uses the money to fund other agenda items.

REMEMBERING MARTIN AND
GRACIA BURNHAM

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 298th day that Martin and Gracia Burnham have been held captive by Muslim terrorists in the Philippines.

A couple of weeks ago our spirits were raised as we heard of a new video showing Martin and Gracia. Our initial enthusiasm at the confirmation that they are still alive and healthy quickly dissipated as we realized the videotape was much older than claimed. Though the cameraman claims the tape is from mid-January, many signs point to it being shot much earlier, earlier even than the tape released in December.

Martin and Gracia's clothes are in much better condition than in the video shot in November. Martin is not wearing glasses that he received in November and wore on the previous video. Martin's beard is shorter, and the Burnhams are much healthier looking

than in November. So we still await recent pictures and statements from Martin and Gracia.

The tape is noteworthy, however, because for the first time the Abu Sayyaf Group, or the ASG, indicates that it regards itself as part of Osama bin Laden's al Qaeda network, something we have long suspected. This admission should give the Philippine government and their military added incentive to quickly track down and capture the ASG. It should also embolden our government to do as much as they can to free our fellow Americans.

As always, I ask you to join me in prayer for Martin and Gracia and their loved ones, so that this nightmare may soon be over.

RAIDING THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

(Ms. KILPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the President's budget and the Republicans' budget.

Some months ago, this House stood almost unanimously and said we would put the Social Security monies in a lockbox. The lockbox is smashed. We are spending Social Security, \$1.6 trillion of it, in this budget resolution that is before us today. In addition, Medicare is being cut billions of dollars.

Our seniors, who have built this country, have no medical insurance. Our health care industry is about to crash. This budget resolution is a sham.

Come on, Republicans, we can do a lot better. Let us take care of America's people and America's seniors.

KEEPING FISCAL DISCIPLINE DURING DIFFICULT TIMES

(Mr. TANCREDO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise the work of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), and the Republican members of that Committee on the Budget. As we all know, this year has been very challenging as the results of the attacks of September 11 and the downturn in our economy.

Mr. Speaker, we will hear a lot of people talking about this budget today. As always, a great deal of rhetoric will emanate from this House. There is one thing that seems to frighten the members of the Democratic minority here more than anything else.

There are a couple of words that absolutely petrify them, apparently; it is called "balanced budget." They do not know what it is, they had never had one during the time they were in charge of this body, but we are pre-

senting them with one today. It is a scary thing for them, unfortunately.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that if we accepted all of the 17 amendments offered in the Committee on the Budget this year by members of the minority, we would increase spending over the next 5 years by \$205 billion and require \$175 billion in additional taxes. That is the old way of doing business. There is a better way. It is called a balanced budget. It is called defending America, and that is what this budget does.

CESAR CHAVEZ, A GREAT AMERICAN HERO

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an historic event in San Diego, the renaming of Crosby Street in Barrio Logan to Caesar E. Chavez Parkway.

Guided by local leaders Councilman Ralph Inzunza, Rachel Ortiz, Luis Natividad, Sam Duran, Carlos and Linda Legerrette, and pushed along by the San Diego Cesar Chavez Commemoration Committee, the Parkway paves the way for the renaissance of Barrio Logan.

Chavez's commitment to fair wages, better working conditions, decent housing and quality education is still alive and well in San Diego. I am proud of my constituents and the efforts of local leaders to honor this humble yet great man.

Cesar Chavez deserves to be honored as a great American hero. His dedication to human rights and justice warrants his birthday being seriously considered a national holiday.

I hope my colleagues will join me in giving Chavez his rightful place in American history.

CELEBRATING 90TH BIRTHDAY OF DOROTHY HEIGHT, PRESIDENT AND CEO OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO WOMEN

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 90th birthday of Dorothy Height. We will be celebrating this wonderful event tonight. She is the President and CEO of the National Council of Negro Women. She grew up under the tutelage of Mary McCleod Bethune and is a member of my great sorority, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated, and I am so pleased to stand up.

But, see, Dorothy Height would want me to stand on the floor today and talk about a what? He said a balanced budget? This is not a balanced budget. I cannot believe the man even had the nerve to stand there and say that. Balanced budget on the back of seniors

who need Social Security, and Dorothy Height, a 90-year-old woman, needs Social Security. Balanced on the backs of seniors who need Medicare. Dorothy Height needs Medicare. Balanced on the back of seniors who need housing. Fortunately, Dorothy Height has housing.

Mr. Speaker, give me a break. Balanced budget? I do not even believe he had the nerve to let those words come out of his mouth. We are balancing it on the back of the senior citizens who need it most.

□ 1100

SEEKING INFORMATION ON WHEREABOUTS OF MIRANDA GADDIS AND ASHLEY POND

(Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House today to once again alert those who may be watching in Oregon and across the Nation to the disappearance of two young girls from my district. Miranda Gaddis and Ashley Pond, both 13 years of age, students of Gardiner Middle School in Oregon City and teammates on the school dance team, have been reported missing.

Ashley disappeared January 9, and Miranda vanished March 8. Both were last seen by their mothers early in the morning as they left their homes at the Newell Village Creek apartments to catch the bus to school on South Beaver Creek Road.

Investigators continue to hold out hope that the girls will come home. They believe that the girls may have been abducted by a person or persons that they knew.

If Members have any information regarding Ashley and Miranda's whereabouts, I ask them to please contact the FBI office or the Oregon City Police Department at 503-657-4964.

REPUBLICAN "BALANCED BUDGET" WILL RAID SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND AND CUT FUNDS FOR EDUCATION AND SENIOR HEALTH

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to sound the alarm, particularly for our baby boomers. This budget breaks into the Social Security trust fund, breaks into the lockbox, and raids the trust fund to the tune of \$1.6 trillion. Members remember the lockbox. It was our solemn promise not to touch Social Security trust fund money. Well, that has been obliterated.

My friends on the Republican side of the aisle would be quick to say, well, you have to understand, the deficit is caused by the war. Not so. Only 10 percent of our deficit is caused by the war.

Almost half of that deficit is caused by tax breaks for the very rich.

What happens?

We raid Social Security, creating an insolvency for baby boomers about to enter retirement age.

We underfund education. We make a great noise about passing the Leave No Child Behind Act. What do we do in this budget? We underfund education by 16 percent. That is not right.

We talk about prescription drugs, but this budget underfunds prescription drugs for seniors. This is an unfair budget. It raids the Social Security trust fund, and it should be rejected.

CELEBRATING THE BIRTHDAY OF CESAR CHAVEZ, AN AMERICAN HERO

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of March, we approach the birthday of Cesar Chavez, a positive role model for the Latino community, a hero. Caesar Chavez touched the lives of millions with his nonviolent struggle for justice, education, and equality. He was a beacon of hope.

But Cesar Chavez views the challenges he faced as a motivation to help farmworkers whose suffering he shared. In 1962, Caesar Chavez founded the National Farmworkers Association, the predecessor to the United Farmworkers of America.

He organized farmworkers to campaign for fair working conditions, reasonable wages, and decent housing and health conditions. He sacrificed himself for human rights and for dignity. He left a legacy for each and every one of us, and for generations to come.

He has received the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Martin Luther King, Jr., Peace Prize, and was nominated for the Nobel Prize.

No one better symbolizes Latino empowerment than does Caesar Chavez. He is a symbol of hope, and we will never forget his words. The challenge of life, justice, and equality will ever ring in our lives: Si, se puede; yes, we can. We should honor his birthday by celebrating it, and I am hopeful we will pass that legislation.

CONGRATULATIONS ON A GREAT SEASON TO DIVISION I STATE BOYS' BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS, THE CATHEDRAL HIGH SCHOOL PANTHERS

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the city of Springfield, Massachusetts, is known worldwide as the birthplace of basketball. It is also where the new Basketball Hall of Fame is being constructed on the historic banks of the Connecticut River. And

today, it is the home of the Division I State basketball champions, the Cathedral High School Panthers.

On Saturday night in the Worcester Centrum, Cathedral defeated Brookline by a score of 75 to 71 to capture their first State crown. Led by coach Gene Eggleston, the Panthers are now the third team from western Massachusetts to earn this coveted State athletics title.

In addition, the boys' basketball team has now won four of the six last western Massachusetts championships.

Mr. Speaker, their accomplishments speak for themselves. As a former teacher at Cathedral, I know the importance the school places on education and athletics, and the great job that the Sisters of St. Joseph do. They should take great pride in the character demonstrated by the boys' basketball team on and off the court this weekend when they earned the right to be called the very best team in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Congratulations on a great season to the Cathedral High School Boys' Basketball State Champions.

ACKNOWLEDGING WOMEN FROM THE 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS FOR THEIR ACTIVISM

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in acknowledging that the Bush budget does nothing for Americans and it does nothing for women.

This month is a month when we commemorate the history of women in America, and I would like to acknowledge, from the 18th Congressional District, women who are part of the winds of political change and activism: Christie Adair, Irma Leroy, Ninfa Lorenzo, Kathy Whitmire, Eleanor Tinsley, Helen Huey, Christian Hartung, Madge Bush, Esther Williams, Beverly Clark, Judge Betty Brock Bell, Sylvia Garcia, Carol Alvarado, Carol Galloway, Ada Edwards, and Lisa Berry Dockery, all women who realize that we must stand up and be counted for what is right in our community, and stand up and be counted to make sure that for all of the spoils of America, all the issues that deal with a good quality of life, women of this community and women that I have just listed have all been advocates for helping those in their communities.

They are our heroes. They are part of America's history. They are part of the history of women in America.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3924, FREEDOM TO TELECOMMUTE ACT OF 2002

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 373 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 373

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3924) to authorize telecommuting for Federal contractors. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3924, the Freedom to Telecommute Act of 2002.

The rule allows the chairman of the Committee of the whole to accord priority in recognition to those Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Finally, the rule provides for 1 motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today that the House is considered the Freedom to Telecommute Act. Currently, a Federal agency may refuse a bid proposal from a potential contractor that utilizes telecommuting in its work force. This legislation would prohibit agencies from continuing this practice. That a potential contractor would allow its employees to telecommute when appropriate would not disqualify or reduce the chances of that company winning a Federal contract.

The bill also requires that the GAO, General Accounting Office, make a report to Congress within 1 year of enactment on the compliance by agencies with telecommuting regulations.

In the past 25 years, telecommuting has become an increasingly attractive option for employees in the workplace, and, I would also add, a commonsense

addition to the workplace. Technology advances have allowed more and more employees to telecommute, allowing them to work from anywhere at any time. In fact, it is estimated that 19 million people enjoy the benefits of telecommuting today.

As our country continues to engage in the war on terrorism, we are obviously all more sensitive to the concerns regarding safety and security. This bill takes into consideration these concerns, allowing an exception to be made if the contracting officer certifies in writing that telecommuting would conflict with the needs of that agency. For example, this exception could apply if a contractor deals with classified or sensitive information.

Mr. Speaker, the rest of the workplace has recognized the advantages of telecommuting. The benefits include encouraging a more productive work force, increasing employee morale and quality of life, as well as helping the environment by eliminating pollution from increasing commuter traffic.

Under the leadership of my good friend, the chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), the Subcommittee on Technology and Procurement Policy has been a champion of developing and promoting telecommuting as an option in the Federal workplace. I believe that we should share the same vision and that the Federal Government should be the leading advocate for the best practices for the workplace, not lagging behind.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this open rule, as well as the commonsense legislation it underlies.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, advances in computer and telecommunications technology have opened the door for more and more Americans to work from their homes if they so choose. More than 45,000 Federal employees exercised their option to telecommute for 52 days or more in 2001.

A footnote right there. This being the seat of creativity, my reading and that of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) is that "telecommute" joins the lexicon of new verbs, because to our knowledge, it did not exist before. So I am kind of proud of us for coming up with something that takes into consideration all of the technology that is setting upon our great Nation and our world.

These Federal employees were among the 19 million Americans who telecommuted at least once last year. Telecommuting holds a host of advantages for America's workers and employers. It allows workers the flexibility to perform their jobs and manage their demanding personal lives at the same time.

Businesses can use telecommuting to retain valuable workers whose personal and extracurricular obligations would

otherwise force them to take a leave of absence, or, worse, terminate their employment altogether.

Telecommuting also has the potential to reduce gridlock and automobile pollution by allowing workers to skip the rush hour commute.

As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) already noted, H.R. 3924, the Freedom to Telecommute Act, modifies Federal procurement rules to allow private contract employees working for Federal agencies the option to telecommute when executing their duties under those contracts. These workers will join Federal employees who are already able to telecommute under existing law.

If a Federal contracting officer feels that telecommuting would be inconsistent with agency needs, he or she would be permitted under this legislation to prohibit it, thus creating workplace flexibility and ensuring security at the same time.

The legislation basically is non-controversial. It was passed out of the Committee on Government Reform unanimously, and I urge my colleagues to support it on the floor this morning.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say that I appreciate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for his support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), chairman of the Subcommittee on Technology and Procurement Policy.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the open rule for H.R. 3924, the Freedom to Telecommute Act of 2002. I believe this is a noncontroversial bill, but I think it is one long overdue in this House.

Telecommuting is something we ought to encourage. I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the Committee on Rules for moving swiftly to bring this bill to the floor. Their efforts to ensure that we can vote on this important bill I think will expand opportunities for telecommuting.

H.R. 3924 will prevent Federal agencies from restricting potential contractors from participating in the bidding process if they use telecommuters to fulfill the contract. Congress has passed bills over the last several years that actually direct Federal agencies to develop and promote telework programs. Unfortunately, the current acquisition policy sends the wrong message about the importance of telework in the modern workplace.

Telework is a popular movement that has gained tremendous momentum over the last 25 years. Today, an estimated 19 million Americans telework. Employees are drawn to it because it offers improved quality of life. It increases morale. It generates greater productivity because there are fewer office distractions.

□ 1115

Telecommuting is a family-friendly policy that accommodates employees with health problems or child care problems or elder care responsibilities. It also eases traffic congestion, and in this region that is very important, by getting motorists off the roads at key hours and allowing them to telecommute either from their home or from telecommuting work stations. And by easing traffic congestion, not only is it friendlier and saves motorists time, but it helps the environment due to increased vehicle emissions.

Our Subcommittee on Technology and Procurement Policy has held two hearings about telecommuting. We heard from both public and private sector witnesses about their efforts to develop and implement such programs in their organizations. Many of them have been very successful in employee retention, in employee recruitment and in productivity. The testimony revealed that telecommuting is often used as a human capital management initiative in the private sector and in a few Federal agencies. It allows employees greater flexibility in their work environment, and it enhances their quality of life.

It is costly to recruit people, to hire people, to train new staff on a constant basis. If they are used strategically, telecommuting programs keep organizations competitive and are critical to maintaining continuity and efficiency in the workplace. Federal managers have been reluctant to embrace the concept because they would no longer be in a position to monitor employees directly. I submit, Mr. Speaker, this is the old model. That is the work model from the industrial era. Today's workers operate quite differently. The Federal managers have to move away from such out-dated process-oriented measures. We need to encourage the government to become a results-driven organization, to learn from the efficiencies that the private sector has produced.

By allowing Federal agencies to contract with companies that employ telework initiatives, they are directly exposing them to the employees. I think this helps the Federal level to encourage our managers to use more of it. It helps to reverse negative managerial attitudes toward telecommuting in the Federal Government.

But among contracting officers there has been reluctance to encourage bids from companies that utilize telecommuting, again, operating under the old concepts that if we are not there watching over an employee, somehow the work is not getting done. That is most often done with security concerns in mind.

H.R. 3924 provides contracting officers with the necessary guidance for encouraging telecommuting among potential Federal contractors. An exception is made if the contracting officer certifies in writing that telecommuting would conflict with the needs of the agency. For example, this exception could apply if a contractor deals

with classified or sensitive information. You do not want to let out information to some foreign Web site or information. This will ensure that Federal marketplaces continue to be a competitive choice among contractors.

H.R. 3924 would also prohibit agencies from issuing solicitations that would reduce the scoring of a potential contractor's proposal if that contractor utilizes telecommuting.

We ought to be encouraging it, not prohibiting it. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 3924.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I am rising to support the rule of the Freedom to Telecommute Act and to acknowledge the importance of the underlying bill. Particularly as this relates to independent contractors, it certainly is distinctive from full-time employees. With independent contractors there is a valid basis, saving money and helping with child care issues. It is good that this bill is moving its way to the floor of the House.

I would argue and make mention of the fact that there are still many other issues that we must address. I believe that the very fact of this rule indicates the necessity for addressing the need to finish our work and to do more work as it relates to the budget, particularly as we look prospectively at the rule on the budget that has only 2 hours for this body, 435 Members of Congress, to be able to discuss one of the most vital responsibilities that this Congress has. And I would hope that the time we spend on this rule supporting this very valid legislation would cause us to think about the time that we have to utilize and debate on the budget resolution, particularly as we look at the Republican budget and the budget of the President, that has clearly squandered the surplus that is going after Social Security and slashes the lock box of which all of us have had such a strong and vital commitment.

Only 2 hours of debate is the cause that we have. And I believe that 2 hours of debate does not equate to the time we are spending on the telecommute resolution and the telecommute bill. I think it is important to note that the budget resolution of the Republicans dissipates most of the Social Security surplus and decimates all of the Medicare surplus for the next 5 years. In fact, it is evident that we have a situation that shows us that the President's budget surplus shorts Medicare \$226 billion; \$226 billion is what the President's budget does to Medicare. The Republican resolution shows

only 5 years of budget figures instead of 10. The Republican resolution uses OMB, Office of Management and Budget, rather than CBO figures, which we all know the Congressional Budget Office is far more objective.

The Republican resolution omits numerous impending budgetary costs so, therefore, it undermines and misrepresents how much money we have left. The Republican resolution pays more lip service to prescription drug benefits. It gives nothing to my constituents who ask me time after time, senior citizens, about when are they going to get their prescription drug benefit. And then, of course, the Republican resolution on the budget does not even fund the education bill. If you want to see the results, in fact, the education bill, leave no child behind, has been cut by the Republican budget. And something that impacts Houston most of all is to realize that his budget and the Republican budget guts mental health federally funded evidence-proven programs. Coming from Houston, seeing the tragedy of Andrea Yates, knowing how important it is for intervention and prevention dollars in the budget, it is an outrage.

I would say this is a good rule on the telecommute bill. I would say the bill itself is a good bill. But the question becomes what are we doing about the budget? Why do we have this short period of time? And when you ask us why the minority does not have a budget, let me just point you to Newt Gingrich, because it is the responsibility of the majority to put a budget that America can be proud of. We are not proud of this budget, and we stand by the fact it is up to you all to fix the problem. You have not fixed it. You have decimated the needs of Americans as it relates to the domestic budget.

It clearly decimates the domestic policies of this country, and it speaks to the contrast of the words of the President some many months ago when he said the bipartisan education bill was a priority by not leaving any child behind. How can you do that if your budget cuts that very authorization? I would simply argue to my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle, would it not have been better in times like these for us to have been able to fight together for more funding for homeland security, more funding for education, more funding for health care, more funding for mental health needs, more funding for housing, and more funding for economic development in our communities? Yet what we have here is a raiding of Social Security and a killing of Medicare and no relief for our seniors with a prescription drug benefit and no relief for our veterans and our military personnel.

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

Mr. Speaker, last night in the Committee on Rules we had a fabulous opportunity to speak not only about this telecommuting bill but also about the budget. And last night I spoke to the

senior Democrat who is on the Committee on the Budget and I said is there one penny, one penny that is being taken away from Medicare, Social Security or Medicaid? Not one penny in this new budget. Not one penny.

The second thing I would like to speak about that the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) talked about is the lock box. Dag-gum right we passed a lock box, but the other body has not. The other body has not taken this important legislation up so it is not the law of the country. So the things which we as Republicans have talked about in this House for a long time, of making sure that the American public has the growth and the opportunity and the take-home pay for jobs and opportunity in this country for retirement security is exactly what this budget is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the gentleman is not in the Chamber because I want to say some very nice things about him. I am talking, of course, about the author of this important measure, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS). He has been on the forefront of our effort to realize that the technology revolution has brought about some incredible changes to our lives. And clearly when it comes to the issue of telecommuting, dealing with the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area is a very high priority because we have so many serious problems here. I happen to hail from Los Angeles where we have even worse problems. In fact, I like to say that I live in two of the most congested areas on the face of the Earth, Los Angeles, California, and Washington, D.C. where we have very serious traffic problems.

So the idea of encouraging telecommuting is something that I believe is important for us to pursue and I think it is very apropos that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) lead the charge in doing that.

Let me say that this rule is an open rule that will allow for a free-flowing debate on this issue, and I think there should be a strong bipartisan consensus on it. And my colleagues have begun the debate on the budget process, as we proceed with the rule, the special rule for consideration of telecommuting legislation; and we are going to have an opportunity to discuss this during the rule debate this afternoon. But let me just say that it is very clear that the package which we have come forward with first on the rule which allows for the consideration of legitimate substitutes, there was not a legitimate substitute put forward, and that is the reason that we made the decision as has traditionally been the case

that only legitimate substitutes would be given an opportunity for consideration.

The supposed substitutes that were put forward were simply, as described by one of the authors, perfecting amendments to the chairman's proposed budget, to the budget that came from the Committee on the Budget and some modifications of numbers going from utilization of the Congressional Budget Office for the scoring process to the Office of Management and Budget. And so we are going to have this afternoon a very important debate with this war-time budget that we are going to be addressing.

I believe that we should enjoy strong bipartisan support because when we came together following September 11 behind the President of the United States with the number one priority being to win the war on terrorism, this budget that we will be voting on is directly tied to that shared bipartisan American goal that we have. And so I hope very much that we will be able to have strong support for it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from the State of Virginia for yielding me time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I note that the distinguished chairperson of the Committee on Rules, I apologize, he is walking out not because he knew I would say something regarding what he said. In that debate on last evening in the Committee on Rules and as late as 12:30 this a.m., I certainly, and my colleagues certainly, raised the question of us having sufficient time to discuss this war-time budget.

I did not think and I said so and I do not think that the limited time that we have is going to be sufficient for all of the Members of the House of Representatives who so desire to come forward and discuss the particulars of this budget. The chairman is absolutely correct. There is no distinction between a Democrat or a Republican on homeland defense and on the security of our Nation and pursuing the necessary defense in order that we may be secure. But there is a distinction on whether or not we are going to fund education or if we are going to fund housing for the disabled or if we are going to take care of the energy and environmental considerations. And some of us see the necessity to avoid some of the tax consequences that have been put forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

□ 1130

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

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to address this rule on the suspension today and indicate that I suspect that this particular bill is going to meet with a great deal of agreement on both sides of the House. I do regret, however, that this rule probably has more time allotted to discussion and debate than the rule on the budget will and the rule on the budget being in comparison so much more important in dealing with such a large part of what it is that we do here and what we do for the American people and at their behest.

I would have to say that there is no difference between the Republican-Democratic stand when it comes to making sure that our national security is taken care of and that our homeland security is taken care of. We stand together. We stand united. We support the protection of this country at all times.

There is, however, a significant amount of difference, and if we had ample time on the rules to discuss that and on the bill itself to discuss it between what our beliefs are and the right way to proceed with the economic and social security of people in this country. Everybody understands the financial commitment that we will have to make toward our national security and toward homeland security, but there is a great deal of disagreement as to whether we should be accelerating tax breaks for very wealthy individuals when we should be standing united as a country and putting some investment into the education and to the health care and to the building of roads and bridges and to protection of our homeland, and that is where the debate, if we had time on the rule and if we had time on the bill itself, would come into play.

Very frankly speaking, this is a situation where this rule does not allow enough time in comparison. This rule gives more time than is needed for a bill and the other rule does not.

POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, point of order, relevancy. I make a point of order the gentleman is not discussing the rule at hand.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman that just spoke was not discussing it either.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman will suspend.

The pending special order of business provides for the consideration of the telecommuting bill. It does not provide for the consideration of the budget resolution. The Members will confine their remarks to the issue of consideration of the telecommuting bill.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I will make a note on that, that as the last speaker was speaking about the process of the Committee on Rules last night, not pertaining to this bill, the Chair was completely silent on that, and I would like some fair treatment as this moves forward and would expect it from my colleague from New York,

who has been known in the past to be a person of fairness, and I would expect that to apply here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts will suspend.

The Chair normally awaits a relevancy point of order from the floor. The Chair does not take initiative.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear what the Chair had to say on that. I did not hear anything when the other speaker was speaking, and I cannot hear the Chair now either.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not normally take initiative on a relevancy point of order.

The gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed in order.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida will state his point of order.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, then all of us, myself and the chairperson of the Committee on Rules, that have spoken, our words should be taken out of the RECORD for the reason that they were not relevant?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It would take a unanimous consent request in order to remove those words from the RECORD.

The gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed in order.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, let me proceed to talk on the rule for a second. I think one of the reasons that we are speaking here is that while this rule on this particular bill by suspension allows more than adequate time to talk about that rule, the rule on the budget does not allow enough time to talk about that rule nor does the budget debate allow for enough time on that.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the gentleman is in violation of House rule XVII, which requires a Member to confine himself to the question under debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the gentleman and all Members that remarks should be confined to the pending special order of business and the underlying telecommuting bill.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would just suggest to the Chair that my memory being fine, I was discussing and comparing the rule under the telecommunications bill with the rule for the budget, and I think that if I am talking about the rule and making a comparison I am in fact speaking germanely and on the RECORD, and while my colleagues have tried, the majority, to stifle that debate on the budget and stifle our debate on the budget rule, I do not think it is permissible to stifle our debate on this rule where we are drawing that kind of comparison.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman can maintain a nexus to the pending special order of business, he may proceed.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker because it is difficult to maintain a nexus, but we do have to take opportunity that we can to make sure that we are at least heard to some degree on this budget that is coming up and make sure that we use whatever time we can to make sure people understand that there is a difference between the parties when it comes to dealing with the social and economic security of this country. We can talk under the rules all we want about being able to step out and protect our Nation and there is no disagreement, but there ought to be a debate as between accelerating tax cuts and accelerating the tax cuts for the wealthy versus doing things for the economic security of this country.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

I think the gentleman is in violation of House rule XVII, which requires a Member to confine himself to the question under debate. We are speaking today about telecommuting, and that is what this rule is concerning and on the floor at this time, and I would ask for the Chair to rule upon this again, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will require the gentleman from Massachusetts not to dwell on the merits of the budget resolution. It is not before the House at this point in time.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker. I understand that my colleagues on the other side do not want us to dwell on the budget comparisons and on those issues, and so I will try again to confine my remarks to the rule, understanding how assiduously they have worked to make sure we do not get into an extended debate about the economic and social security of our country and the comparison with tax breaks and acceleration of tax breaks for the wealthy.

Continuing on this rule, Mr. Speaker, this rule gives us plenty of time, as I said before, to discuss in fact an issue that is not in great contention, and it is remarkable that we have so much time to discuss a bill that comes under a great deal of agreement and so little time to discuss other bills that, in fact, have a great deal of disagreement and issues of very significant importance to this country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this Rule because it denies the American people a full and fair debate to the fiscal year 2003 budget resolution, and denies America's First Responders a full and fair debate over whether this budget will assist them as they assist us in fighting terrorism.

As we all know, our nation's first responders rose to the occasion in recent months, answering the call to protect and stabilize our communities after the terrorist attacks of September 11th and the anthrax attacks of October 2001. Communities incurred over a billion dollars in overtime costs for police, fire and medical personnel—and stand to incur similar unreimbursed expenses as the war on terrorism continues.

This Amendment—which the Majority refused to allow to come up for a vote—calls for Congress to include some relief for America's First Responders who have so ably served our country. It addresses FEMA's State and Local Terrorism Preparedness Initiative which requires local first responders to put up a burdensome (and for many, unaffordable) 25% local "match" in order to receive ANY assistance. The Amendment concludes that "Government should assist local communities who stand ready to participate in FEMA's Local Terrorism Preparedness Initiative by waiving the 25 percent local match prerequisite or by reducing the percentage as much as practicable."

This amendment, the substance of which was communicated to the Budget Committee last week by 114 Members of Congress—Democrats and Republicans from urban and rural districts across the country—is a budget neutral remedy to a problem faced by first responders in my district and across the country. The letter was signed by Representatives ABERCROMBIE, ACKERMAN, ANDREWS, BACA, BALDACCI, BALDWIN, BECERRA, BERKLEY, BERMAN, BLAGOJEVICH, BLUMENAUER, BONIOR, BOSWELL, S. BROWN, CAPP, CAPUANO, CARDIN, B. CARSON, CHRISTENSEN, CLAYTON, CLEMENT, CLYBURN, COYNE, CROWLEY, CUMMINGS, D. DAVIS, DELAHUNT, DELAULO, DOGGETT, EDWARDS, FARR, FILNER, FRANK, GORDON, G. GREEN, GRAHAM, HARMAN, HINCHEY, HOFFEL, HOLT, HONDA, HOUGHTON, HYDE, JACKSON, TUBBS JONES, W. JONES, KILDEE, KIND, KUCINICH, LAFALCE, LAMPSON, LANGEVIN, LANTOS, LARSEN, LARSON, B. LEE, JACKSON LEE, J. LEWIS, LOBIONDO, LOFGREN, LYNCH, MALONEY, MARKEY, MATSUI, MCCARTHY, MCGOVERN, MCKINNEY, MCNULTY, MEEKS, MENENDEZ, MILLENDER-MCDONALD, G. MILLER, MOORE, NADLER, NEAL, NORTON, OLVER, PALLONE, PASCARELL, PASTOR, PAYNE, PELOSI, PHELPS, QUINN, RAHALL, RIVERS, RODRIGUEZ, ROSS, SANDLIN, SAWYER, SCHAKOWSKY, SCHIFF, SCOTT, SHOWS, SKELTON, SLAUGHTER, SNYDER, SOLIS, STUPAK, SWEENEY, M. THOMPSON, THURMAN, TIERNEY, TOWNS, TURNER, M. UDALL, T. UDALL, WAMP, WATSON, WAXMAN, WELDON, WOOLSEY, WU, and WYNN, all of whom share a commitment to ensuring that local first responders receive our support and resources to fight terrorism.

This Amendment is co-sponsored by a number of my colleagues who simply want the opportunity to show our First Responders that our budget includes resources for them to protect and defend our communities. I thank Representatives JOHN BALDACCI, TAMMY BALDWIN, ROD BLAGOJEVICH, SHERROD BROWN, MICHAEL CAPUANO, STEVE LYNCH, BOB MATSUI, NANCY PELOSI, CIRO RODRIGUEZ, LUCILLE ROYBAL-AL-LARD, MAX SANDLIN, and TOM SAWYER for their support in this important effort.

Our Local Terrorism Preparedness Initiative Amendment will allow creativity and flexibility in shaping policy, so that lawmakers may either waive the match for fiscal year 2003, reduce the 25% percentage, and/or explore a "soft match" whereby communities that have together incurred over a billion dollars in overtime costs for police, fire and medical personnel can individually designate the expenses incurred after September 11th as part of their match—at no additional cost to the taxpayers.

Congress has an historic opportunity to assist local communities: by relieving them of

this unfunded mandate; by rewarding the entrepreneurial and patriotic spirit in so many districts like my own in Massachusetts where first responders have put aside turf issues and worked cooperatively to create Local Emergency Planning Committees and other cross-jurisdictional response strategies to serve the American people; and by ensuring that local first responders may continue to serve as America's first line of defense.

Our nation's first responders are in desperate need of assistance from the Federal government for homeland security efforts and they deserve a full and fair debate over whether Congress is prepared to respond to their urgent needs in this year's budget.

Because the Majority refused to allow this debate, I urge my colleagues to stand up for America's First Responders and against this unfair rule.

This Amendment to H. Con. Res. 353, the FY 2003 Budget Resolution, calls for Congress to include some relief for America's First Responders who have so ably served our country after the terrorist attacks of September 11th and the anthrax attacks of October, 2001. It addresses FEMA's proposed \$3.5 billion State and Local Terrorism Preparedness Initiative—\$2.625 billion of which will be directed toward local communities—which requires local first responders to put up a burdensome (and for many, unaffordable) 25% local "match" in order to receive ANY assistance. The Amendment concludes that "Government should assist local communities who stand ready to participate in FEMA's Local Terrorism Preparedness Initiative by waiving the 25 percent local match prerequisite or by reducing the percentage as much as practicable."

This bipartisan effort includes a letter signed by 114 Members—Democrats and Republicans from urban and rural districts across the country—seeking a budget neutral means to relieve local police, fire and emergency responders of this unfunded mandate and to ensure that local first responders may continue to serve as America's first line of defense. (Please see an attached copy of the letter with a list of signatories.)

If passed, the Amendment will allow flexibility in shaping policy, so that lawmakers may either waive the match for FY 2003, reduce the 25% percentage, and/or explore a "soft match" whereby communities that have together incurred over a billion dollars in overtime costs for police, fire and medical personnel can individually designate the expenses incurred after September 11th as part of their match.

At the end, add the following new section:
SEC. . LOCAL TERRORISM PREPAREDNESS ASSISTANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) our Nation's first responders rose to the occasion in recent months, answering the call to protect and stabilize our communities after the terrorist attacks of September 11th as well as the anthrax attacks of October 2001;

(2) communities incurred over a billion dollars in overtime costs for police, fire and medical personnel, and stand to incur similar unreimbursed expenses as the war on terrorism continues;

(3) the proposed \$3.5 billion for FEMA's State and Local Terrorism Preparedness Initiative, \$2.625 billion of which would be directed toward local communities might not allow most first responders to participate because of an onerous 25 percent local match prerequisite for Federal assistance; and

(4) Congress can fashion a budget-neutral remedy to assist communities that otherwise could not afford to participate in the State and Local Terrorism Preparedness Initiative through waiver or reduction of the local match requirement, thereby relieving local police, fire and emergency responders of this unfunded mandate and ensuring that local first responders may continue to serve as America's first line of defense.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Government should assist local communities who stand ready to participate in FEMA's Local Terrorism Preparedness Initiative by waiving the 25 percent local match prerequisite or by reducing the percentage as much as practicable.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chair, House Budget Committee, Cannon House
Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN SPRATT,
Ranking Member, House Budget Committee,
O'Neil House Office Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NUSSLE AND RANKING MEMBER SPRATT: We are writing to respectfully request that the fiscal year 2003 budget resolution include a waiver for local first responders in desperate need of assistance from the Federal government for homeland security efforts.

As you are aware, our nation's first responders rose to the occasion in recent months, answering the call to protect and stabilize our communities after the terrorist attacks of September 11th as well as the anthrax attacks of October 2001. Communities incurred over a billion dollars in overtime costs for police, fire and medical personnel—and stand to incur similar unreimbursed expenses as the war on terrorism continues.

While we are encouraged by the President's proposed increases in homeland security spending, particularly the \$3.5 billion for FEMA's proposed State and Local Terrorism Preparedness initiative—\$2.625 billion of which will be directed toward local communities—we note with concern that the Administration's proposed budget might not allow most local communities to participate because of an onerous (under current circumstances cited above) 25% local "match" prerequisite for federal assistance. Congress has an historic opportunity to assist local communities by adding \$875 million to this package, thereby relieving them of this unfunded mandate, and ensuring that local first responders may continue to serve as America's first line of defense. In the event that the Committee cannot fund the \$875 million, we respectfully request that you waive the local match or reduce the percentage as much as possible and adjust local terrorism preparedness appropriations accordingly.

We recognize the difficult choices that you face this fiscal year. However, we continue to believe that funding for local homeland security efforts demands our attention and assistance.

Thank you for your consideration of our request.

Sincerely,

Representatives Abercrombie, Ackerman, Andrews, Baca, Baldacci, Baldwin, Becerra, Berkley, Berman, Blagojevich, Blumenauer, Bonior, Boswell, S. Brown, Capps, Capuano, Cardin, B. Carson, Christensen, Clayton, Clement, Clyburn, Coyne, Crowley, Cummings, D. Davis, Delahunt, DeLauro, Doggett, Edwards, Farr, Filner, Frank, Gordon, G. Green, Graham, Harman, Hinchey, Hoeffel, Holt, Honda, Houghton, Hyde, Jackson, Tubbs Jones, W. Jones, Kildee, Kind,

Kucinich, LaFalce, Lampson, Langevin, Lantos, Larsen, Larson, B. Lee, Jackson Lee, J. Lewis, LoBiondo, Lofgren, Lynch, Maloney, Markey, Matsui, McCarthy, McGovern, McKinney, McNulty, Meeks, Menendez, Millender-McDonald, G. Miller, Moore, Nadler, Neal, Norton, Olver, Pallone, Pascrell, Pastor, Payne, Pelosi, Phelps, Quinn, Rahall, Rivers, Rodriguez, Ross, Sandlin, Sawyer, Schakowsky, Schiff, Scott, Shows, Skelton, Slaughter, Snyder, Solis, Stupak, Sweeney, M. Thompson, Thurman, Tierney, Towns, Turner, M. Udall, T. Udall, Wamp, Watson, Waxman, Weldon, Woolsey, Wu, and Wynn.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK).

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Freedom to Telecommute Act of 2002.

For many years, the government contracting industry has been forced to lag behind because many government agencies prohibit their contractors from allowing telecommuting. This legislation will help them move into the 21st century.

Many of the country's most technologically advanced companies have embraced telecommuting as a cost-savings measure that is good for companies, good for employees and good for families. For far too long the demands of the job have conflicted with the demands of the family, and workers have had to choose between the two. For many workers, a 9 to 5 workday is not feasible.

Rather than neglecting their duties at home in order to work, telecommuting allows them to supplement their traditional workday or to occasionally work from home. Some businesses have also found it advantageous to offer telecommuting as an alternative to the traditional office environment. This practice saves money, and when the government is the customer, the savings can be passed along to the American taxpayer.

This legislation permits government contractors to take advantage of telecommuting opportunities. We will all benefit from this change to procurement policies. Government contracts will be completed faster and more efficiently, saving us all money and taxes. The deterrents to working more than the normal workday will be removed if employees can work from home and contractors will invest money in their product rather than costly overhead.

The increased number of telecommuters will also take people off the roads during heavy commuting hours, reducing congestion and helping our environment.

The most important change that will result from this legislation is the benefits that will result for the employees of government contractors. They will be able to spend more time with their family, while still meeting their work commitments. Moms and dads will be able to stay at home with a sick child and still be able to work. Moms and dads can take their kids to soccer prac-

tice and return to work when they get home.

The district I represent in Norfolk and Virginia Beach has hundreds of companies who contract with the Defense Department. By allowing their employees to telecommute, many of these contractors will save money and give the government the ability to spend money on our Nation's national security priorities rather than more costly government contracts.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is pro-taxpayer, pro-business and pro-family. I thank my good friend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Technology and Procurement Policy, for submitting this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 17½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) if he has additional speakers. At this time we have none and we are prepared to close.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the gentleman and tell him that we do have one additional speaker and then I would close. We will go ahead and allow my speaker, allow the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) to close and then we will do the same. It is my understanding there will be a vote on this rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), as of 5 minutes ago there was no vote requested.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to advise Members that may be listening there is a potential to have a vote on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding me the time, and I thank most especially the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) for bringing this Freedom to Telecommute Act on the floor.

I rise in support of the rule and of the bill, H.R. 3924. This legislation is vital to transforming our entire workforce into the model for the 21st century.

In the year 2000 there were 2.8 million regularly employed teleworkers in the United States, growing about 20.6 percent from the previous years. A recent telemarketing cost-benefit analysis suggests telework arrangements can save employers \$3,000 per year per employee.

There is no doubt that this family friendly work arrangement is more productive both for the employer and the employee and will become more commonplace in the next century, but

currently Federal Government employers lag far behind their private counterparts in accepting and implementing alternative work methods such as telecommuting. Many Federal employers are stuck in the old style of management, believing that employees must be in the employer's sight in order to be productive and effective, and that I believe is a problem.

In my home district of West Virginia, particularly in the Eastern Panhandle area, which is very close to Washington, D.C., there are many Federal employees who endure a tremendously long commute every day. These hours in the car or on a train cause stress or strain and they prevent parents from spending more time with their families.

The Jefferson Telecenter in Ranson, West Virginia, has been a wonderful resource for setting up a more family friendly work environment. I was just there yesterday and visited with an employee from the EPA who expressed her arrangement was very satisfactory, both for her and for her employer.

These personal stories of a better quality of life where people can spend more time with their children and less time in a car are ample evidence that Congress should be more open to telecommuting opportunities.

I urge my colleagues to join me and pass not only the rule but the act.

I again want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) for his constant vigilance in the area of telecommuting, and I want to join with him in every effort to see that this moves forward to bring us to a more productive workforce.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

There were points of order against this debate that were raised by my colleagues on the other side, and there was a citation to the specific rule that ostensibly and allegedly was violated and rulings from the Speaker and the Parliamentarian's advices in that regard, all on this particular rule with reference to telecommunication.

After all the bluster of the past few minutes, let me remind my friends on the other side that under their budget fewer people will be able to telecommute because there will be fewer jobs. That is simply the point we were trying to make, and telecommunication in the final analysis, the contractors that we are trying to protect are people who will be dealing with Medicare, people dealing with hospitals and health care, people dealing with roads, people dealing with education, all of these telecommuters that we are about the process of trying to protect.

Thus, we saw some of my colleagues come down here to the floor to discuss the fact that I raised last evening, and that is that we did not have enough time to discuss those matters that are germane, and there is a distinction in this rule and the rule that we will be discussing on the more germane points

having to do with this Nation's security both economically as well as its defense.

Let me just say, stifling debate is the antithesis of opening up the process that we are trying to do on this telecommunications rule.

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

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

Today, we have had a rule that we debated on telecommuting. We have underlying legislation that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), through his subcommittee, has brought to the floor today. We had a vigorous debate. Seems like we have agreement on this bill.

I am very proud of not only the work that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) does but also the Committee on Rules for its fair rule, a one-hour debate which we provide on any piece of legislation that is important enough to come to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the underlying legislation which will allow all workers to enjoy the all-around benefits of telecommuting, the Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

□ 1145

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS). Pursuant to House Resolution 373 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill, H.R. 3924.

□ 1145

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3924) to authorize telecommuting for Federal contractors, with Mr. FOSSELLA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill now under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3924, the Freedom to Telecommute Act of 2002. I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, for his assistance in bringing this to the floor, as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN); and the ranking member of my subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER); and also the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), my colleague from Virginia, who has been a pioneer in the area of telecommuting throughout this Congress and previous Congresses.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen a tremendous push for competitors to enter the marketplace. As the economy has cooled and the Federal Government appears to be ramping up on spending, vendors are now turning to the government marketplace as the first stop, not the last. Current acquisition law hampers the expansion of the government marketplace because Federal agencies may, under current law, refuse a bid proposal from a potential contractor that utilizes telecommuting in its work force. This is a hindrance to some contractors wishing to participate in the Federal marketplace. It also reduces the pool of contractors from whom the Federal Government can procure innovative services and technologies, and by so doing, of course, raises the cost to the American taxpayer and limits the number of items and the breadth of items that we can purchase that will accomplish the governmental mission.

H.R. 3924 would prohibit Federal agencies from continuing this practice. An exception is made if the contracting officer certifies in writing that telecommuting would conflict with the needs of the agency. For example, this exception may apply if a contractor deals with classified or sensitive information. This will ensure that the Federal marketplace continues to be a competitive choice among contractors.

The bill would also prohibit agencies from issuing solicitations that would reduce the scoring of a potential contractor's proposal if that contractor utilizes telecommuting.

Technological advances make telecommuting an attractive choice for employees because it allows them to work almost anywhere at any time. Telecommuting has caught on over the last 25 years and has become an option for Federal employees just over the last decade. Today, we estimate that close to 19 million people telework, and that number is increasing.

Private sector organizations and Federal agencies with telecommuting programs receive significant benefits. Telework has gained in popularity since it promotes a productive workforce and increases morale and quality of life, often resulting in higher rates of worker retention. The potential for

increased productivity exists because of reduced office distractions: fewer phone calls, no water cooler chats, less commuting time going back and forth to work. Therefore, employees have increased time uninterrupted at work to do their jobs.

As a Member from northern Virginia, I know what it is like to sit in the worst traffic congestion in the country. Telecommuting reduces congestion on our roads, and it helps the environment by eliminating a significant number of vehicle trips during peak hours. Telework is also a very family-friendly initiative. It offers parents the choice of providing care and supervision for their own children while continuing their careers. It also accommodates employees with health problems or elder care or day care responsibilities.

The Subcommittee on Technology and Procurement Policy, which I chair, has been encouraging the development and promotion of telecommuting policies for the Federal Government. Last year, we conducted two oversight hearings to examine Federal agencies' progress in this area. We found that telecommuting is an excellent recruitment and retention tool that the Federal Government can use to address its human capital management crisis. The Federal Government should be a telecommuting leader. We should not be following industry. We should not be following our contractors. We ought to be leading the way. But, unfortunately, Federal agencies have been reluctant to embrace this concept.

For example, Federal managers are resistant to the concept because they would no longer be in the position to monitor employees directly. This attitude ignores the increased employee morale and productivity that results. The testimony before our subcommittee shows that the private sector is turning to this because it increases employee morale, it increases employee retention, it helps in recruitment, and, most of all, it increases productivity. It is time for Federal managers to shift their focus from a process-oriented performance measurement to a results-driven measurement.

When the Federal Government contracts with companies that embrace telework initiatives, the Federal workforce is directly exposed to this concept. Managers who have been reluctant to embrace this concept get to see it firsthand. This is one more way to help break down the managerial barriers that exist today to successful telecommunications and telecommuting in the Federal Government.

Federal agencies continue to grapple with barriers to acquiring the goods and services they need in order to meet their mission objectives. Agencies require better management approaches and purchasing tools government-wide to facilitate the efforts of acquisition managers in meeting agency goals.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Technology and Procurement Policy, I am working with our minority mem-

bers in the administration to accomplish broader acquisition reform. For example, I recently introduced H.R. 3832, the Services Acquisition Reform Act, SARA, which directs the Federal Government to adopt management reform techniques modeled after those in the private sector.

The current Federal services acquisition policy precludes companies with innovative human capital management models from participating fully in the Federal marketplace. And the loser is the Federal Government, which does not get the value and it does not get the competitive nature of these groups. The taxpayers also lose because they do not get the lower prices that competition brings. This sends the wrong message to Federal agencies, and it sends the wrong message to potential contractors.

Federal agencies receive mixed messages about the value of telecommuting under current law. Congress has passed a variety of legislation promoting telecommuting in the Federal workplace, and yet we turn around and restrict Federal contractor employees from implementing similar policies. At the same time, we are striving to create an acquisition system for the Federal Government that is modeled after the best practices of the private sector. But our current policy prevents the private sector from utilizing a critical management initiative such as telecommuting.

At the Subcommittee on Technology and Procurement Policy's two hearings on this topic, we heard from companies such as AT&T and Siemens Enterprise Networks. Both companies testified about the benefits of their telecommuting programs. They highlighted the strategic value of these programs as recruitment and retention tools.

Moreover, at the Subcommittee on Technology and Procurement Policy's September 6, 2001, hearing, we heard testimony from the Information Technology Association of America, the ITAA. Harris Miller, ITAA's president, testified about the challenges his organization's member companies face in the contracting process when they offer their employees the flexibility of telework. Contracting officers are reluctant to allow contractors to telecommute. As I already mentioned, H.R. 3924 will solve this problem.

As the Federal Government transforms its services' contracting processes from one that is performance-based to a results-driven process, human capital management strategies need to be adjusted accordingly. Human capital is of primary importance to private sector organizations. The Federal Government should encourage this viewpoint among its contractors and incorporate it into the agencies' management structures.

We are way behind the 8 ball on this at the Federal level; and this legislation, I think, will move us a step forward. So I encourage my colleagues to help expand telecommuting opportuni-

ties for Federal contracting employees, and I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3924.

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

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

I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 3924, and I commend Chairman DAVIS for his work on this legislation. It is very clear, I think to all of us, that the Federal Government faces a severe and looming human capital crisis; and one of the ways, one of the ways that we can encourage a strong Federal workforce is to utilize some of the management principles that the private sector has adopted. And we know for certainty that the private sector has been much more aggressive in promoting the use of telecommuting in the private sector than has the Federal Government.

The benefits to the Federal Government would be to improve worker productivity, morale and retention, and to improve recruitment of Federal workers. And to do so, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) has proposed in this legislation an encouragement to the private contractors, those who contract with the Federal Government, a provision that would prohibit them from outright banning the use of telecommunication unless there is some clear and distinct justification for doing so, such as national security or some other practical prohibition that would keep those employees of that private contractor from being able to engage in telecommuting.

Advances in information technology have made it so that many jobs in our society can be conducted from many locations. People can, in fact, perform work at home, on the Internet, rather than coming in to the traditional office. We look at the numbers of how many people are utilizing telecommunication in the private sector and we see, according to the latest figures, that there are about 19 million Americans who telecommute as a part of their job, and that number is rising. But when we look at the Federal Government, according to the Office of Personnel Management, there are only about 45,000 employees, or about 2.6 percent of our Federal workforce, that telecommute once a week, and almost half of those are in a single agency.

So we can see that the Federal Government has, in fact, lagged behind the private sector. Now, this bill is designed to encourage the greater use of telecommuting in the Federal Government. And it is interesting to note that though this is a very significant piece of legislation to the gentleman from Virginia, who represents northern Virginia, where we have a large Federal workforce, the encouragement of telecommuting could in fact provide Federal employment opportunities as far away as my district in east Texas. Because if jobs can in fact be performed at home through the use of the Internet, perhaps some of those very lucrative Federal jobs could be spread

around, Mr. Chairman, to some of the rest of us.

So I am very pleased to be able to join my colleague in support of this legislation to encourage further use of telecommuting in the Federal Government.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and let me just say that there is no reason jobs could not go to east Texas, or anywhere else under telecommuting, where we could get the best and the brightest to be able to perform their duties and not have to have them in the current work-structured atmosphere, an outmoded structure that the Federal Government now operates under.

I want to again thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for his help and assistance on this legislation. He has been a most constructive partner in our efforts to better utilize telecommunicating and acquisition reform. Hopefully, the time is not too distant when we will find thousands more parents in the Washington area and other areas able to telecommute, giving them more time to drive their kids back and forth to their piano lessons, to see their kids' practices and games or visit their schools, to adjust to appropriate medical appointments their kids may have; and, frankly, just to have more time with their families. With greater family satisfaction, I think, goes greater worker productivity.

□ 1200

It means for the Federal Government our ability to recruit and retain good people and keep them in this business, something that over the long term for the American taxpayer lowers our costs and gets better value for our tax dollars. This is an important first step. I urge adoption of this measure.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor today to support H.R. 3924, the Freedom to Telecommute Act. This bill does the right thing by permitting federal agencies to allow contractors to telecommute.

Telecommuting is an integral part of building livable communities because it gives people more choices in their work, for their families and for our environment. Not everyone can live next-door to his or her workplace, but with telecommuting, more people can work from home when appropriate and we can reduce the troublesome peak-hour demand on our transportation systems.

In 2001, one in five American workers, or 28 million Americans were telecommuters and the growth of telecommuting is impressive. The number of U.S. telecommuters grew from roughly 19 million in 2000 to 32 million in 2001 and experts predicts that more than 137 million workers will be involved in some sort of remote work by next year.

Increasingly, private and public organizations are adopting telecommuting as a successful workforce strategy because telecommuting helps recruit new employees, expand the labor pool and provide staffing flexibility. It

also reduces sick leave, increases productivity, reduces stress and protects the environment. In fact, if 10 percent of the nation's workforce were able to telecommute only one day a week, we would cut 24.4 million driving miles, eliminate 12,963 tons of air pollution and conserve more than 1.2 million gallons of fuel each week.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill that helps build more livable communities by promoting telecommuting.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3924, the Freedom to Telecommute Act of 2002. Mr. Chairman, I have been a strong advocate of telecommuting and believe that it can be a major answer to solving traffic congestion around the country. It's simple. Fewer cars equal less traffic equal less pollution.

The federal government is already on the way to making telework a standard option for federal employees. Two years ago I included a provision in the transportation spending bill which requires federal agencies to identify employees whose jobs would be appropriate for telework one or more days each week. By the end of last year, each agency was required to offer the telework option to 25 percent of these eligible employees and to continue offering the option to an additional 25 percent until 100 percent of federal employees who are able to telework can.

My friend and colleague from Virginia, Representative DAVIS who strongly supports the federal telework program, has sponsored the Freedom to Telecommute Act on the floor today. This bill to authorize telecommuting for federal contractors will partner with my provision requiring federal agencies to allow workers to telework. It only makes sense that if we are working to encourage federal employees to be teleworking, we should also be allowing employees of federal contractors who work side by side with federal workers the option to telecommute.

A George Mason University study found that by reducing cars on the road by 3 percent, you can reduce traffic delays by 10 percent. This means if we can get 6 percent of the workforce to telecommute, we can reduce traffic congestion by 20 percent.

Studies show that employees are more productive when they telework. They also have a higher quality of life and more time to spend with their families instead of sitting in traffic. Teleworking also saves businesses money by freeing up expensive office space. Add in the benefit of cleaner air from fewer cars on the road and teleworking adds up to a win-win situation for everyone.

I urge a unanimous vote for H.R. 3924.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of H.R. 3924 is as follows:

H.R. 3924

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Freedom to Telecommute Act of 2002".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF TELECOMMUTING FOR FEDERAL CONTRACTORS.

(a) AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation issued in accordance with sections 6 and 25 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 405 and 421) shall be amended to permit the use of telecommuting by employees of Federal contractors in the performance of contracts with executive agencies.

(b) CONTENT OF AMENDMENT.—(1) The amendment issued pursuant to subsection (a) shall, at a minimum, provide that solicitations for the acquisition of goods or services shall not set forth any requirement or evaluation criteria described in paragraph (2) unless the contracting officer first—

(A) determines that the needs of the agency, including the security needs of the agency, cannot be met without any such requirement; and

(B) explains in writing the basis for that determination.

(2) A requirement or evaluation criteria under this paragraph is a requirement or evaluation criteria that would—

(A) render an offeror ineligible to receive a contract award based on the offeror's plan to allow its employees to telecommute; or

(B) reduce the scoring of an offeror's proposal based upon the contractor's plan to allow its employees to telecommute.

(c) GAO REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date on which the amendment required by subsection (a) is published in the Federal Register, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress an evaluation of—

(1) compliance by executive agencies with the regulations; and

(2) conformance of the regulations with existing law, together with any recommendations that the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "executive agency" has the meaning given that term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

The CHAIRMAN. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) having assumed the chair, Mr. FOSSELLA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3924) to authorize telecommuting for Federal contractors, pursuant to House Resolution 373, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8(c) of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for an electronic vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 371, which vote will be taken immediately after the vote on passage of H.R. 3924.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]
YEAS—421

Abercrombie	Clayton	Gallegly
Ackerman	Clement	Ganske
Aderholt	Clyburn	Gekas
Akin	Coble	Gephardt
Allen	Collins	Gibbons
Andrews	Combest	Gilchrest
Armey	Condit	Gillmor
Baca	Conyers	Gilman
Bachus	Cooksey	Gonzalez
Baird	Costello	Goode
Baker	Cox	Goodlatte
Baldacci	Coyne	Gordon
Baldwin	Cramer	Goss
Ballenger	Crane	Graham
Barcia	Crenshaw	Granger
Barr	Crowley	Graves
Barrett	Cubin	Green (TX)
Bartlett	Culberson	Green (WI)
Barton	Cummings	Greenwood
Bass	Cunningham	Grucci
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Gutknecht
Bentsen	Davis (IL)	Hall (OH)
Bereuter	Davis, Jo Ann	Hall (TX)
Berkley	Davis, Tom	Hansen
Berman	Deal	Harman
Berry	DeFazio	Hart
Biggert	DeGette	Hastings (FL)
Bilirakis	Delahunt	Hastings (WA)
Bishop	DeLauro	Hayes
Blumenauer	DeLay	Hayworth
Blunt	DeMint	Hefley
Boehler	Deutsch	Herger
Boehner	Diaz-Balart	Hill
Bonilla	Dicks	Hilleary
Bonior	Dingell	Hilliard
Bono	Doggett	Hinchee
Boozman	Dooley	Hinojosa
Borski	Doolittle	Hobson
Boswell	Doyle	Hoeffel
Boucher	Dreier	Hoekstra
Boyd	Duncan	Holden
Brady (PA)	Dunn	Holt
Brady (TX)	Edwards	Honda
Brown (FL)	Ehlers	Hooley
Brown (OH)	Ehrlich	Horn
Brown (SC)	Emerson	Hostettler
Bryant	Engel	Houghton
Burr	English	Hoyer
Burton	Eshoo	Hulshof
Buyer	Etheridge	Hunter
Callahan	Evans	Hyde
Calvert	Everett	Inslee
Camp	Farr	Isakson
Cannon	Fattah	Israel
Cantor	Ferguson	Issa
Capito	Filner	Istook
Capps	Flake	Jackson (IL)
Capuano	Fletcher	Jackson-Lee
Cardin	Foley	(TX)
Carson (IN)	Forbes	Jefferson
Carson (OK)	Ford	Jenkins
Castle	Fossella	John
Chabot	Frank	Johnson (CT)
Chambliss	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (IL)
Clay	Frost	Johnson, E. B.

Johnson, Sam	Moran (VA)
Jones (NC)	Murtha
Jones (OH)	Myrick
Kanjorski	Nadler
Kaptur	Napolitano
Keller	Neal
Kelly	Nethercutt
Kennedy (MN)	Ney
Kennedy (RI)	Norwood
Kerns	Nussle
Kildee	Oberstar
Kilpatrick	Obey
Kind (WI)	Olver
King (NY)	Ortiz
Kingston	Osborne
Kirk	Ose
Kleczka	Otter
Knollenberg	Owens
Kolbe	Oxley
Kucinich	Pallone
LaFalce	Pascrell
LaHood	Pastor
Lampson	Paul
Langevin	Payne
Lantos	Pelosi
Larsen (WA)	Pence
Larson (CT)	Peterson (MN)
Latham	Petri
LaTourette	Phelps
Leach	Pickering
Lee	Pitts
Levin	Platts
Lewis (CA)	Pombo
Lewis (GA)	Pomeroy
Lewis (KY)	Portman
Linder	Price (NC)
LoBiondo	Pryce (OH)
Lowe	Putnam
Lucas (KY)	Quinn
Lucas (OK)	Radanovich
Luther	Rahall
Lynch	Ramstad
Maloney (CT)	Rangel
Maloney (NY)	Regula
Manzullo	Rehberg
Markey	Reyes
Mascara	Reynolds
Matheson	Riley
Matsui	Rivers
McCarthy (MO)	Rodriguez
McCarthy (NY)	Roemer
McColum	Rogers (KY)
McCrery	Rogers (MI)
McDermott	Rohrabacher
Grucci	McGovern
McHugh	McGovern
McInnis	McInnis
McIntyre	Roukema
McKeon	Royal-Allard
McKinney	Royce
McNulty	Ryan (WI)
Meehan	Ryan (KS)
Meek (FL)	Sabo
Meeks (NY)	Sanchez
Menendez	Sanders
Mica	Sandlin
Millender-	Sawyer
McDonald	Saxton
Miller, Dan	Schaffer
Miller, Gary	Schakowsky
Miller, George	Schiff
Miller, Jeff	Schrock
Mink	Scott
Mollohan	Sensenbrenner
Moore	Serrano
Moran (KS)	Sessions

Shaw	Shays
Sherman	Sherman
Sherwood	Sherwood
Shimkus	Shimkus
Shuster	Shuster
Simmons	Simmons
Simpson	Simpson
Skeen	Skeen
Skelton	Skelton
Slaughter	Slaughter
Smith (MI)	Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)	Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)	Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)	Smith (WA)
Snyder	Snyder
Solis	Solis
Souder	Souder
Spratt	Spratt
Stark	Stark
Stearns	Stearns
Stenholm	Stenholm
Strickland	Strickland
Stump	Stump
Stupak	Stupak
Sullivan	Sullivan
Sununu	Sununu
Sweeney	Sweeney
Tancredo	Tancredo
Tanner	Tanner
Tauscher	Tauscher
Tauzin	Tauzin
Taylor (MS)	Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)	Taylor (NC)
Terry	Terry
Thomas	Thomas
Thompson (CA)	Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)	Thompson (MS)
Thornberry	Thornberry
Thune	Thune
Thurman	Thurman
Tiahrt	Tiahrt
Tiberi	Tiberi
Tierney	Tierney
Toomey	Toomey
Towns	Towns
Turner	Turner
Udall (CO)	Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)	Udall (NM)
Upton	Upton
Velazquez	Velazquez
Visclosky	Visclosky
Vitter	Vitter
Walden	Walden
Walsh	Walsh
Wamp	Wamp
Waters	Waters
Watkins (OK)	Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)	Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)	Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)	Watts (OK)
Waxman	Waxman
Weiner	Weiner
Weldon (FL)	Weldon (FL)
Weller	Weller
Wexler	Wexler
Whitfield	Whitfield
Wicker	Wicker
Wilson (NM)	Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)	Wilson (SC)
Wolf	Wolf
Woolsey	Woolsey
Wu	Wu
Wynn	Wynn
Young (AK)	Young (AK)
Young (FL)	Young (FL)

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 371.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 371, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]
YEAS—423

Abercrombie	Collins	Goode
Ackerman	Combest	Goodlatte
Aderholt	Condit	Gordon
Akin	Conyers	Goss
Allen	Cooksey	Graham
Andrews	Costello	Granger
Armey	Cox	Graves
Baca	Coyne	Green (TX)
Bachus	Cramer	Green (WI)
Baird	Crane	Greenwood
Baker	Crenshaw	Grucci
Baldacci	Crowley	Gutknecht
Baldwin	Cubin	Hall (OH)
Ballenger	Culberson	Hall (TX)
Barcia	Cummings	Hansen
Barr	Cunningham	Harman
Barrett	Davis (CA)	Hart
Bartlett	Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)
Barton	Davis, Jo Ann	Hastings (WA)
Bass	Davis, Tom	Hayes
Becerra	Deal	Hayworth
Bentsen	DeFazio	Hefley
Bereuter	DeGette	Herger
Berkley	Delahunt	Hill
Berman	DeLauro	Hilleary
Berry	DeLay	Hilliard
Biggert	DeMint	Hinchee
Bilirakis	Deutsch	Hinojosa
Bishop	Diaz-Balart	Hobson
Blumenauer	Dicks	Hoeffel
Blunt	Dingell	Hoekstra
Boehler	Doggett	Holden
Boehner	Dooley	Holt
Bonilla	Doolittle	Honda
Bonior	Doyle	Hooley
Bono	Dreier	Horn
Boozman	Duncan	Hostettler
Borski	Dunn	Houghton
Boswell	Edwards	Hoyer
Boucher	Ehlers	Hulshof
Boyd	Emerson	Hunter
Brady (PA)	Engel	Hyde
Brady (TX)	English	Inslee
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Isakson
Brown (OH)	Etheridge	Israel
Brown (SC)	Evans	Issa
Bryant	Everett	Istook
Burr	Farr	Jackson (IL)
Burton	Fattah	Jackson-Lee
Buyer	Ferguson	(TX)
Callahan	Filner	Jefferson
Calvert	Flake	Jenkins
Camp	Fletcher	John
Cannon	Foley	Johnson (CT)
Cantor	Forbes	Johnson (IL)
Carson (IN)	Ford	Johnson, E. B.
Carson (OK)	Fossella	Johnson, Sam
Castle	Frank	Jones (NC)
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Jones (OH)
Chambliss	Frost	Kanjorski
Clay	Gallegly	Kaptur
Clayton	Gekas	Keller
Clement	Gephardt	Kelly
Clyburn	Gibbons	Kennedy (MN)
Coble	Gilchrest	Kennedy (RI)
	Gillmor	Kerns
	Gilman	Kildee
	Gonzalez	Kilpatrick
		Kind (WI)

NOT VOTING—13

Blagojevich	Morella	Shows
Davis (FL)	Northup	Traficant
Gutierrez	Peterson (PA)	Weldon (PA)
Lipinski	Rush	
Lofgren	Shadegg	

□ 1225

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 71, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

King (NY) Norwood Shimkus
 Kingston Nussle Shuster
 Kirk Oberstar Simmons
 Kleczka Obey Simpson
 Knollenberg Olver Skeen
 Kolbe Ortiz Skelton
 Kucinich Osborne Slaughter
 LaFalce Ose Smith (MI)
 LaHood Otter Smith (NJ)
 Lampson Owens Smith (TX)
 Langevin Oxley Smith (WA)
 Lantos Pallone Snyder
 Larsen (WA) Pascrell Solis
 Larson (CT) Pastor Souder
 Latham Paul Spratt
 LaTourette Payne Stark
 Leach Pelosi Stearns
 Lee Pence Stenholm
 Levin Peterson (MN) Strickland
 Lewis (CA) Peterson (PA) Stump
 Lewis (GA) Petri Stupak
 Lewis (KY) Phelps Sullivan
 Linder Pickering Sununu
 LoBiondo Pitts Sweeney
 Lofgren Platts Tancredo
 Lowey Pombo Tanner
 Lucas (KY) Pomeroy Tauscher
 Lucas (OK) Portman Tauzin
 Luther Price (NC) Taylor (MS)
 Lynch Pryce (OH) Taylor (NC)
 Maloney (CT) Putnam Terry
 Maloney (NY) Quinn Thomas
 Manzullo Radanovich Thompson (CA)
 Markey Rahall Thompson (MS)
 Mascara Ramstad Thornberry
 Matheson Rangel Thune
 Matsui Regula Thurman
 McCarthy (MO) Rehberg Tiahrt
 McCarthy (NY) Reyes Tiberi
 McCollum Reynolds Tierney
 McCrery Riley Toomey
 McDermott Rivers Towns
 McGovern Rodriguez Turner
 McHugh Roemer Udall (CO)
 McInnis Rogers (KY) Udall (NM)
 McIntyre Rogers (MI) Upton
 McKeon Rohrabacher Velazquez
 McKinney Ros-Lehtinen Vislosky
 McNulty Ross Vitter
 Meehan Rothman Walden
 Meek (FL) Roukema Walsh
 Meeks (NY) Roybal-Allard Wamp
 Menendez Royce Waters
 Mica Ryan (WI) Watkins (OK)
 Millender- Ryun (KS) Watson (CA)
 McDonald Sabo Watt (NC)
 Miller, Dan Sanchez Watts (OK)
 Miller, Gary Sanders Waxman
 Miller, George Sandlin Weiner
 Miller, Jeff Sawyer Weldon (FL)
 Mink Saxton Weller
 Mollohan Schaffer Wexler
 Moore Schakowsky Whitfield
 Moran (KS) Schiff Wicker
 Moran (VA) Schroek Wilson (NM)
 Murtha Scott Wilson (SC)
 Myrick Sensenbrenner Wolf
 Nadler Serrano Woolsey
 Napolitano Sessions Wu
 Neal Shaw Wynn
 Nethercutt Shays Young (AK)
 Ney Sherman Young (FL)
 Northup Sherwood

NOT VOTING—11

Blagojevich Lipinski Shows
 Davis (FL) Morella Trafficant
 Ehrlich Rush Weldon (PA)
 Gutierrez Shadegg

□ 1236

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, in protest of this rule and since passage of this rule would require spending the Social Security surplus, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The Chair will remind the gentleman from Texas that the motion to adjourn is not debatable.

The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 77, noes 337, answered “present” 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

AYES—77

Allen Hall (OH) Pomeroy
 Baird Hastings (FL) Price (NC)
 Baldwin Hilliard Roybal-Allard
 Bentsen Hinchey Sabo
 Berkley Holt Sanders
 Berry Honda Sandlin
 Boyd Jackson (IL) Sawyer
 Brown (FL) Jefferson Schakowsky
 Carson (OK) Johnson, E. B. Scott
 Clay Jones (OH) Slaughter
 Clyburn Kennedy (RI) Smith (MI)
 Coyers LaFalce Smith (WA)
 Coyne Langevin Solis
 Cummings Lantos Stark
 Davis (IL) Lee Thompson (MS)
 DeFazio Lewis (GA) Tierney
 Deutsch Lowey Towns
 Dicks Markey Udall (CO)
 Doggett McDermott Velazquez
 Evans McNulty Waters
 Farr Meek (FL) Watson (CA)
 Filner Mink Wexler
 Frank Olver Woolsey
 Frost Owens Wynn
 Gephardt Pastor
 Gordon Pelosi

NOES—337

Abercrombie Camp Ehlers
 Ackerman Cannon Ehrlich
 Aderholt Cantor Engel
 Akin Capito English
 Andrews Capps Eshoo
 Arney Etheridge
 Baca Cardin Everett
 Bachus Castle Fattah
 Baker Chabot Ferguson
 Baldacci Chambliss Flake
 Ballenger Clayton Fletcher
 Barcia Clement Foley
 Barr Coble Forbes
 Barrett Collins Ford
 Bartlett Combest Fossella
 Barton Condit Frelinghuysen
 Bass Cooksey Gallegly
 Berra Costello Gekas
 Bereuter Cox Gibbons
 Berman Cramer Gillmor
 Biggart Crane Gilman
 Bilirakis Crenshaw Gonzalez
 Bishop Crowley Goode
 Blumenauer Cubin Goodlatte
 Blunt Culberson Goss
 Boehlert Cunningham Graham
 Boehner Davis (CA) Granger
 Bonilla Davis (FL) Graves
 Bonior Davis, Jo Ann Green (TX)
 Bono Davis, Tom Green (WI)
 Boozman Deal Greenwood
 Borski DeGette Grucci
 Boswell Delahunt Gutknecht
 Boucher DeLauro Hall (TX)
 Brady (PA) DeLay Hansen
 Brady (TX) DeMint Harman
 Brown (OH) Dingell Hart
 Brown (SC) Dooley Hastings (WA)
 Bryant Doolittle Hayes
 Burr Doyle Hayworth
 Burton Dreier Hefley
 Buyer Duncan Herger
 Callahan Dunn Hill
 Calvert Edwards Hilleary

Hinojosa McInnis Ryun (KS)
 Hobson McIntyre Sanchez
 Hoeffel McKeon Saxton
 Hoekstra McKinney Schaffer
 Holden Meehan Schiff
 Hooley Meeks (NY) Schrock
 Horn Menendez Sensenbrenner
 Hostettler Mica Serrano
 Houghton Miller, Dan Sessions
 Hoyer Miller, Gary Shaw
 Hulshof Miller, George Shays
 Hunter Miller, Jeff Sherman
 Hyde Mollohan Sherwood
 Inslee Moore Shimkus
 Isakson Moran (KS) Shuster
 Israel Moran (VA) Simmons
 Issa Morella Simpson
 Jackson-Lee Murtha Skeen
 (TX) Myrick Skelton
 Jenkins Nadler Smith (NJ)
 John Napolitano Smith (TX)
 Johnson (IL) Neal Snyder
 Johnson, Sam Nethercutt Souder
 Jones (NC) Ney Spratt
 Kanjorski Northup Stearns
 Kaptur Norwood Stenholm
 Keller Nussle Strickland
 Kelly Oberstar Stump
 Kennedy (MN) Obey Stupak
 Kerns Ortiz Sullivan
 Kildee Osborne Sununu
 Kilpatrick Ose Sweeney
 Kind (WI) Otter Tancredo
 King (NY) Oxley Tanner
 Kingston Pallone Tauscher
 Kirk Pascrell Tauzin
 Kleczka Paul Taylor (MS)
 Knollenberg Payne Taylor (NC)
 Kolbe Pence Terry
 Kucinich Peterson (MN) Thomas
 LaHood LaHood Thompson (CA)
 Lampson Lampson Petri
 Larsen (WA) Phelps Thune
 Larson (CT) Pitts Pickering
 Latham Platts Pickering
 LaTourette Pombo Toomey
 Leach Portman Turner
 Levin Pryce (OH) Udall (NM)
 Lewis (CA) Putnam Upton
 Lewis (KY) Quinn Vislosky
 Linder Radanovich Vitter
 LoBiondo Rahall Walden
 Lofgren Ramstad Walsh
 Lucas (KY) Rangel Wamp
 Lucas (OK) Regula Watts (OK)
 Luther Rehberg Waxman
 Lynch Reyes Weiner
 Maloney (CT) Reynolds Weldon (FL)
 Maloney (NY) Riley Weller
 Manzullo Manuzello Whitfield
 Matheson Matheson Rodriguez Wicker
 Matsui Matsui Roemer Wilson (NM)
 McCarthy (MO) McCarthy (MO) Rogers (KY) Wilson (SC)
 McCarthy (NY) McCarthy (NY) Rogers (MI) Wolf
 McCollum McCollum Ross Young (AK)
 McCrery McCrery Roukema Young (FL)
 McGovern McGovern Royce
 McHugh McHugh Ryan (WI)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Gilchrest

NOT VOTING—19

Blagojevich Johnson (CT) Rush
 Carson (IN) Lipinski Shadegg
 Diaz-Balart Millender Shows
 Emerson McDonald Trafficant
 Ganske Peterson (PA) Watkins (OK)
 Gutierrez Ros-Lehtinen Weldon (PA)
 Istook Rothman

□ 1256

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia and Messrs. MATSUI, KLECZKA, and MOORE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 353, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 372 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 372

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 353) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2003 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2007. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed three hours, with two hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Saxton of New Jersey and Representative Stark of California or their designees. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. After general debate the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution, as amended, to the House. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 72, noes 333, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

AYES—72

Ackerman Baird Bentsen
Allen Baldwin Berkley

Bonior
Boyd
Brown (FL)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Coyne
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Dicks
Doggett
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Frank
Frost
Gephardt
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchev
Honda
Jackson (IL)

Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kennedy (RI)
Kilpatrick
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lowe
Markey
McDermott
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mink
Oliver
Owens
Pallone

NOES—333

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Andrews
Army
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Balducci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom

Deal
DeGette
DeLahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Etheridge
Everett
Fattah
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof

Hunter
Hyde
Inslie
Isakson
Israel
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Menendez
Mica
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, Jeff
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney

Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obeyes
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Paul
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Simmons
Simpson
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Roukema

Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schiff
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo

Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—29

Blagojevich
Carson (IN)
Dooley
Emerson
Evans
Gutierrez
Issa
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Klecza

Millender-
McDonald
Miller, George
Moran (VA)
Oxley
Platts
Riley
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Rush

Ryun (KS)
Serrano
Shadegg
Sherwood
Shows
Smith (WA)
Taylor (NC)
Traficant
Weldon (PA)
Young (FL)

□ 1316

Mr. WEXLER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 353, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only on the matter before us.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 372 is a closed rule which has been crafted to bring forward the annual Congressional budget resolution. While this differs in some ways from years past, it does reflect the fact that the previous 6 months has been anything but typical in the United States of America. As with all legislation considered by this body in the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks, we have found ourselves in a unique situation where the traditional way of doing things has

been modified by both sides to meet the more important priorities of a Nation fighting a war.

I am very pleased that the motion to adjourn and the one that preceded it both showed that even though there were 77 Members, or 72 Members in the second vote of the loyal opposition who do want to adjourn, that on a large bipartisan basis, most of this body wants to get on with this important work of the budget, and I think it is in that bipartisan spirit that we present this rule.

For a number of years, we have gotten into the admirable habit of managing debate on the budget by asking that all amendments be drafted in the form of substitutes so that Members could consider the whole picture as we debate and weigh spending priorities, which is, after all, our first mission here. Although we set out to continue that practice this year, unfortunately no real alternatives were offered.

While some may claim and some will claim that some near substitutes were offered, the proposals were actually modifications to process rather than substance, and they in no way qualified as full substitutes.

Despite rhetoric that I am sure we will hear as we always do in this particular debate that states otherwise, this rule provides a healthy forum for debate of our Nation's budget, and that is what we will be about this afternoon. It provides for 3 hours of general debate with 2 hours confined to the Congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. Additionally, 1 hour of what we call Humphrey-Hawkins debate on the subject of economic goals and policies will be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), the House chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Joint Economics respectively.

The rule further waives all points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution and provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole, and the rule permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to offer amendments in the House to achieve mathematical consistency.

Finally, the rule provides that the concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for a or division the question of its adoption. So this is a fair rule. It is a practical rule and it fits the circumstances that we have today very well.

Mr. Speaker, in previous years the beginning of the budget season was a time when Members of this body would show the full color of their beliefs. Like in that other great rite of spring, the growth of the cherry blossoms, Washington explodes with new life and

vividness as the great budgetary debates began, and we heard lots of good ideas. We argued over what programs should grow, what should prosper, what should be cut. We disagreed about how much money should be used to pay down debts and how much should be given back to the citizens, and we debated about lockboxes and highway funds, and in short, we argued about what are the proper responsibilities of the government, how do we go about our spending.

In all my years on Capitol Hill I have seldom met a Member of this body who did not believe that security and defense are among the most basic and essential duties of government, and that is what this budget is about, our national security. In fact, this budget is about three types of security.

First, it is about fiscal security for the Nation. This budget increases our defense spending by 13 percent so that well-paid, well-trained and well-equipped soldiers can defeat and deter all those who wish to harm the United States of America and its citizens at home and abroad.

The budget also provides \$38 billion for new homeland defense spending. This money will be used to monitor our borders, improve intelligence collection, secure airports and better equip first responders for acts of terrorism, and indeed, we have seen some amazing heroic acts from those first responders.

Second, this budget is about economic security. It continues to pay down the national debt and retains important tax cuts for families and businesses. Additionally, this budget provides money for investments in energy, transportation and agriculture. Collectively, these measures will ensure that our economy continues to turn the corner away from recession and towards sustained prosperity.

Thirdly, this budget is about personal security. It secures the commitments that our government has made to its citizens. It increases spending for veterans programs, and in my district that is particularly welcome news. It increases spending for education funding, for Medicare costs and environmental needs, and of course, Social Security is protected.

All of America's most important social spending programs are maintained and increased under this budget. In total this \$2.1 trillion budget the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has put together meets all of America's long-standing commitments while it greatly increases funds for programs that will safeguard the lives of our families, our neighbors, our fellow citizens in this time of unusual peril.

Many may try to argue that this is the first deficit budget in recent years or that some favorite project of theirs is not sufficiently funded. Many will even try to claim both of these at the same time, and it is true that some projections show we will run a modest deficit this year, but in the last 6 months our Nation has been through

war and recession. The small deficit we may face this year is a minor cost considering the urgency of defense needs and given the fact that all major social programs are fully funded.

Further, most budget experts agree that for the rest of the decade after this emergency year we can expect increasing budget surpluses.

When I speak to my constituents back home in southwest Florida, the last thing in the world they are concerned about is which political party scored points in this debate today. What matters to them now is that their government steps up and does the job that it was created to do to protect their lives and their liberty. It is our duty to give the American people a budget that does precisely that.

This is a fair rule to bring forward, an excellent budget. I urge passage of the rule.

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

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this closed rule. I oppose the cynicism it embraces and the contempt it demonstrates for honest debate. With this rule, the Republican leadership has blocked amendments offered by Democrats, all in an effort to adapt a flawed and disingenuous budget.

Our side of the aisle has made clear that the President has the firm support of this caucus when it comes to waging war on terrorism, and as a ninth generation American whose ancestors have fought in every United States conflict since the Revolutionary War, I am keenly aware of the sacrifices that war calls for.

I am also keenly aware that national security does not abrogate us from pursuing the priorities important to the country. Mr. Speaker, we have promised to keep. Generations of Americans have poured billions of dollars into Social Security and Medicare with the promise that these vital programs would be there for them when they and their loved ones retired. This body has voted five separate times to put Social Security and Medicare in a lockbox and throw away the key. Yet this budget resolution breaks that promise.

Indeed, the measure before us wipes out most of the Social Security surplus and decimates all of the Medicare surplus over the next 5 years. Thirty-two million retirees rely on Social Security income, and that number is increasing every day.

Mr. Speaker, I am still stunned that we have fallen so far so fast. In less than a year a surplus of \$5.6 trillion shrank by \$4 trillion. This is the worst fiscal reversal in American history and

for what? A single-minded obsession with tax cuts that overwhelmingly benefit the very wealthy in this Nation, and do not be fooled by today's rhetoric. The negative impact of the budget priorities of the majority were already stinging many Americans well before the tragedy that unfolded September 11. In fact, 43 percent of the surplus was already gone by then due to the tax cut.

Why then in the midst of this fiscal problem do we now hear that the leadership in the House is demanding further tax cuts a month from now? Why are we jeopardizing the Nation's future for a press hit during tax time?

This administration and leadership of the body has squandered an extraordinary opportunity for reasons largely unrelated to the war. The budget reverses a decade of fiscal progress and takes the country back down a perilous path of unending deficits. From 2002 through 2012, budget surpluses are converted into budget deficits, and Social Security and Medicare trust funds are raided with abandon.

Mr. Speaker, virtually every independent analysis of this budget has dubbed it a sham. It omits numbers in the second 5 years even though we have employed 10-year projections since Congress passed the Balanced Budget Act. Even more ominously this resolution uses OMB rather than CBO estimates in an effort to hide the real impact of the budget. Instead of relying on Congress' nonpartisan CBO estimates, the majority chose to use the much rosier estimates provided by the administration's political appointees at OMB.

My colleagues may recall that in 1995 the other side shut down the government to insist on the use of CBO estimates. If CBO should prove correct rather than OMB, virtually the entire Social Security surplus will be gone for the next 10 years.

At the very least the Committee on Rules should have allowed an amendment by Mr. MORAN to pull in the reins on deficit spending to allow us to return to fiscal responsibility. The committee should have allowed the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) to offer his substitute, which simply used realistic CBO cost estimates to shape the Nation's budget.

Moreover, Democrats had hoped to offer amendments on a host of issues. In addition to undermining Social Security and Medicare, the resolution woefully underfunds education, a prescription drug benefit, efforts to fight HIV and AIDS. The list goes on and on.

This close ruled kills honest debate on these and other issues.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), a member of the committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) for allowing me a few minutes to talk

about the budget, the Republican budget, that has run through committee.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) in that committee has done a fabulous job and I want to talk about some of the great things that this budget does.

First of all, as the parent of a child with Down's syndrome, I am very pleased to know that we are going to continue providing schools with money for IDEA. It is important that this Congress understand that IDEA and the education of our children is important. We have increased funding.

We have made sure that as we go through this budget that we make sure that not one penny has been taken from Medicare, Medicaid or Social Security. Last night in the Committee on Rules, I had an opportunity to speak with not only the chairman of the Committee on the Budget but also the ranking member and asked the question specifically, is there one penny that we have taken out? That answer is no.

We have continued to make sure we pay down debt. We have continued to make sure that veterans receive not only an increase of the money we give them but that we continue to focus on the efficiency of those programs.

We make sure in this budget that not only do we talk about homeland security, which is probably the number one issue combined with winning the war, but we fully fund those requests that come from our President to make sure that those things happen with making sure the military and homeland security gets their money.

We are making sure that we do things to support funding of not only education and homeland security but we are also making sure that we are giving the money to NIH. NIH funding has doubled now since 1996. We are making sure that we take care of the needs of a growing Nation, a Nation that needs NIH to solve and give us cures related to medicine.

□ 1330

So what we are doing in this budget is going through and making sure that the priorities of this Nation are taken care of. We are increasing funding some places, but we are making sure that homeland security and the defense of this country is taken care of. At a time when we are at war, what we are doing is not having deficit spending. We are making sure that we end with a balance here. And at a time when increasingly it is more and more difficult to find enough money to keep spending, we are making sure that priorities are taken care of.

I am proud of not only what this Republican bill does, but last night we heard from the other side, the Democrats, that they do not intend to offer a budget. I think it is very insincere for someone to come and attack you for doing the heavy lifting when in fact they do not present their own budget. It is easy to attack one piece or another,

one place or another, but when you put together an entire budget, which is what we have done, I think it deserves the support of this House, and that is what I support.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. I speak as the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, and I speak with those who wear the uniform of our country in mind.

The vote on this resolution might well be the most important national defense vote cast this year. In my opinion, the rule that is being offered today shortchanges national defense. Let me explain.

The top line that is recommended is a \$48 billion increase. I think that is fine. We have needed that for some time. However, there is a \$10 billion so-called reserve fund that we are not allowed to appropriate. My amendment that was offered at the Committee on Rules, and that was denied, would fix that flaw and fix that error. So what this amounts to is a \$10 billion zero, a cut in the proposed figure of \$48 billion down to a \$38 billion increase.

Under the Constitution, our duty is clear: article one, section 8 requires that the Congress of the United States raise and maintain the military. We cannot delegate that duty, as is proposed in this rule and in this resolution. We cannot give it to anyone else, the Secretary of Defense, though he is a fine man; the President, or anyone else. As Harry Truman once said, and the little sign said on his desk: "The buck stops here." The buck stops on national security and national defense right with us.

I cannot offer, as a result of the Committee on Rules' denial of my amendment, a pay increase that should equal the pay increase that the soldiers and those in uniform received last year. They cannot receive the military construction money that is needed. And just today, General Joe Ralston revealed in testimony and showed us in pictures the dilapidated family housing that our people live in in Europe. We need more Navy ships, ammunition, and unfunded requirements.

It is our duty. It is not a political thing; it is our duty under the Constitution to vote against this rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time that remains on either side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 20 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York has 22½ minutes remaining.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Since September 11, Americans have united in historic fashion, pulling together as a national family to face down the new dangers of terrorism, and Democrats remain committed to ensuring our troops have all the resources they need to win the war on terrorism. There is no partisan debate over defending America. But that is not the only challenge facing us right now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I can only assume that my friends on the other side of the aisle are great fans of Lewis Carroll. You remember Lewis Carroll. He is the fellow who wrote "Alice in Wonderland." We have a situation where down is up and up is down. Republicans say, oh, we do not touch the Social Security surplus. We do not take a penny out of Social Security. Well, down is up and up is down, my colleagues, because, in fact, this budget uses \$1 trillion of the Social Security and Medicare surplus the first 5 years and \$2 trillion over a 10-year period.

Over the past 12 years, America has fallen into a very deep and dangerous budgetary hole, one that poses a great threat to Social Security and other priorities like education, prescription drugs, and homeland security. Since Republicans passed their budget last year, America has lost \$5 trillion of the proposed surplus. That is nearly 90 percent of our national nest egg down the drain.

Mr. Speaker, last year, we were planning to pay off America's national debt. This year, the Bush administration wants to increase the debt ceiling so all Americans can go deeper into debt. Before last year, we were using the Social Security surplus to strengthen Social Security. In fact, this House overwhelmingly passed five different lock boxes, pledging not to spend Social Security on other government programs. But this year, Republicans have broken their promise to America and offered a budget that raids Social Security in each of the next 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one way to dig ourselves out of this hole and that is by working together as a national family to restore fiscal responsibility and honest budgeting. That is how families across the country operate. They sit down at the kitchen table and take an honest look at their expenses, their debts, and their income. Mr. Speaker, that is why Democrats have repeatedly urged Republicans to forget politics as usual and join us at the negotiating table to work out a bipartisan budget.

Unfortunately, Republicans refuse to even acknowledge the mess they have made or the threat it poses to Social Security. Instead, their budget cooks the books yet again and tries to pass off another bad check on the American people. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are hiding behind budget gimmicks and accounting tricks that no self-respecting accountant would stomach, unless he worked for Enron.

Republicans are desperate, Mr. Speaker. They are desperate to hide

the fact that the Republican budget is a trillion dollar raid on Social Security, one that still increases the debt and shortchanges priorities like education and prescription drugs. Additionally, as the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) have pointed out, Republicans are seriously shortchanging health care for veterans and military retirees.

Vote "no" on the rule and "no" on the budget.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Charlotte, North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), the hub of most good flights going to Florida these days, and a member who does great work on our Committee on Rules.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I think over this next period of hours we are going to be hearing a lot of rhetoric about Social Security and what is happening to Social Security. It seems to be the keynote of the day.

I just wanted to commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for what he has done in bringing this budget forward.

I came here, like a lot of others, in 1995, with the commitment that we are going to balance the budget; and in 1997 we were able to achieve that, and we have been doing that every year since. And Chairman NUSSLE is keeping us on that path.

We have paid down debt; and, yes, we can move the numbers around, people seem to be good at that, but we have paid down almost a half trillion dollars in debt so far, and that is really a good start. We are going to be paying down more, and we have a commitment to continue to do that as well as protecting Social Security over these next few years.

And I will say that anybody who is receiving Social Security today, or is close to receiving Social Security or Medicare, should not be misled in any way by people saying, oh well, it is not going to be there for them. They are perfectly fine. We are talking about the future, which we are going to be working on.

I cannot help but make the comment that if previous leaderships over the past 30 years, before we took over in 1995, had not spent the Social Security surplus specifically for other government programs, they used it every year, if that had not happened, that money would still be there and we would not be having any argument whatsoever of whether there was enough money for Social Security. That point seems to get lost when we are doing debate.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to bring that to everyone's attention and again commend Chairman NUSSLE for the good job he has done in protecting our future with the war and our homeland defense and our economic security; and I urge my colleagues to vote

"yes" on the rule and "yes" on the budget.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) my colleague on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this budget is a case study in poor leadership and fiscal management. It serves as an example of what goes wrong when you fail to think ahead.

Mr. Speaker, the general theme of this year's budget resolution is a reckless disregard for the obvious. After all, the resolution does not account for the last 5 years of last year's tax cut, and it certainly does not account for real CBO numbers.

What the majority's figures do account for is a more than 5 percent cut in nondefense related spending and an additional \$28 billion in tax cuts. They account for a 16 percent shortchanging of "leave no child behind," and they account for the elimination of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

The resolution also accounts for cuts in health care, law enforcement, energy production, environmental protection, not enough money for election reform, housing for the elderly, the capital fund for housing, homeless assistance cuts; and all the way across the board we find this.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, what has happened is the lock box has been unlocked, thrown away, retooled, and made into an ATM machine.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for the purpose of a colloquy with a colleague.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to engage in a short colloquy with the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget.

It is my desire to clarify where the increase in the money authorized for health-related spending will go. I would like to stress the importance of providing funding for the Center for Disease Control buildings and facilities in respect to winning the war on terrorism.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would be pleased to enter into that colloquy with the very distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

One of today's most serious potential threats to our national security is bioterrorism. The CDC is a major and integral part of the homeland defense because of its ability to identify, classify, and recommend courses of action in dealing with biological and chemical threats.

In addition to working in asbestos-laden facilities, many highly trained

scientists perform their research in facilities that lack safety features, such as sprinkler systems and adequate electrical and air flow systems, and, as a result, limits the agency's ability to recruit and retain the world-class scientists.

The multiyear master plan, put together by the CDC for adding to and replacing infrastructure at its Atlanta location, has received wide bipartisan support in the House and the Senate. Addressing the deficiencies will greatly benefit all Americans. It will enhance CDC's ability to respond to emergencies as well as provide the desperately needed facilities required for day-to-day public health and research activities.

Last year, we provided \$250 million for upgrading out-of-date equipment and restore dilapidated facilities at CDC. The CDC needs an additional \$300 million to provide the 4th year of construction funding for a new infectious disease laboratory, which will include greatly needed bio-safety level-four hot labs, construction of a new environmental toxicology lab, and greatly needed security updates.

The budget resolution for fiscal year 2003 calls for \$223.5 billion in health-related spending, which is a \$22.8 billion increase from the \$200.7 billion in fiscal year 2002. It is my understanding that fiscal year 2003 total spending for HHS's bioterrorism efforts would rise to \$4.3 billion, an increase of \$1.3 billion above the 2002 level. These funding levels will support critical homeland security initiatives. This includes funding for improvement to buildings and facilities at CDC.

Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman clarify that the increase in health funding would include improvements and modernization of facilities at CDC?

□ 1345

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. The budget resolution assumes \$4.3 billion to counter the threat of bioterrorism. Emphasis, I believe, should be given to hospitals and other public health facilities, research and development, and it does accommodate the Georgia CDC lab in Atlanta.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, can the gentleman clarify that the budget resolution will accommodate at least \$300 million of the \$4.3 billion for improvements to the buildings and facilities at the CDC in Atlanta, Georgia, an amount that was authorized in the bioterrorism bill passed by the House and the Senate last year?

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct, it would accommodate for a facility such as the gentleman has described in Atlanta, Georgia, \$300 million for CDC.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his clarification of this matter.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all, whatever this Congress does, we have to respect funding for national security. But while protecting ourselves from foreign enemies, we should fund programs that protect seniors and children, too. This budget fails to protect children or senior citizens.

In fact, according to this chart, this budget spends the Social Security surplus and the Medicare surplus for the next 10 years. For the next 3 years, we go into deficit spending over and above the surpluses in Medicare and Social Security. More than 40 million Americans are without health insurance, and yet there is nothing in this budget that does anything for them. There is no prescription drug benefit for seniors. The expectation of the cost is \$750 billion. This budget does not even make a down payment on that.

Many States like Texas have trouble funding its SCHIP program which provides health care for children. There is nothing in this budget that allows the \$3 billion for our States to have insurance for our children. To cap this off, the government is backing deficit spending for 3 years, and for the next 10 with Medicare and Social Security, as Members can see from this chart.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and would like to identify another reason for opposing this rule. We need to have a credible plan to get back to the balanced budget without relying on the Social Security Trust Fund once we have gotten control over this war on terrorism that the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has alluded to and pulled out of this recession.

This budget resolution provides no such credible plan. A trigger, which a number of us offered which received a Republican vote in the Committee on the Budget, stated that next year the House had to produce a budget resolution that put the budget in balance without using the Social Security Trust Fund, and it had to be a 5-year plan. There is no such provision in this bill today. We are headed down a path without regard to how we are going to debate spending and tax cut proposals as far as how it impacts our ability to get back to a balanced budget, to pay down the debt, to help keep interest rates low, to prepare Medicare and Social Security for its future solvency when the baby boomers begin to retire in 2006.

Mr. Speaker, we need a plan. This budget resolution does not do it. The trigger is such a plan, and it ought to be part of a debate we have today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to speak against this rule. I and my moderate Blue Dog colleagues sought to present

a reasonable, bipartisan alternative that would have adopted the majority's budget, but would have required us in Congress to do what every American with a bank book is required to do, and that is to keep it balanced.

This rule does not allow for discussion of a bipartisan alternative. It does not allow for discussion about prescription drugs for seniors. It does not allow for discussion about squandering our surplus, or allow for a full debate on avoiding a raid on the Social Security and Medicare trust funds every year for the next 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly voted with my Republican friends and with the President when I felt that they were reaching across party lines to develop bipartisan consensus on real problems. I had hoped that we would be able to do that with this budget and this rule, but this rule does not provide for that. It is unfair. It is undemocratic. It is the majority's way or no way; and on that basis we should defeat this rule and come back and develop true bipartisan consensus on a balanced budget, a strong defense and meets the needs of working families.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this budget. We have led on our side. We have a plan to protect Social Security. We have a plan to prosecute the war and provide for tax relief for Americans.

The other side's leadership has ordered them not to produce a budget. The gentleman from South Carolina is a very fine Member of Congress who would have been able to put together a good alternative had he been allowed to. But instead, there is no plan on the other side. When we look at the options, the options are to raise taxes, cut defense spending, go further into debt. We have no leadership on the other side. Thank goodness our majority has led on this topic.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I take a back seat to no one in support of a strong budget and increased intelligence spending, but these priorities can and should be met in the context of a balanced budget with balanced priorities. I voted for such a budget over a decade, and each time that budget has been supported by the Blue Dogs, of which I am a Member. One does not have to be from the South, unless we count southern California, or a male, to be a Blue Dog, and I proudly am one and proudly support a fiscally responsible budget.

This time, for the first time, the Blue Dog proposal has not been made in order, and so we do not have on the table and we will not be able to vote for a balanced budget proposal with balanced priorities.

I strongly oppose this rule. I strongly oppose the notion that many of us on a

bipartisan basis are not in favor of balanced budgets. I think as we talk about homeland security, we can only achieve that in a context of economic security which we risk destroying by this vote today. Vote "no" on this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am here to oppose the rule. The President has asked for bipartisanship, and I have bent over backwards to be bipartisan. In fact, I voted for the President's tax cut last year. When we were asked to be bipartisan, we have tried. In fact, a group of us, the Blue Dogs, submitted a substitute budget using all of the numbers in the Republican budget with two differences: One, that we used Congressional Budget Office numbers, the same numbers used for the last 10 years, not switching numbers; number two, that we added a midyear review in August in case the projections do not come out the way that we hope they will.

So when we hear a Member on the other side say there was not an alternative or substitute budget submitted, it is not true. They can say black is white, but it does not make it true. They have the votes, and they denied our substitute budget. They denied us the opportunity to present a substitute budget. They know that the numbers do not add up.

Mr. Speaker, why is a review important? Because Congress right now is in the Social Security funds and will be in \$200 billion by the end of the next fiscal year, and \$1 trillion over the next 10 years if things are not changed. Under the present budget and the proposal, it is a trillion dollars into Social Security funds over the next 10 years. I voted for the tax cut. I want a chance to work with the other side on a bipartisan manner, but it is not happening. We reached out to them and basically were slapped in the face.

I wish we could start this over because we could work together given half an even and fair chance. The President and the Secretary of Treasury has asked for a \$750 billion increase in the debt limit. That is a \$750 billion blank check. I think Congress has a responsibility to make sure that we oversee the use of that money and not write blank checks or provide blank checks to any person.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) invoked my name, and let me assure the gentleman, I am a free agent. I am comfortable with the decision that our caucus has made and our leadership has made. Frankly, we tried to produce a budget resolution, and we found to have a competing resolution on the floor and an apples-to-apples comparison, we would have to use the gimmicks and the devices the other side used to get the results they achieve. We did not want to do that for a couple

of reasons, not the least of which we did not want to go to 5 years. We think a 10-year budget is proper. We did not want to use OMB, as complacent as they can be sometimes in helping Members get the bottom line that they want. We wanted to stick with the Congressional Budget Office, the neutral and nonpartisan group.

Mr. Speaker, for these and many other reasons, we decided not to do a budget resolution; but there will be a Democratic resolution. It will be presented in the other body by Senator CONRAD.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying legislation. As a member of the Committee on Rules and the Committee on the Budget, I congratulate the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) on a fair rule, for allowing for open debate, and for the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for producing a wartime budget that recognizes the need to secure our homeland, win the war on terror, and bolster our economy.

By providing record increases in defense spending, providing for greater intelligence networking and funding antiterrorism measures, our budget takes a comprehensive approach to winning the war on terror.

By including funds for aviation security, defending against biological attacks, and securing America's borders, our budget makes homeland defense our highest priority. By allowing American taxpayers to keep \$66 billion more of their own money during the next 5 years through economic stimulus tax relief, our budget helps stabilize and secure our economy.

Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion lately about the importance of a balanced budget. I have always been a strong proponent of balanced budgets; but even proponents of proposals for balanced budget constitutional amendments like we addressed several years ago, those allow flexibilities when emergencies occur. Surely this time of national emergency, war and economic distress more than justifies temporary budget flexibility.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight four aspects of this resolution which are of particular interest to my area of the Pacific Northwest: First, as chairman of the House Nuclear Cleanup Caucus, I am pleased that the Committee on the Budget has included my provision to set the Department of Energy's nuclear cleanup budget at \$6.7 billion for next year, and a total of \$1.1 billion to be available to fully implement the Department of Energy's accelerated cleanup effort.

Second, by including bipartisan language authored by myself and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY),

our budget highlights local fish recovery efforts in the Pacific Northwest. People in central Washington and throughout the region are dedicated to ensuring the survival of our salmon. It is crucial that the Federal Government and Pacific Northwest residents continue to work together to address the entire range of factors impacting fish populations.

Further, this budget serves our growers and farmers by fully providing for the expansion of the Market Access Program included in the House farm bill. Funding for this program will more than double from \$90 million to \$200 million in order to open new markets and expand trade opportunities for American agricultural products.

Finally, the budget resolution provides \$700 million in additional borrowing authority for the Bonneville Power Administration. This additional borrowing authority is supported on a bipartisan basis by all Members from the Pacific Northwest.

□ 1400

This increase will be used to assist the BPA in upgrading and building transmission lines that are urgently needed. I am pleased that this resolution fully funds the President's request for additional borrowing authority.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and the underlying resolution.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, if there is anything bipartisan about this budget resolution, it is probably our mutual displeasure with it. I do not think anyone is satisfied with this budget. And even if my colleagues on the other side accept the bottom line, that this budget resolution will run a real deficit and then continue to spend Social Security and Medicare dollars to pay for general government for years to come, I would say this year's partisan budget process does not permit a single substantive amendment, not in the Budget Committee, not in the Rules Committee, not on the House floor.

I mention only one. Yesterday, I asked the Rules Committee to make in order an amendment that would have made improvements to this budget, specifically to increase our investment in research and development. It was not allowed. This budget resolution does provide increased funding for the National Institutes of Health, but it does not provide enough funding for general scientific research and development through the National Science Foundation and other agencies. The NSF, the National Science Foundation, provides the backbone for the science and the scientists that are necessary to ensure that this Nation remains a leader. In other words, if the NIH investment is going to pay off, we need to make an investment in the other areas of science research and development.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I take to the floor in the strongest possible opposition to this unfair rule. I cannot believe my colleagues on this side that can stand up and say, "Support this fair rule."

But the first thing I want to say today is let the record clearly state, and I could not agree more, that Congress must join the President to provide for the security of our Nation, our troops, our law enforcement officials, and everyone else who is fighting the war on terrorism. We agree. However, it is cowardly, not patriotic, to use this vitally important priority for all of us as a scapegoat for abandoning all fiscal responsibility and the budget process in the pursuit of this unfair rule.

As a member of the minority, I do not expect I am going to win very often on the floor. But I do expect the majority to show a modicum of respect for the democratic process, if not for Democrats. To have every single Democratic amendment, both a complete substitute as well as numerous single bullet amendments, completely shut out of the debate is outrageous. What really bothers me about this, I remember the times in the last 23 years in which I have stood up with you on this side of the aisle when you were in the minority and demanded that you have an opportunity to have your amendments on the floor and debated and usually I was with you.

But yesterday the Rules Committee said "no" to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), and myself when under the rules that you sent to us, we brought you a complete substitute and you said, "No, we do not wish to allow you to have 1 hour of debate on a substitute." We offered the good hand of friendship to you and you said "no." That is your privilege. That is your privilege. You can do so. But it is not just a few Blue Dogs or the Democrats who have a problem. The majority seems determined to ignore it, but they have the same problem that needs to be solved and that is a deficit.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, that denied me an opportunity to have debate.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that in the testimony that the gentleman from Texas gave yesterday before the Committee on Rules, he made it very clear that what he was offering was, and this is a direct quote, "a perfecting amendment to the chairman's budget." That is how he described what did come forward, he said as a substitute. He described it as a

perfecting amendment to the chairman's budget. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. STENHOLM. I take back my time from the chairman and say that these are the rules of the House. The Rules Committee said to all people who brought a rule, "Bring a budget that is scored by CBO." We did. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) did not bring a budget to the Committee on Rules scored by CBO. You ignored your own rules in allowing the gentleman from Iowa to come forward with an OMB-scored when your rules and what you instructed me to do is come CBO-scored. You chose to ignore it, which you can do. You can waive any rule any time you want to in the majority. But let me remind the gentleman that the chickens will come home to roost.

You are going to have to vote to borrow \$750 billion, and it is going to be more than that with the economic game plan you folks are on. You are going to get to stand up and provide 218 votes to increase the debt ceiling when we could have been with you and we offered to be with you in a bipartisan way to the President saying, We do not have to resort to games; we can do it under the rules of the House and we can do it bipartisanship. But no thanks, you did not want any part of that.

There is justice in this world, and you are going to get a chance pretty soon to borrow that money in an up and down vote and explain why you are doing it when you could have had something better.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield again such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for a colloquy.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa on H. Con. Res. 353, the fiscal year 2003 House budget resolution.

Mr. NUSSLE. I am pleased to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. First of all, I would like to commend Chairman NUSSLE of the Committee on the Budget for bringing this resolution to the floor. I am very pleased with the cooperative working relationship that has developed between our two committees.

As you know, the President's budget proposes an \$8.6 billion, or 27 percent, reduction in highway funding, from \$31.8 billion in fiscal year 2002 to \$23.2 billion in fiscal year 2003. Most of this proposed decrease in funding is based on the revenue-aligned budget authority provision of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, otherwise known as TEA-21, which I continue to support in principle. However,

it is simply too harmful to our State transportation budgets and our economy to allow such a dramatic funding cut to take place next year. Therefore, my goal has been to restore the highway program to a reasonable, sustainable funding level of at least \$27.7 billion, which is the funding level envisioned by fiscal year 2003 in TEA-21. Any language to the contrary in the report accompanying H. Con. Res. 353 does not accurately reflect my views on this subject.

My position on this issue is made clear in H.R. 3694, the Highway Funding Restoration Act. H.R. 3694 calls for highway funding of not less than \$27.7 billion in fiscal year 2003. The words "not less than" are profoundly important to me and the 315 cosponsors of the legislation. This is a fluid process, and I reserve the right of my committee to move this bill or some version of it in the future if necessary. If it becomes clear to me that the highway trust fund can sustain a higher funding level and at that time there is significant support for restoring more than \$4.4 billion in fiscal year 2003, then I will actively support a further increase in highway funding. The budget resolution adds \$4.4 billion for highways and highway safety, thereby increasing funding for the highway program to \$27.7 billion. This is a significant improvement over the President's budget. For that and other reasons, I support the resolution and urge my colleagues, on my committee especially, to do likewise.

I would like to clarify my views with the gentleman from Iowa and ask if there is anything in H. Con. Res. 353 that would preclude adding more than \$4.4 billion to the highway program at some point in the future.

Mr. NUSSLE. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and also for the cooperation between our committees. I agree with the gentleman from Alaska that there is nothing in this resolution that would preclude adding more than \$4.4 billion to the highway program under certain circumstances. For instance, such a further increase could be possible if conference negotiations with the Senate result in a higher funding level for highways or if the Appropriations Committee, as an example, would allocate additional outlays to its transportation subcommittee by reducing outlays in some other function.

I understand the gentleman will continue to work with the Budget Committee to help modify the caps, including those for highways and transit to, among other things, accommodate the additional transportation spending and to smooth out the year-to-year fluctuations in the revenue adjustments made under the RABA provision of TEA-21. I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on this.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I will

work with him as I have told him before not only on the floor but in private to provide both the general purpose and transportation caps to, among other things, reflect the increase in highway spending. I want to thank the gentleman again for his good work.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, all of us have to vote against this rule, because all of us have voted to do so. Unless you were just elected in the past year, every single one of us have voted to protect Social Security and Medicare if at all possible. I offered the most reasonable amendment you could imagine, a trigger amendment. All it said was that we will give you a pass this year but beginning next year, if the Congressional Budget Office tells us that we are operating at a deficit, that we will have to dip into Social Security trust funds, then the Budget Committee has to produce a path, a budget plan over 5 years to bring us back into balance without using Social Security. That is all it does. If you vote against the rule, you are saying that you are letting off the Budget Committee from coming up with a 5-year plan that is not based upon raiding Social Security trust funds. And this budget does do that. That is the problem with this budget.

There is a \$224 billion deficit in this year's budget that is paid for by Social Security Trust Funds. Over the next 5 years, \$830 billion comes out of the Social Security trust funds. Over the next 10 years, \$1.6 trillion is going to come from Social Security trust funds. All we are saying is that as of next year, if you find that we are still operating at a deficit, give us a plan, a 5-year plan that will enable us to be good to our word, because five times we have voted for the lock box. Five times. 228 Republicans have voted for the lock box, saying we are not going to use Social Security to balance the budget. Yet here we are today, about to do exactly what we promised never to do.

If you vote for the rule, you are rejecting an amendment that simply said give us a 5-year plan to get out of the reliance upon Social Security trust funds. Let us balance this budget with general funds revenue, not take it from the trust funds, not put the burden on our children to have to come up with our retirement and our Medicare health funds. That is all we are asking for, to be good to our word. We are on record. We gave allowances if we are at a time of war. Or in a weak economy, it does not apply. But all things being equal, the Budget Committee has a responsibility to bring us to balance over 5 years without depending upon the trust funds. And if for no other reason, you need to support that and vote against this rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I again yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the very distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee for yielding.

I rise to engage the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee in a colloquy.

Mr. NUSSLE. I am pleased to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the budget resolution includes a reserve fund for highways and highway safety. My reading of the relevant provisions indicates to me that if the Appropriations Committee reports a bill with obligation limitations for programs within the highway category in excess of \$23.864 billion, then you as the chairman of the Budget Committee may increase the allocation for outlays for the highway program if the Appropriations Committee bill allocates the additional funding in accordance with TEA-21.

□ 1415

In addition, the outlays from the reserve fund cannot exceed \$1.18 billion. Is that correct?

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. It is also my understanding that the budget resolution does not require the Committee on Appropriations to report a bill containing obligation limitation for programs within the highway category in excess of \$23.864 billion. Is that correct?

Mr. NUSSLE. That is also correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. In the course of my review of the budget resolution before us today, I see no provision that establishes discretionary caps in fiscal year 2003 or extends the highway and transit guarantees beyond 2003. Is that accurate?

Mr. NUSSLE. That is also accurate. As a concurrent resolution, the budget before us today does not establish discretionary caps or continue the highway or transit firewalls beyond fiscal year 2003.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Would the chairman also agree that discussions on establishing discretionary caps in fiscal year 2003 and beyond and extending the highway and transit firewalls beyond the current fiscal year should include the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. NUSSLE. I most definitely agree with that. The Committee on the Budget has exclusive jurisdiction over the Budget Enforcement Act, but the chairman and I, I think, have established a good working relationship, and I will continue to consult with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as you have just said, you and I have established great communica-

tions. We have had numerous discussions about the need of the Committee on Appropriations to be able to determine the appropriate balance of competing needs and priorities within the discretionary segment of the budget. The needs are great for the prosecution of the war against terrorism, homeland security and other critically important Federal programs. We both recognize that the cuts anticipated in the highway program are too great to be sustained this year, though these reductions in the highway program are required by provisions of existing law in TEA21 in which expenditures must equal receipts. Those provisions were supported by a majority of the House and had the full backing of the highway lobby at the time. Nevertheless, there is a great deal of support to increase spending for highways beyond the collections of the trust fund this year.

By contrast, the resources to fund all these unmet needs are limited. That is why the gentleman from Wisconsin and I introduced legislation that would ensure that any increase for the highway program not come at the expense of other Federal programs. H.R. 3900 adjusts the highway category. It ensures that additional spending is guaranteed for highways in fiscal year 2003.

H.R. 3900 has been referred to your committee. Is your committee expected to report favorably this legislation to ensure that the highway firewalls are increased above the \$23.864 billion this year?

Mr. NUSSLE. It is my expectation that my committee will be reporting legislation to ensure that the highway category is increased.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the commitments of the gentleman from Iowa and the clarity that he has provided to me and to the House today. I would like to add that his job is not the easiest job in the Congress. It is a difficult job to bring all of the divergent views together. I applaud the gentleman for the good job he has done. He can count on my vote for this resolution.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. There is only one more difficult job than mine, and that is to do it 13 times. I certainly respect and admire the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for his good work.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote against this rule. The rule is unfair. It does not allow an adequate debate on the most important issue we will decide on the floor of this House this year. It is a travesty that we have 3 hours to talk about the most important set of decisions we will make perhaps in a generation.

We should be talking about a different budget today. The budget should be based on values, on opportunity, responsibility and community. But this Republican budget, which is the only thing we are able to consider today, fails on all counts.

It is not honest. It shows deficits as far as the eye can see, in large part because of the Republican economic program that we passed about 9 months ago.

First of all, we have squandered the surplus, squandered the surplus, \$4.5 trillion, gone in the flash of an eye. Gone. \$4.5 trillion, gone in the flash of an eye. Twelve months ago we had it; now it is gone. Of course, the loss of that surplus means that we cannot fulfill our promise to the lockbox. Five times in this House 220-plus Members of the Republican Party voted solidly for the lockbox. By voting today for this budget, they are breaking into the lockbox. We are not keeping our word.

Let us look at the words. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) declared the House of Representatives is not going to go back to raiding the lockbox. He said, "Not a dime's worth of Social Security or Medicare money will be spent on anything other than Social Security and Medicare."

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the distinguished chair of the committee, said, "This Congress will protect 100 percent of Social Security and Medicare trust funds. Period. No speculation. No supposition. No projections."

These are words that mean something. They are being broken.

The Speaker of the House in the same month said, "Since I have been Speaker, we have not spent a penny of the Social Security Trust Fund, and," he said, "we don't intend to."

Promises are being broken. The contract is being broken. The word, our collective word, is being broken by what we are trying to do here today with this budget.

\$1.8 trillion will be spent from Social Security in the next 10 years with this budget. We do not even have time to talk about it, to debate it, to worry about it. We said a number of years ago, let us put Social Security first. This budget puts Social Security last. We are in essence taking money out of the Social Security Trust Fund and we are spending it on everything else. It is last. That is not what we said to the American people.

Then there is prescription drugs. Oh, we all ran ads on prescription drugs. Oh, we are going to take care of prescription drugs.

Where are the prescription drugs in this bill? The program that is described in this Republican budget is paltry. It does not affect most of the senior citizens who thought they were going to get something out of this program, because, once again, I guess it is prescription drugs last in Medicare. We are going to put it behind everything else.

Let me just finally say this: I guess my greatest worry is that we are doing

this without anybody in the country much knowing about it. How many people in the country actually know what happened to Social Security in this budget? It is 3 hours, I fear, because we do not want them to know what is happening to their Social Security.

This bill has real live consequences for people, millions of people all over this country. Let me just tell you my story as kind of a symbol or an analogy of what is happening to lots of other people.

My mother called me a week ago and she said, "I bounced some checks." She is 94-years-old and she still keeps her own checkbook. She lives in independent living in St. Louis. She said, "I bounced some checks. It is the first time I have ever done it in my life. Please, when you come home next, sit down with me. We have to figure this out."

So I sat down with her and we went over all of her checks. She lives in independent living. The cost is \$2,500 a month. She has got a prescription drug bill of about \$600 over that. So her monthly outgo before she gets to spending money is about \$3,100 a month. Her Social Security is \$1,200 a month. My brother and I, we are lucky. We are fine and we can help her with the difference.

But as we were going over her checks, she kept saying to me, "Dick, what if the Social Security check were to stop coming? How would we do this?" She even suggested to me, "Maybe I ought to move out of this place because we cannot afford it," because her prescription drug bill has been going up every month.

She is 94. She and millions like her and their families should not have to be worrying about all this. What if she were in a family that did not have people like my brother and me who could help her? We are fortunate. What if she did not have that money coming in to take care of her prescription drugs, to pay her monthly bills?

This budget has real live consequences for the people that we represent. Are we going to privatize Social Security? Are we going to cut the benefits? Because that is the logical conclusion of this budget. The President has said he wants to privatize it, which means you have got to come up with a lot of money that is not in this budget. The only way you are going to get it is to cut the benefits. Is that what we are saying to the American people today? I hope it is not.

This is the most important budget that you will vote on probably in your time in this Congress. A year ago we had surpluses; today we are breaking the lockbox. A year ago we had taken care of Social Security first; this budget puts Social Security last. A year ago we had the money for prescription drugs; today we are not going to have a decent prescription drug program.

It is a travesty that we have 3 hours to talk about the most important fiscal

decisions that will have consequences in everybody's life in this country.

I urge Members to vote no on a ridiculous rule and vote no if we have to vote on this budget today. Let us get to a summit. Let us get to a discussion. Let us get to a family discussion with the President. Let us work out a budget for America that is a real compromise, that will keep the word and the promise of the United States Congress to the people of this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Chair would advise both sides that each side has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and I am opposed to this budget resolution. It is a budget, unfortunately, that only Enron could love. It is using 5-year numbers instead of 10 years, obviously hiding the impact of the tax cuts exploding in the second 5 years and the impact that is going to have with budget deficits. It is using OMB numbers instead of the Congressional Budget Office, when the same Republican party shut down this place in 1995 accusing President Clinton of doing the exact same thing; and it underestimates the true cost of Medicare spending in the years to come.

As Yogi Berra once said, it is *deja vu* all over again. It takes us back to the deficit spending of the eighties and early nineties, using Social Security and Medicare trust fund money for other purposes, rather than taking us forward by maintaining fiscal discipline so we can deal with the greatest fiscal challenge facing us today: the aging population. This is happening at exactly the wrong time, Mr. Speaker, just before the 77 million American baby-boomers start retiring in just a few short years.

But this is more than just about the baby-boomers. This is about the future of my 3- and 5-year-old boys, because it will be their generation who will be asked to fix the irresponsibility of what occurred last year and what is about to happen today.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose the rule and to oppose this budget resolution.

□ 1430

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, we will be calling a vote on it. I will offer an amendment to this unfair and undemocratic closed rule.

Democrats are seeking to make in order two amendments to the budget resolution. The first is a trigger amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), and the second is the Moore-Stenholm-Tanner-Matheson substitute that the majority

on the Committee on Rules refused to make in order.

The Moran trigger amendment prohibits the Congress from adopting any budget resolution next year if it does not project a surplus within 5 years. Democrats have offered a vehicle in this trigger amendment that can force the institution to face up to the facts.

The majority has spent some time today complaining that no substitutes were offered in the Committee on Rules. I beg to differ. The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), along with the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON), offered a substitute that establishes a budget plan for fiscal discipline. Yet, the Committee on Rules failed to make it in order. Our amendment to the rule would correct this serious failing.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, the President and every House Republican leader promised that every dollar of Social Security and Medicare trust funds would be saved for Social Security and Medicare. With this budget, that promise has been broken.

We want to give the majority one last chance to do the right thing, Mr. Speaker. By defeating the previous question, we can restore honesty to the budget process and protect Social Security.

The time for games has ended. Let us pass an honest budget, or at least a trigger amendment that protects Social Security. It is the right thing to do, and every Member knows it.

I urge a no vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD immediately before the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the distinguished gentleman from greater San Dimas, California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate, and I guess have participated in it briefly with my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

I have to say that I am reminded, as I have heard the exchange take place over the last hour or so, of the words of a very famous former Democratic President who was known for his colorful but poignant words when Harry Truman said, "Any jackass can kick a barn down, but it takes a carpenter to build one."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have a beautifully crafted budget which has come forward from the hard work of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE)

and the members of the Committee on the Budget working to address a challenge the likes of which the United States of America has never faced, this war on terrorism, while at the same time focusing on the important need to make sure that we have the resources to win the war on terrorism and to address a wide range of other priority needs which have come forward: transportation, which the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) addressed; national security issues; and education issues.

That is why it is so important that we focus on stimulating our economy and making sure that we grow this economy so that we have the resources necessary. Why is it that we have seen this slowdown? Because of September 11 and the slowing economy that followed. And what we have done is we have seen time and energy put into place to craft, like carpenters, this beautiful plan which I believe deserves bipartisan support because we are all together in our quest to win the war on terrorism, and the way to do it is to make sure that we have the resources necessary and a budget in place that will do that.

What is it that we have gotten from our friends on the other side of the aisle? Absolutely nothing. My friend, the gentlewoman from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) just talked about the fact that we had substitutes submitted. There were no substitutes submitted.

Mr. Speaker, every single time we have made in order substitutes that have come from the Blue Dogs, from the Progressive Caucus, from the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and yet, we saw the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget tell us that 96 pages, 96 pages, Mr. Speaker, were put into a package which simply criticized the package that came forward from the Committee on the Budget, and in fact, there was no alternative provided whatsoever.

Vote in favor of this rule and in favor of this very fair, responsible budget.

The amendment previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved in to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration resolution (H. Con. Res. 353) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2003 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2007. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed three hours, with two hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Saxton of New

Jersey and Representative Stark of California or their designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. No further amendment to the concurrent resolution shall be in order except those specified in section 2 of this resolution. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order specified in section 2, may be offered by a Member designated in section 2 or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable as specified in section 2, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments specified in section 2 are waived. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution, as amended, to the House with such further amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division on the question of its adoption.

Sec. 2. The further amendments referred in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) By Representative Moran of Virginia, debatable for 30 minutes.

After section 303, insert the following new section:

SEC. 304. CIRCUIT BREAKER FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective January 1, 2003, if the Congressional Budget Office's January Budget and Economic Outlook for any fiscal year projects an on-budget deficit (excluding social security) for the budget year or any subsequent fiscal year covered by those projections, then the concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year shall reduce on-budget deficits relative to CBO's projections and put the budget on a path to achieve balance within 5 years, and shall include such provisions as are necessary to facilitate deficit reduction.

(b) POINTS OF ORDER.—(1) In any fiscal year in which the Congressional Budget Office's January Budget and Economic Outlook for any fiscal year projects an on-budget deficit for the budget year or any subsequent fiscal year covered by those projections, it shall not be in order in the House or the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year or any conference report thereon that fails to reduce on-budget deficits relative to CBO's projections and put the budget on a path to achieve balance within 5 years.

(2) In any fiscal year in which the Congressional Budget Office's January Budget and Economic Outlook for any fiscal year projects an on-budget deficit for the budget year or any subsequent fiscal year covered by those projections, it shall not be in order in the House or the Senate to consider an amendment to a concurrent resolution on the budget that would increase on-budget deficits relative to the concurrent resolution on the budget in any fiscal year or cause the budget to fail to achieve balance within 5 years.

(c) SUSPENSION OF REQUIREMENT DURING WAR OR LOW ECONOMIC GROWTH.—This section is suspended if—

(1) the most recent of the Department of Commerce's advance, preliminary, or final reports of actual real economic growth indicate that the rate of real economic growth (as measured by real GDP) for each of the most recently reported quarter and the immediately preceding quarter is less than 1 percent; or

(2) a declaration of war is in effect.

(b) By Representative Moore of Kansas, debatable for one hour

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003.

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2003 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2004 through 2007 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$
Fiscal year 2004: \$
Fiscal year 2005: \$
Fiscal year 2006: \$
Fiscal year 2007: \$

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$
Fiscal year 2004: \$
Fiscal year 2005: \$
Fiscal year 2006: \$
Fiscal year 2007: \$

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$
Fiscal year 2004: \$
Fiscal year 2005: \$
Fiscal year 2006: \$
Fiscal year 2007: \$

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$
Fiscal year 2004: \$
Fiscal year 2005: \$
Fiscal year 2006: \$
Fiscal year 2007: \$

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$
Fiscal year 2004: \$
Fiscal year 2005: \$
Fiscal year 2006: \$
Fiscal year 2007: \$

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$
Fiscal year 2004: \$
Fiscal year 2005: \$
Fiscal year 2006: \$
Fiscal year 2007: \$

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$
Fiscal year 2004: \$
Fiscal year 2005: \$

Fiscal year 2006: \$
Fiscal year 2007: \$

SEC. 102. HOMELAND SECURITY.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2003 for Homeland Security are as follows:

- (1) New budget authority, \$
(2) Outlays, \$

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2003 through 2007 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$

Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$

Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$

Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$

Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority,

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority,
(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2006:	(A) New budget authority,	(A) New budget authority,	(A) New budget authority,
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2007:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2007:	(17) General Government (800): Fiscal year 2003:
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ (9) Community and Regional Development (450): Fiscal year 2003:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2004:	(A) New budget authority,
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2004:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2005:	(A) New budget authority,
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2005:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2006:	(A) New budget authority,
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2006:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2007:	(A) New budget authority,
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2007:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2007:	(18) Net Interest (900): Fiscal year 2003:
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2003:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2004:	(A) New budget authority,
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2004:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2005:	(A) New budget authority,
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2005:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2006:	(A) New budget authority,
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2006:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2007:	(A) New budget authority,
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2007:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2007:	(19) Allowances (920): Fiscal year 2003:
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2003:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2004:	(A) New budget authority,
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2004:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2005:	(A) New budget authority,
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2005:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2006:	(A) New budget authority,
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2006:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2007:	(A) New budget authority,
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2007:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2007:	(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950): Fiscal year 2003:
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2003:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2004:	(A) New budget authority,
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2004:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2005:	(A) New budget authority,
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2005:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2006:	(A) New budget authority,
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2006:	(A) New budget authority,	(B) Outlays, \$ _____ Fiscal year 2007:	(A) New budget authority,
\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____

**TITLE II—RESTORING FISCAL DISCIPLINE
AND PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY**

SEC. 201. REVIEW OF BUDGET OUTLOOK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If, in the report released pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, entitled the Budget and Economic Outlook Update (for fiscal years 2003 through 2012), the Director of the Congressional Budget Office projects that the unified budget of the United States for fiscal year 2003 will be in balance and that the budget (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) will be in balance by fiscal year 2007, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House is authorized to certify that the budget is projected to meet the goals of a balanced budget and protecting social security.

(b) CALCULATING DISCRETIONARY SPENDING BASELINE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall use the discretionary spending levels set forth in this resolution to calculate the discretionary spending baseline. In calculating the report referred to in subsection (a), such Director shall exclude the emergency appropriations provided in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Recovery From and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States (Public Law 107-38) in calculating the baseline for discretionary spending.

SEC. 202. REQUIREMENT FOR PRESIDENTIAL PLAN TO RESTORE BALANCED BUDGET AND PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS.

(a) REQUEST IF UNIFIED DEFICIT PROJECTED.—If the report of the Congressional Budget Office referred to in section 202 projects a unified deficit in fiscal year 2003, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall request that the President—

(1) submit to the House a proposal to bring the unified budget of the United States into balance by fiscal year 2003 and the budget (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) into balance by fiscal year 2007, or

(2) submit to the House a request that the unified budget of the United States for fiscal year 2003 be in deficit by [INSERT SPECIFIC DOLLAR AMOUNT] if the President certifies that such deficit amount is related to the costs of war or recession.

(b) REQUEST IF DEFICIT PROJECTED FOR BUDGET EXCLUDING OASDI.—If the report of the Congressional Budget Office referred to in section 202 projects the budget (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) will be in deficit in fiscal year 2007, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall request that the President submit to the House a proposal to bring the unified budget of the United States into balance by fiscal year 2003 and the budget (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) into balance by fiscal year 2007.

(c) TEXT OF PROPOSAL.—The proposal shall include—

(1) specific legislative changes to reduce outlays, increase revenues, or both; and

(2) the text of a special resolution implementing the President's recommendations through reconciliation directives instructing the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and Senate to determine and recommend changes in laws within their

jurisdictions to reduce outlays or increase revenues by specified amounts; sufficient to meet the balanced budget goals described in section 201.

(d) INTRODUCTION OF PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL.—Within 5 legislative days after receipt of the proposal referred to in subsection (a), the majority leader of the House shall introduce legislation to carry out such proposal.

SEC. 203. CONGRESSIONAL ACTION REQUIRED IF BALANCED BUDGET AND SOCIAL SECURITY PROTECTION GOALS ARE NOT BEING MET.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR LEGISLATION RESTORING BALANCED BUDGET AND PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS.—Whenever the President submits a plan to restore balanced budgets and restore the social security surplus under section 202, the Committee on the Budget of the House shall report, not later than September 15, a revised concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2003 with instructions to committees to achieve reductions in outlays or increases in revenues, or both, sufficient to meet the balanced budget goals in section 201, and appropriately revised section 302(a) allocations to the Committee on Appropriations.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR SEPARATE VOTE TO ALLOW FOR A UNIFIED DEFICIT IN FISCAL YEAR 2003.—If the resolution reported by the Committee on the Budget of the House proposes to eliminate less than all of the projected unified deficit in fiscal year 2003, then that committee shall report a separate resolution waiving the balanced budget goal for fiscal year 2003 and authorizing a deficit of a specific amount with a finding that the deficit is a result of economic recession or costs related to the war on terrorism.

(c) PROCEDURE IF HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE FAILS TO REPORT REQUIRED RESOLUTION.—

(1) AUTOMATIC DISCHARGE OF HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE.—If the Committee on the Budget fails to report the resolution required by subsection (a), then the legislation introduced pursuant to section 202 (legislation implementing the President's plan) shall be automatically discharged from consideration by the committee or committees to which it was referred and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(2) CONSIDERATION BY HOUSE.—Ten days after the applicable committee or committees have been discharged under paragraph (1), any Member may move that the House proceed to consider the resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and not debatable.

(d) APPLICATION OF CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT.—To the extent that they are relevant and not inconsistent with this title, the provisions of title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall apply in the House of Representatives and the Senate to resolutions and legislation under this title and reconciliation legislation reported pursuant to directives included in those resolutions.

SEC. 204. INCREASE IN DEBT LIMIT CONTINGENT UPON PLAN TO RESTORE BALANCED BUDGET AND PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) TEMPORARY INCREASE IN STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT.—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House shall report a bill as soon as practicable, but not later than March 25, 2002, that consists solely of changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the statutory debt limit sufficient to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to meet the obligation of the Government through, but not later than, September 30, 2002.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—(1) Except as provided by paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the House to consider any bill, joint resolu-

tion, amendment, or conference report that includes any provision that increases the limit on the public debt beyond September 30, 2002.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the House if—

(A) the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House has made the certification described in section 201 that the budget (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) will be in balance by fiscal year 2007; or

(B) the President has submitted a plan meeting the requirements of section 202 and the House has voted on a resolution meeting the requirements of section 203.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN LEGISLATION REDUCING THE SURPLUS OR INCREASING THE DEFICIT AFTER FISCAL YEAR 2007.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that includes any provision that first provides new budget authority or a decrease in revenues for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2007 that would decrease the surplus or increase the deficit for any fiscal year.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House certifies, based on estimates prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, that Congress has enacted legislation restoring 75-year solvency of the Federal Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance Trust Fund and legislation extending the solvency of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for 20 years.

SEC. 302. CRITICAL DEFENSE NEEDS.

This resolution includes \$10 billion in new budget authority requested by the President for fiscal year 2003 within functional category 050, and a corresponding level of outlays that flow from this budget authority, without specified purpose. Therefore, this \$10 billion in new budget authority shall be available for critical defense requirements, including additional pay raises for military personnel, military construction, readiness, naval shipbuilding, and other procurement requirements not originally included in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2003.

SEC. 303. RESERVE FUND FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by subsection (b), in the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Energy and Commerce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides a prescription drug benefit, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the appropriate committee allocations for such committees and other appropriate levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose.

(b) FUNDS AVAILABLE CONTINGENT UPON BALANCED BUDGET AND PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY.—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may only make revisions under subsection (a) if—

(1) the chairman has made the certification described in section 201 that the unified budget is projected to be in balance in fiscal year 2003 and that the budget (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) will be in balance by fiscal year 2007; or

(2) the President has submitted a plan meeting the requirements of section 202 and

the House has voted on a resolution meet the requirements of section 203.

SEC. 304. RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL TAX CUTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by subsection (b), in the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Energy and Commerce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides for reductions in revenues of not more than \$4,431,000,000 for fiscal year 2003 and \$27,853,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2008, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may reduce the recommended level of Federal revenues and make other appropriate adjustments for that fiscal year.

(b) FUNDS AVAILABLE CONTINGENT UPON BALANCED BUDGET AND PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY.—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may only make revisions under subsection (a) if—

(1) the chairman has made the certification described in section 201 that the unified budget is projected to be in balance in fiscal year 2003 and that the budget (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) will be in balance by fiscal year 2007; or

(2) the President has submitted a plan meeting the requirements of section 202 and the House has voted on a resolution meet the requirements of section 203.

SEC. 305. RESERVE FUND FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002 SUPPLEMENTAL FOR MILITARY ACTION AND HOMELAND SECURITY.

If the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution providing appropriations requested by the President for military action and homeland security, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for that purpose and if the request by the President is accompanied by a list of rescissions to offset some or all of its costs, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate revisions to the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but the total adjustment under this section shall not exceed the amount so requested by the President.

SEC. 306. RESERVE FUND FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2003.—In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides in excess of \$7,529,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2003 for grants to States authorized under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the appropriate allocations for such committee and other appropriate levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed \$1,000,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2003 and outlays flowing therefrom.

(b) FISCAL YEARS 2004–2007.—In the House, if the Committee on Education and the Workforce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that reauthorizes grants to States under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the applicable allocations of the appropriate committees to

accommodate a total budget authority and outlay level for such program not in excess of the following: \$9,587,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom, \$10,755,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2005 and outlays flowing therefrom, \$12,047,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2006 and outlays flowing therefrom, and \$13,497,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2007 and outlays flowing therefrom (assuming changes from current policy levels of the following: \$1,752,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004, \$2,763,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2005, \$3,894,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2006, and \$5,180,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2007).

SEC. 307. RESERVE FUND FOR HIGHWAYS AND HIGHWAY SAFETY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that establishes an obligation limitation in excess of \$23,864,000,000 for fiscal year 2003 for programs, projects, and activities within the highway category (under section 251(c)(7)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays for such committee by the amount of outlays resulting from such excess, but—

(1) only if chairman of the Committee on the Budget determines that the bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that establishes such obligation limitation provides that the obligation limitation is made available solely for programs, projects, or activities as distributed under section 1102 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century;

(2) only if the total amount of obligation limitation for programs, projects, or activities distributed by such formula for fiscal year 2003 exceeds \$23,864,000,000; and

(3) does not exceed \$1,180,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2003.

(b) RULE OF ENFORCEMENT.—In the House, section 302(f)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall be deemed to also apply to the applicable allocation of outlays in the case of any bill or joint resolution that establishes an obligation limitation for fiscal year 2003 for programs within the highway category, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon.

SEC. 308. ADDITIONAL SURPLUSES RESERVED FOR DEBT REDUCTION.

In the House, if after the release of the report pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 entitled the Budget and Economic Outlook: Update (for fiscal years 2003 through 2012), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget determines, in consultation with the Directors of the Congressional Budget Office and of the Office of Management and Budget, that the estimated unified surplus for fiscal year 2003 and for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2007 exceeds the estimated unified surplus for fiscal year 2003 and for that period as set forth in the report of the Committee on the Budget for this resolution, then the chairman of that committee may increase the surplus or reduce the deficit, as applicable, and reduce the level of the public debt and debt held by the public by the difference between such estimates for that period.

SEC. 309. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

SEC. 310. USE OF CBO ESTIMATES IN ENFORCING THIS RESOLUTION.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall enforce this resolution based upon estimates made by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office using the economic and technical assumptions underlying the Congressional Budget Office's report released on March 6, 2002, entitled "An Analysis of the President's Budgetary Proposals for 2003", except as provided by title II.

SEC. 311. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL HOMELAND SECURITY STRATEGY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) effective homeland security requires the coordinated efforts of Federal, State, local, and private investment to prevent, prepare for, and respond to terrorist attack;

(2) spending from each entity must proceed from a comprehensive strategy outlining threats, vulnerabilities, needs, and responsibilities for all aspects of homeland security strategy;

(3) there has been no comprehensive threat or vulnerability assessment to guide the homeland security budget;

(4) there has been no comprehensive national homeland security strategy to match priority needs with Federal spending; and

(5) in the absence of a national homeland security strategy, Congress will find it difficult to allocate funds according to the prioritization and required level of need.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my extreme displeasure with the budget that is before us today. It can hardly be called a budget—that implies some logic and order to the document.

In reality, the Republicans have filled this budget with "funny math" in order to say that it is balanced and fair. According to the Republicans, this budget protects our domestic agenda and allows for the nation to fight the war on terrorism.

However, this budget is anything but fair. After pushing through \$1.7 trillion in tax cuts last year and the \$43 billion in tax cuts in the so-called economic stimulus signed into law on March 9, 2002 which largely benefits the wealthiest Americans and corporations, our nation's financial situation has deteriorated at an alarming pace.

Just over a year ago, many experts were estimating a 10 year, \$5 trillion surplus. However, under President Bush's watch and because of the tax cuts, \$4 trillion of that surplus has disappeared. Over the next ten years we will have to dip into the social Security surplus—to the tune of \$1.8 trillion.

To protect those tax cuts, President Bush and the Republicans in Congress have advocated a budget that cuts and slashes hundreds of millions of dollars from domestic programs. Programs that, up until recently, they have said are their highest priorities.

For example, in the Budget Resolution Congress debated today, the Department of Education's budget is barely increased. In addition, the Republicans have underfunded elementary and secondary education by \$4.2 billion. Indeed, they do not even appropriate enough funding for President Bush's signature education legislation, Leave No Child Behind. The budget for that is underfunded \$90 million.

The President also campaigned on strengthening health care for all Americans. Since assuming office, he has repeatedly urged Congress to send him legislation that will help Americans with the burdens associated with health care. However, we do not have to look any further than his own budget to see what a low priority he and his party place on health care. While there seems to be a \$1.5 billion increase to health care services programs, in reality, the House Republican Leadership has required the elimination or reduction of several important programs in order to achieve this increase. For example, they have eliminated the Community Access Program, which coordinates health care to the under-insured and uninsured offered by public hospitals and community health centers and other community providers. They have also eliminated State Planning Grants, which help provide access to health insurance coverage. Additionally, the budget provides absolutely no assistance to those individuals and families who do not have health insurance, and requires States to return expiring SCHIP (State's Children Health Insurance Program) funds to the US Treasury. This means that 900,000 children would lose their health coverage.

I urge adoption of a budget that will protect the programs that millions of individuals depend on. A budget that will protect Social Security so that retirees can be assured that their benefits will be paid and that future generations will not be saddled with massive tax increases or reductions in benefits. Unfortunately, President Bush and his party have rejected this kind of budget. While I support the President in his efforts to combat terrorism both here and abroad, I am concerned that we are neglecting our domestic responsibilities and putting intense strain on the nation's finances—a strain that will remain for generations after the war on terrorism has been won.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support of the rule and for fully funding the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (IDEA). I am pleased that the Fiscal Year 2003 budget includes \$19.6 billion over 10 years for IDEA, however this amount is still a long way from providing states with the 40 percent funding level Congress committed to pay.

Federal IDEA funding assists states in providing invaluable services and educational opportunities for children with disabilities. However, Congress has not fulfilled their financial commitment to the states, and has left states to determine how to pay for IDEA.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should not mandate stringent federal programs without first determining how to fit these programs into the federal budget, and then providing states with the

necessary funds to comply with those federal standards. States should not be left to fund programs that are not initiated at the State and local level.

I support the IDEA program and realize the importance of providing disabled youth with the opportunity to gain an equal education. As the former Lieutenant Governor for the State of Idaho, and a former member of the state legislature, I also realize the budget constraints placed on states when federal programs are mandated without funding. As many states face severe deficit spending it is important for Congress to meet its commitments to IDEA, past and present.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 206, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—221

Aderholt
Akin
Army
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggart
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann

Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger

Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, Jeff
Moran (KS)

Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stump
Sullivan
Sununu

Sweeney
Tancred
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—206

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon

Green (TX)
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoolley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecza
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender
McDonald
Miller, George

Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vislosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)

Waxman Wexler Wu
Weiner Woolsey Wynn

NOT VOTING—7

Blagojevich Schaffner Traficant
Gutiérrez Shows
Riley Tierney

□ 1457

Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. LUTHER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered on the resolution.

MOTION TO TABLE MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the motion to table the motion to reconsider offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote followed by a 5-minute vote on the resolution, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 206, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—222

Abercrombie	Cubin	Hansen
Aderholt	Culberson	Hart
Akin	Cunningham	Hastings (WA)
Armey	Davis, Jo Ann	Hayes
Bachus	Davis, Tom	Hayworth
Baker	Deal	Hefley
Ballenger	DeLay	Herger
Barr	DeMint	Hilleary
Bartlett	Diaz-Balart	Hobson
Barton	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Bass	Dreier	Horn
Bereuter	Duncan	Hostettler
Biggert	Dunn	Houghton
Billirakis	Ehlers	Hulshof
Blunt	Ehrlich	Hunter
Boehlert	Emerson	Hyde
Boehner	English	Isakson
Bonilla	Everett	Issa
Bono	Ferguson	Istook
Boozman	Flake	Jenkins
Brady (TX)	Fletcher	Johnson (CT)
Brown (SC)	Foley	Johnson (IL)
Bryant	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Burr	Fossella	Jones (NC)
Burton	Frelinghuysen	Keller
Buyer	Gallely	Kelly
Callahan	Ganske	Kennedy (MN)
Calvert	Gekas	Kerns
Camp	Gibbons	King (NY)
Cannon	Gilchrest	Kingston
Cantor	Gillmor	Kirk
Capito	Gilman	Kolbe
Castle	Goode	LaHood
Chabot	Goodlatte	Latham
Chambliss	Goss	LaTourette
Coble	Graham	Leach
Collins	Granger	Lewis (CA)
Combest	Graves	Lewis (KY)
Cooksey	Green (WI)	Linder
Cox	Greenwood	LoBiondo
Crane	Grucci	Lucas (OK)
Crenshaw	Gutknecht	Manzullo

McCrery	Radanovich
McHugh	Ramstad
McInnis	Regula
McKeon	Rehberg
Mica	Reynolds
Miller, Dan	Rogers (KY)
Miller, Gary	Rogers (MI)
Miller, Jeff	Rohrabacher
Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen
Morella	Roukema
Myrick	Royce
Nethercutt	Ryan (WI)
Ney	Ryun (KS)
Northup	Saxton
Norwood	Schaffer
Nussle	Schrock
Osborne	Sensenbrenner
Ose	Sessions
Otter	Shadegg
Oxley	Shaw
Paul	Shays
Pence	Sherwood
Peterson (PA)	Shimkus
Petri	Shuster
Pickering	Simmons
Pitts	Simpson
Platts	Skeen
Pombo	Smith (MI)
Portman	Smith (NJ)
Pryce (OH)	Smith (TX)
Putnam	Smith (WA)
Quinn	Souder

NAYS—206

Ackerman	Gonzalez
Allen	Gordon
Andrews	Green (TX)
Baca	Hall (OH)
Baird	Hall (TX)
Baldacci	Harman
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)
Barcia	Hill
Barrett	Hilliard
Becerra	Hinchey
Bentsen	Hinojosa
Berkley	Hoeffel
Berman	Holden
Berry	Holt
Bishop	Honda
Blumenauer	Hooley
Bonior	Hoyer
Borski	Inslee
Boswell	Israel
Boucher	Jackson (IL)
Boyd	Jackson-Lee
Brady (PA)	(TX)
Brown (FL)	Jefferson
Brown (OH)	John
Capps	Johnson, E. B.
Capuano	Jones (OH)
Cardin	Kanjorski
Kapture	Carson (IN)
Kennedy (RI)	Carson (OK)
Kildee	Clay
Kilpatrick	Clayton
Kind (WI)	Clement
Kleczka	Clyburn
Kucinich	Condit
LaFalce	Conyers
Lampson	Costello
Langevin	Coyne
Lantos	Cramer
Larsen (WA)	Crowley
Larson (CT)	Cummings
Lee	Davis (CA)
Levin	Davis (FL)
Lewis (GA)	Davis (IL)
Lipinski	DeFazio
Lofgren	DeGette
Lowe	Delahunt
Lucas (KY)	DeLauro
Luther	Deutsch
Lynch	Dicks
Maloney (CT)	Dingell
Maloney (NY)	Doggett
Markey	Dooley
Mascara	Doyle
Matheson	Edwards
Matsui	Engel
McCarthy (MO)	Eshoo
McCarthy (NY)	Etheridge
McCollum	Evans
McDermott	Farr
McGovern	Fattah
McIntyre	Finer
McKinney	Ford
McNulty	Frank
Meehan	Frost
Meek (FL)	Gephardt

Stearns	Udall (CO)
Stump	Udall (NM)
Sullivan	Velazquez
Sununu	Visclosky
Sweeney	Waters
Tancredo	
Tauzin	
Taylor (NC)	
Terry	
Thomas	
Thornberry	
Thune	
Tiahrt	
Tiberti	
Toomey	
Upton	
Vitter	
Walden	
Walsh	
Wamp	
Watkins (OK)	
Watts (OK)	
Weldon (FL)	
Weldon (PA)	
Weller	
Whitfield	
Wicker	
Wilson (NM)	
Wilson (SC)	
Wolf	
Young (AK)	
Young (FL)	

Blagojevich	Watson (CA)
Gutiérrez	Watt (NC)
	Waxman
	Weiner
	Wexler

NOT VOTING—6

Blagojevich	Knollenberg	Shows
Gutiérrez	Riley	Traficant

□ 1507

Mr. SULLIVAN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 206, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—222

Aderholt	Ferguson	LaTourette
Akin	Flake	Leach
Armey	Fletcher	Lewis (CA)
Bachus	Foley	Lewis (KY)
Baker	Forbes	Linder
Ballenger	Fossella	LoBiondo
Barr	Frelinghuysen	Lucas (OK)
Bartlett	Gallely	Manzullo
Barton	Ganske	McCrery
Bass	Gekas	McHugh
Bereuter	Gibbons	McInnis
Biggert	Gilchrest	McKeon
Billirakis	Gillmor	Mica
Blunt	Blunt	Miller, Dan
Boehlert	Goode	Miller, Gary
Boehner	Boehner	Miller, Jeff
Bonilla	Goss	Moran (KS)
Bono	Graham	Morella
Boozman	Granger	Myrick
Brady (TX)	Graves	Nethercutt
Brown (SC)	Green (WI)	Ney
Bryant	Greenwood	Northup
Burr	Grucci	Norwood
Burton	Gutknecht	Nussle
Buyer	Hansen	Osborne
Callahan	Hart	Ose
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Otter
Camp	Hayes	Oxley
Cannon	Hayworth	Paul
Cantor	Hefley	Pence
Capito	Herger	Peterson (PA)
Castle	Hilleary	Petri
Chabot	Hobson	Pickering
Chambliss	Hoekstra	Pitts
Coble	Horn	Platts
Collins	Hostettler	Pombo
Combest	Houghton	Portman
Cooksey	Hulshof	Pryce (OH)
Cox	Hunter	Putnam
Crane	Hyde	Quinn
Crenshaw	Isakson	Radanovich
Cubin	Issa	Ramstad
Culberson	Istook	Regula
Cunningham	Jenkins	Rehberg
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson (CT)	Reynolds
Davis, Tom	Johnson (IL)	Riley
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
DeLay	Jones (NC)	Rogers (MI)
DeMint	Keller	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Ros-Lehtinen
Doolittle	Kennedy (MN)	Roukema
Dreier	Kerns	Royce
Duncan	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Dunn	Kingston	Ryun (KS)
Ehlers	Kirk	Saxton
Ehrlich	Knollenberg	Schaffer
Emerson	Kolbe	Schrock
English	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Everett	Latham	Sessions

Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Tiberi
Souder
Stearns
Stump

Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Upton
Vitter

Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—206

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)

Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hookey
Hoyer
Inslie
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler

Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Boehner
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—6

Blagojevich
Boyd

Gutierrez
Harman

Shows
Traficant

□ 1518

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.
Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER OFFERED BY MR. DREIER

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that we reconsider the vote.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 206, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—213

Aderholt
Akin
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggart
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Hayvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Hyde
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley

Forbes
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Collins
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kerns
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCreary

McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, Jeff
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)

Souder
Stearns
Stump
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas

Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)

Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—206

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Hall (OH)

Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hookey
Hoyer
Inslie
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler

Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—15

Blagojevich
Buyer
Callahan
Doolittle
Gutierrez

Hilleary
Hobson
Jenkins
Kennedy (MN)
Kleczka

Lantos
Saxton
Shadegg
Shows
Traficant

□ 1538

So the motion to table was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:
Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I was inadvertently detained and

missed rollcall vote No. 78, providing for consideration of H. Con. Res. 353, Budget Resolution 372 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 353.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 372 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 353.

□ 1538

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 353) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2003 and setting forth appropriate budget levels for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2007, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

The text of H. Con. Res. 353, as amended pursuant to House Resolution 372, is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 353

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003.

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2003 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2004 through 2007 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$1,531,893,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004: \$1,626,605,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005: \$1,747,988,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: \$1,837,957,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$1,927,213,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$4,431,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004: \$5,455,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005: \$6,418,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: \$2,020,704,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$5,555,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$1,784,073,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004: \$1,840,292,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005: \$1,930,171,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: \$2,020,704,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$2,114,974,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$1,756,432,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004: \$1,815,097,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005: \$1,899,231,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: \$1,978,512,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$2,058,894,000,000.

(4) ON-BUDGET DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the on-budget deficits are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$224,539,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004: \$188,492,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005: \$151,243,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: \$140,555,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$131,681,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$6,414,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004: \$6,762,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005: \$7,073,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: \$7,371,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$7,661,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$3,495,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004: \$3,505,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005: \$3,448,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: \$3,369,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$3,270,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. HOMELAND SECURITY.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2003 for Homeland Security are as follows:

- (1) New budget authority, \$37,702,000,000.
- (2) Outlays, \$21,860,000,000.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2003 through 2007 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

- Fiscal year 2003:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$393,828,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$375,259,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$401,640,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$390,578,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$422,740,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$409,696,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$444,243,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$425,090,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$466,458,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$439,181,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

- Fiscal year 2003:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$23,752,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$22,343,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$24,683,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$22,675,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$25,481,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$23,165,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$26,137,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$23,769,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$27,043,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$24,467,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology

(250):

- Fiscal year 2003:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$22,743,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$22,095,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$23,398,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$22,798,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$23,917,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$23,577,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$24,476,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$24,073,000,000.

(4) Community and Regional Development

(450):

- Fiscal year 2003:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$67,561,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$60,068,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$68,221,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$61,318,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$68,897,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$63,302,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$69,561,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$64,286,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$70,221,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$65,270,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$25,055,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$24,667,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

- Fiscal year 2003:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$316,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$364,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$157,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$129,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$687,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$644,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$526,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$467,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$532,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$454,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment

(300):

- Fiscal year 2003:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$29,218,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$29,868,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$30,546,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$30,362,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$31,449,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$30,932,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$30,851,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$31,677,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$31,474,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$32,032,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

- Fiscal year 2003:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$23,641,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$24,054,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$23,848,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$23,860,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$22,167,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$22,280,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$21,300,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$21,438,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$21,157,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$21,307,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

- Fiscal year 2003:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$8,800,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$4,985,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$9,274,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$4,192,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$8,798,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$3,128,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$8,015,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$1,910,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$9,405,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$2,361,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

- Fiscal year 2003:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$63,447,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$60,807,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$66,950,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$59,675,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$67,561,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$60,068,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$68,221,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$61,318,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$68,897,000,000.
 - (B) Outlays, \$63,302,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development

(450):

- Fiscal year 2003:
 - (A) New budget authority, \$14,668,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,352,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,961,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,515,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,895,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,705,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,548,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$81,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$79,090,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$83,241,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$81,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$86,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$84,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$89,463,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$86,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$92,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$89,259,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$223,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$219,931,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$237,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$236,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$255,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$253,959,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$274,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$272,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$295,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$293,035,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$237,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$237,599,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$245,612,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$245,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$272,903,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$272,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$292,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$292,173,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$317,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$317,667,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$322,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$322,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$325,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$323,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$334,538,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$332,599,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$344,039,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$341,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$352,017,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$348,019,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,303,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,303,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,170,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,170,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,063,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,062,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,863,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,863,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,013,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,012,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$56,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$56,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$59,127,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$58,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$61,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$63,473,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$63,401,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$63,246,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$65,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$62,642,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$36,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$39,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$39,663,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,219,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$37,606,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$38,201,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$38,880,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$38,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$39,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$39,550,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,196,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,426,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,334,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,227,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,788,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,546,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$262,524,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$262,524,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$277,366,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$277,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$286,992,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$286,991,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$294,769,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$294,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$302,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$302,678,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, —\$689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$1,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, —\$917,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, —\$816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$787,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, —\$631,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, —\$696,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$678,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, —\$48,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$48,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, —\$56,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$56,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, —\$57,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$57,370,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, —\$51,180,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$51,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, —\$53,155,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$53,155,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE AND CONTINGENCY FUNDS

Subtitle A—Reserve Funds for Legislation Assumed in Aggregates

SEC. 201. RESERVE FUND FOR WAR ON TERRORISM.

In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Armed Services reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for operations of the Department of Defense to prosecute the war on terrorism, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate revisions to the allocations and other levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but the total adjustment for all measures considered under this section shall not exceed \$10,000,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2003 and outlays flowing therefrom.

SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE MODERNIZATION AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Energy and Commerce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides a prescription drug benefit and modernizes medicare, and provides adjustments to the medicare program on a fee-for-service, capitated, or other basis, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the appropriate committee allocations for such committees and other appropriate levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed \$5,000,000,000 in new budget authority and \$5,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2003 and \$350,000,000,000 in new budget authority and \$350,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2012.

(b) APPLICATION.—After the consideration of any measure for which an adjustment is made pursuant to subsection (a), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make any further appropriate adjustments.

SEC. 203. RESERVE FUND FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2003.—In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides in excess of \$7,529,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2003 for grants to States authorized under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the appropriate allocations for such committee and other appropriate levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed \$1,000,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2003 and outlays flowing therefrom.

(b) FISCAL YEARS 2004–2007.—In the House, if the Committee on Education and the Workforce reports a bill or joint resolution,

or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that reauthorizes grants to States under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the applicable allocations of the appropriate committees to accommodate a total budget authority and outlay level for such program not in excess of the following: \$9,587,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom, \$10,755,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2005 and outlays flowing therefrom, \$12,047,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2006 and outlays flowing therefrom, and \$13,497,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2007 and outlays flowing therefrom (assuming changes from current policy levels of the following: \$1,752,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004, \$2,763,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2005, \$3,894,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2006, and \$5,180,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2007).

SEC. 204. RESERVE FUND FOR HIGHWAYS AND HIGHWAY SAFETY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that establishes an obligation limitation in excess of \$23,864,000,000 for fiscal year 2003 for programs, projects, and activities within the highway category (under section 251(c)(7)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays for such committee by the amount of outlays resulting from such excess, but—

(1) only if chairman of the Committee on the Budget determines that the bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that establishes such obligation limitation provides that the obligation limitation is made available solely for programs, projects, or activities as distributed under section 1102 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century;

(2) only if the total amount of obligation limitation for programs, projects, or activities distributed by such formula for fiscal year 2003 exceeds \$23,864,000,000; and

(3) does not exceed \$1,180,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2003.

(b) RULE OF ENFORCEMENT.—In the House, section 302(f)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall be deemed to also apply to the applicable allocation of outlays in the case of any bill or joint resolution that establishes an obligation limitation for fiscal year 2003 for programs within the highway category, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon.

Subtitle B—Additional Surpluses Reserved for Debt Reduction

SEC. 211. CONTINGENCY FUND FOR ADDITIONAL SURPLUSES.

In the House, if after the release of the report pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 entitled the Budget and Economic Outlook: Update (for fiscal years 2003 through 2012), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget determines, in consultation with the Directors of the Congressional Budget Office and of the Office of Management and Budget, that the estimated unified surplus for fiscal year 2003 and for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2007 exceeds the estimated unified surplus for fiscal year 2003 and for that period as set forth in the report of the Committee on the Budget for this resolution, then the chairman of that committee may increase the surplus or reduce the deficit, as applicable, and reduce the level of the public debt and

debt held by the public by the difference between such estimates for that period.

Subtitle C—Contingency Funds for Accounting Changes

SEC. 221. CONTINGENCY FUND FOR ACCRUAL ACCOUNTING.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate changes in section 302(a) allocations of the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Government Reform and aggregates, if appropriate, to effectuate and implement the necessary authorizing and appropriation measures to charge Federal agencies for the full cost of accrued Federal retirement and health benefits.

SEC. 222. CONTINGENCY FUND FOR RECLASSIFICATION OF STUDENT AID ACCOUNTS.

In the House, if a bill or joint resolution is enacted that amends the Higher Education Act to make student aid administration subject to annual appropriations, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may—

(1) increase the section 302(a) allocation for the Committee on Appropriations by the amount of new budget authority provided by that measure but not to exceed \$797,000,000 for fiscal year 2003 and the outlays flowing therefrom; and

(2) make the appropriate adjustment in the section 302(a) allocation for the Committee on Education and the Workforce resulting from the enactment of the bill or joint resolution making the student aid administration subject to annual appropriations.

Subtitle D—Implementation of Reserve and Contingency Funds

SEC. 231. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

(d) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, there shall be a separate section 302(a) allocation to the appropriate committees for medicare. For purposes of enforcing such separate allocation under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the “first fiscal year” and the “total of fiscal years” shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2003 and the total of fiscal years 2003 through 2012 included in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution, respectively. Such separate allocation shall be the exclusive allocation for medicare under section 302(a).

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE HOUSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), an advance ap-

propriation may not be reported in a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto.

(2) Managers on the part of the House may not agree to a Senate amendment that would violate paragraph (1) unless specific authority to agree to the amendment first is given by the House by a separate vote with respect thereto.

(b) EXCEPTION.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided—

(1) for fiscal year 2004 for programs, projects, activities or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$23,178,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2003 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2003.

SEC. 302. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of such Act to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts provided for the Social Security Administration.

SEC. 303. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE.

The report submitted by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office on or before February 15 of each year pursuant to section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall include the following information for the preceding fiscal year—

(1) a comparison of the different impact between forecasted economic variables used to model projections for that fiscal year and what actually happens;

(2) an identification of the technical factors that contributed to the forecasting inaccuracies for that fiscal year;

(3) a variance analysis between forecasted and actual budget results for that fiscal year; and

(4) recommendations on how to improve forecasting accuracies.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF CONGRESS AND SENSE OF HOUSE PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. COMBATING INFECTIOUS DISEASES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the United States has historically taken an unparalleled leadership role in providing humanitarian assistance and relief to the world's poorest people;

(2) that role has included initiatives to expand trade, relieve debt of countries pursuing structural economic reforms, and provide medical technology to improve health and life expectancy around the globe; and

(3) good governance and continued economic reforms are essential to eliminating poverty, encouraging economic growth, and ensuring stability in developing countries.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should continue to assist, through expanded international trade, debt relief, and medical assistance to combat infectious diseases, those countries that reform their economies, promote democratic institutions, and respect basic human rights.

SEC. 402. ASSET BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) For the vast majority of United States households, the pathway to the economic mainstream and financial security is not through spending and consumption, but through savings, investing, and the accumulation of assets.

(2) One-third of all Americans have no assets available for investment and another 20 percent have only negligible assets. The situation is even more serious for minority households; for example, 60 percent of African-American households have no or negative financial assets.

(3) Nearly 50 percent of all children in America live in households that have no assets available for investment, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 73 percent of African-American children.

(4) Up to 20 percent of all United States households do not deposit their savings in financial institutions and, thus, do not have access to the basic financial tools that make asset accumulation possible.

(5) Public policy can have either a positive or a negative impact on asset accumulation. Traditional public assistance programs based on income and consumption have rarely been successful in supporting the transition to economic self-sufficiency. Tax policy, through \$288,000,000,000 in annual tax incentives, has helped lay the foundation for the great middle class.

(6) Lacking an income tax liability, low-income working families cannot take advantage of asset development incentives available through the Federal tax code.

(7) Individual Development Accounts have proven to be successful in helping low-income working families save and accumulate assets. Individual Development Accounts have been used to purchase long-term, high-return assets, including homes, postsecondary education and training, and small businesses.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Federal tax code should support a significant expansion of Individual Development Accounts so that millions of low-income, working families can save, build assets, and move their lives forward; thus, making positive contributions to the economic and social well-being of the United States, as well as to its future.

SEC. 403. FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PAY.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Members of the uniformed services and civilian employees of the United States make significant contributions to the general welfare of the Nation.

(2) Increases in the pay of members of the uniformed services and of civilian employees of the United States have not kept pace with increases in the overall pay levels of workers in the private sector, so that there now exists (A) a 32 percent gap between compensation levels of Federal civilian employees and compensation levels of private sector workers, and (B) an estimated 10 percent gap between compensation levels of members of the uniformed services and compensation levels of private sector workers.

(3) The President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2003 includes a 4.1 percent pay raise for military personnel.

(4) The Office of Management and Budget has requested that federal agencies plan their fiscal year 2003 budgets with a 2.6 percent pay raise for civilian Federal employees.

(5) In almost every year during the past two decades, there have been equal adjustments in the compensation of members of the uniformed services and the compensation of civilian employees of the United States.

(b) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House that rates of compensation for civilian employees of the United States should be adjusted at the same time, and in the same proportion, as are rates of compensation for members of the uniformed services.

SEC. 404. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON MEDICARE+CHOICE REGIONAL DISPARITIES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) one of the goals of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 was to expand options for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare+Choice program;

(2) the funding formula in that Act was intended to make these choices available to all Americans; and

(3) despite attempts by Congress to equalize regional disparities in Medicare+Choice payments in the Balanced Budget Refinement Act of 1999 and the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Benefits and Improvement and Protection Act of 2000, rural and other low-payment areas have continued to lag significantly behind their higher-payment counterparts in average adjusted per capita (AAPCC) reimbursements.

(b) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House that if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill to reform Medicare, it should apply all new funds directed to the Medicare+Choice program to increase funding to counties receiving floor or blended rates relative to counties receiving the minimum update.

SEC. 405. BORDER SECURITY AND ANTI-TERRORISM.

It is the sense of the House that this resolution assumes \$380 million in new budget authority and a corresponding level of outlays in functional category 750 (Administration of Justice) for the Immigration and Naturalization Service to implement a visa tracking system as part of a comprehensive plan to protect the United States and its territories from threats of terrorist attack.

SEC. 406. PACIFIC NORTHWEST SALMON RECOVERY.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) Pacific Salmon are historically, culturally, and economically important to the people of the Northwest;

(2) the United States Government has negotiated treaties with the Columbia River Indian tribes;

(3) the National Marine Fisheries Service in December 2000 issued a biological opinion on the Federal Columbia River Power System calling for greater efforts by the Federal Government, to satisfy the ESA standards of section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act; and

(4) the citizens of the Pacific Northwest are committed to salmon recovery and their hard work in communities throughout the region to advance local solutions deserves Federal assistance.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that this resolution assumes that the Pacific Northwest salmon recovery program, administered by Federal agencies on the Federal Columbia River Power System and Pacific coast, should be made a high-priority item for funding.

SEC. 407. FEDERAL FIRE PREVENTION ASSISTANCE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) Increased demands on firefighting and emergency medical personnel have made it difficult for local governments to adequately fund necessary fire safety precautions.

(2) The Government has an obligation to protect the health and safety of the firefighting and emergency medical personnel of the United States and to ensure that they have the financial resources to protect the public.

(3) The high rates in the United States of death, injury, and property damage caused by fires demonstrates a critical need for Federal investment in support of firefighting and emergency medical personnel.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, has successfully provided financial resources for basic firefighting needs since its inception; and

(2) in the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the ultimate sacrifice paid by over 300 firefighters, that as Congress makes funding decisions regarding the proposed grants for first responders, local firefighters receive at least as much funding as they did under the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate shall not exceed 3 hours with 2 hours confined to the Congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 1 hour of debate on the Congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the attention of my colleagues for what I think is a very important, very sober debate today that needs to occur about America's future.

Mr. Chairman, the world changed on September 11. Boy, we have heard those words quite a bit lately from a number of Members in a bipartisan way. We are at war. America suffered a profound national emergency. Our pre-attack recession grew deeper, and any one of those challenges would have made putting a budget together very difficult. But all three at one time, trust me, put a pretty difficult task before this Congress in trying to put a budget plan together. All three could have resulted in deficits for many years.

But when the world changed on September 11, the President came forward with a plan. He provided leadership, and America saw the Congress come together in a bipartisan way. We provided, in a bipartisan way, resources to meet the national emergency, resources to prosecute the war, and about week and a half ago, bipartisan tax relief and job creation resources, as well as worker protection assistance.

These were appropriate responses, but these appropriate responses eliminated the surplus.

Americans out there, constituents of all of ours, are still wondering: Is America safe; will I have a good paying job; and what is my family's future going to look like?

First on the question of is America safe, our budget secures our Nation, allows us the resources to win the war, secure the homeland, invest in future technology, and keep our promise to our veterans.

With the budget plan that we put together and that we present to the Congress today, we secure our Nation's future, and we do it in a positive way.

The second question that Americans are asking is will I have a good paying job? Our budget secures a growing economy. It funds job creation and worker protection, adopts a national energy strategy, invests in America's roads and infrastructure, provides for an agriculture safety net, promotes trade and access to our products, and, yes, provides additional tax relief and tax reform. We believe in short what this budget plan does, it creates jobs.

With this budget plan, I believe we secure a growing economy. But Americans are still asking questions. They are asking, do my family and I have a secure future? We cannot forget while we are securing the economy, securing the homeland, that America's priorities must continue. We must secure the future for ourselves and our families, leave no child behind in education, fully fund and reauthorize special education, conserve and protect our environment, access quality and affordable health care. And finally, modernize Medicare and provide prescription drugs for seniors, and protect every penny of Social Security benefits, our pensions, and our savings for the future.

With the plan that we put together, we believe we have better secured our future for ourselves and our families. Without our bipartisan response to the economy and to the war and to protect the homeland, this would have not only been a balanced budget, but even with this budget and even with the short-term borrowing that needs to occur to accomplish those important priorities, under our plan we begin to pay down the national debt again in 2004.

So I believe our mission is undeniable. We must secure America's future. Our strategy is clear. We need security for our Nation, security for a growing economy, and security for ourselves and our families. I believe that our budget makes it happen, together with the fine work of the American people.

We have a plan. There is no doubt that people can quibble with the fact that no plan is perfect in every regard. But the President proposed a plan, we made it better. We are providing positive leadership at this crucial time in American history, and it is time to get that job done.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORN-

BERRY) to talk about securing our Nation.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, every year during the debate on the budget, someone says it is about more than just numbers, it is about priorities. Certainly since September 11, the priorities of the country have changed.

□ 1545

National security is not just something that happens in a military base or in some far-off country. It touches every household, every workplace, every school and hospital in the country. National security is the first priority of the country, and it is the first priority of this budget.

The first paragraph of the President's budget submission says that the war against terrorism is a war unlike any other in American history. We did not choose this war, but we will not shrink from it; and we will mobilize all the necessary resources of our society to fight and to win.

That is what this budget does. It mobilizes the resources necessary to fight and win the war against terrorism. The budget provides \$46 billion, or a 13 percent increase, in defense. Some people think that is too much. Other people do not think it is enough. The committee decided to go with what the President recommended, giving him all of the resources he has asked for to fight this war. We also support the President in focusing on the troops with a 4.1 percent pay hike for the troops as well as an additional 2 percent for some specially targeted mid-career personnel. This budget will help give the troops the tools they need to do their job, with \$69 billion in procurement and \$54 billion for research and development.

It includes the largest operating and maintenance budget ever at \$140 billion; but it also keeps faith with those people who have already served our country, fully funding for the first time in a number of years military health care, expanding concurrent receipt for those who are most severely disabled, and also significantly increasing VA health care by about 12 percent.

In addition to those categories, Mr. Chairman, the budget follows the President's lead in nearly doubling the spending for homeland security. There are some important initiatives here, such as significantly increasing the money for border security. So for the INS, Customs, Coast Guard, which may all be put together soon, there are significant increases in their funding. It improves funding to prepare for bioterrorism with money for hospitals, research for vaccines, strengthening our ability to detect attacks. Most significantly, it has a new program to assist the local policemen, local firefighters and emergency responders with \$3.5 billion administered by FEMA so that those local first responders can have money to train, equip and get the things that they need to do.

Mr. Chairman, it is fair to disagree about the spending on any particular

program, but the overriding fact of this budget and the overriding fact of our time is that this country is at war against terrorism. It is a different kind of war. Sometimes we will be in a fierce military battle such as we have seen in recent days in Afghanistan. At other times there will be lull in the military operations. Sometimes the memory of the attacks against innocent Americans are going to be fresh in our minds. At other times those memories will seem to fade, and we face the danger of drifting back into business as usual.

But the truth is it is not going to be business as usual again for a very long time. We are at war. This budget supports the President in fighting and winning that war, it supports the soldiers on the ground in Afghanistan, it supports the people guarding our borders and the other people trying to protect our public health, it supports local policemen and firefighters; and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, it deserves our support as well.

This is the time to put our money where our mouth is. It is not the time for vague statements and assurances. We put our money where our mouth is with our votes. I suggest we vote for this resolution.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, when we set out to put together this budget, our goal was to put together a strong wartime budget, a budget that met the priorities laid out by the President during his State of the Union Address, to fund and win the war on terrorism, to fund our homeland security needs, and to get our economy moving again after the attacks on September 11 and the impact it has had on our economy and not just in Washington and New York but across the country.

We worked hard to put together a budget plan that meets these priorities and in particular on the economy, putting together a budget that lays the groundwork for strong economic growth not just as we move forward in the year but out 2 years, 5 years and 10 years. We put together a budget that fully funded the worker protection act signed by the President earlier this year, extending unemployment benefits and giving businesses, large and small, incentives to invest in new technology, new productivity, accelerating the depreciation that they could take. We have got to remember that jobs are not created here in Washington by legislators. Jobs are created by entrepreneurs and risk-takers and investors. In my home State of New Hampshire, over 60 percent of the jobs come from small businesses. By giving them that incentive to invest, we give them the opportunity to create jobs for others.

We made a commitment to implement a national energy strategy to reduce our dependence on oil imports

from the Middle East and from overseas. We made a commitment to invest in roads and infrastructure, something that the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure spoke about with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) during a colloquy earlier. We made a commitment to pass a strong farm bill and included that in the budget. We made a commitment to expand opportunities to export American-manufactured products overseas, expand trade and strengthen our economy.

We will hear and have heard a lot of criticism about this budget proposal, but let us remember a few things. If someone wants to change this bill, if someone is criticizing this bill, the spending levels and the priorities, you have got three choices: you can raise taxes to fund those priorities, and I do not think in this economy we should be raising taxes; you can cut defense and homeland security funding to put into a particular domestic initiative, and I think that would be a grave mistake in this environment as we have made a commitment to win the war on terrorism; or you can increase the deficits. Those are your only three choices.

We will hear a lot of scare tactics about Social Security, but let us step back a little bit. The budgets that were opposed by the other side of the aisle over each of the last 4 years, let us look at what they have done. We have paid down over \$450 billion in debt. Never have we put public debt as a percentage of our economy at such a low level. And the scare tactics on Social Security, let us look at where the Social Security trust funds are, with and without the tax relief legislation passed last year. The balances in the Social Security trust funds have not been changed one penny.

Do we need to take up legislation to strengthen Social Security? I believe we do. Do we need to fund a prescription drug benefit for Medicare? Absolutely. And we have committed to doing just that. In this budget, there is \$350 billion for a Medicare prescription drug benefit that is voluntary, that is affordable, that makes a difference for seniors around the country. We have increased special education funding, something very important to schools in New Hampshire, to a record level. And we have funded \$2.6 billion in veterans health benefits and also funded concurrent receipt legislation.

This is a budget that sets good priorities, that I think sets the right priorities; but that does not mean we have not had to make some tough choices. But in not presenting a budget plan, the other side has defaulted on their willingness to make those choices or to set priorities. We heard some discussion about a potential substitute calling for a mid-session review and better CBO scoring. That is not an alternative. That is not a different set of priorities. We need a budget and we need vision. That is what this committee has offered.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Committee on the Budget for yielding me this time and compliment him for his leadership in putting together a budget that is good for American families. All over America, families will ask, Is this a good budget for America's families? And it is. It is a balanced approach. It balances our national defense needs, our homeland security, economic needs, and the priorities for our families. It is a balanced approach. We have made the critical decisions and we have made the critical choices as to where we will invest the \$2.1 trillion.

Again, this budget will be criticized; but our colleagues on the other side have no Democrat substitute. In the Committee on the Budget, we got an idea as to what a substitute might look like if it were proposed. There was \$175 billion to \$200 billion of new spending. Zero of it would be used to reduce the national debt. Zero would be used for Social Security. Zero would be used for national defense. Zero would be used for homeland security. \$175 billion of it, all of it, would be used to increase Washington spending. We do not necessarily believe that that is the best approach for America's families, because if they were not going to increase our national debt, what they would have had to have done is they would have had to have increased taxes. The last time they increased taxes on American families, let us take a look at what they did. They retroactively increased the death tax, they increased taxes on Social Security, they raised Medicare taxes, they raised the gas taxes, they raised personal income tax rates, and they raised the corporate tax rate. That is not a balanced approach for America. We have made the tough decisions that will secure the future for America's families.

Let us take a look at some of the choices that we have made. Let us take a look at what we have done in the area of education. In the last 6 years, we have doubled the investment in our children, the dollars that we have invested in education. This now will enable us to build on those results and continue moving forward in this critical area. The one that perhaps makes the most difference to our local school districts is what we have done for our children with special education needs. Not only do we focus on a priority, but every time we invest in special education we fulfill a commitment that we have made, that we made way back in the 1960s as to funding this and what the Washington commitment would be.

Republican Congresses have tripled funding for IDEA funding in the last 6 years. We increase that by another \$1 billion in this budget, and we put in place a plan so that within the next 10 years we will fully fund our commit-

ment. It is our commitment to these special students, and it is our commitment to local school districts which will free up a lot of education dollars at the local district that they can then drive. We maintain our commitment to higher education by continuing to fund Pell grants at \$4,000. We increase funding for low-income school districts. We put an emphasis on reading first. We have committed to our families and to America that we will keep our focus on education.

We also will ensure that we improve health care. We have set aside \$5.9 billion for bioterrorism. We have set aside \$350 billion to develop a Medicare prescription drug plan. We have carried through, and this is the final installment, of doubling funding over 5 years for the National Institutes of Health. We improve veterans health care. We improve community health centers and health center programs for rural areas. We are committed to continuing our focus on health care and retirement.

This is a balanced, good approach that will secure the future for America's families.

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

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, a year ago I closed the debate on the budget by noting that it has taken us almost 20 years, \$4 trillion in debt, to escape the fiscal mistakes that we made in the 1980s and to turn this budget around and finally move it out of deficits and into surpluses. But we did it. There is the record of the late 8 years of the Clinton administration: every year a better bottom line.

I went on to say that today, if I had one priority, a year ago, one overriding objective, it was simply this, to make sure that we did not backslide into the hole that we have just dug ourselves out of. That was my objective, I said. That is why I had a problem last year with the Republican resolution, because it left so little room for error. I went on to say I hoped that these blue sky projections that totaled some \$5.6 trillion in surpluses over the next 10 years will materialize. It will be a great bounty for all of us. But if they do not and if we pass this resolution, we can find ourselves right back in the red again in the blink of an economist's eye. Mr. Chairman, here we are, back in that hole again. You listen to the other side talk, and you would not even think that we had a problem.

I just pulled two pages out of various economic studies of the budget situation we have got on our hands. Here is CBO's most recent estimate of the deficit in the President's budget. This year it will be \$248 billion.

□ 1600

\$248 billion. Next year, \$297 billion in the red, in deficit. Over the next 10 years, 2003 to 2012, it will be \$1.8 trillion in deficit, and that means \$1.8 trillion into the Social Security Trust

Fund, because that is how you make up that deficit.

They act as if we do not have a problem. They talk about recovering surplus. Look at their own numbers. Next year, a deficit of \$224 billion on budget excluding Social Security. Over 4 or 5 years, \$830 billion.

Here we are, Mr. Chairman. We have witnessed the biggest fiscal reversal in the history of our country. \$5 trillion has vanished, disappeared, it is gone. We had \$5.6 trillion last year. Looking at the President's own numbers this year, we have \$0.6 trillion if we implement his budget. Last year we had for 10 straight years nothing but black ink on the bottom line, 10 straight years we had on budget surpluses last year.

We talked last year about virtually paying off all of the Treasury's debt held by the public, over \$3 trillion worth. This year, this year we have got on budget deficits for 10 straight years. And what are we talking about now? Raising the ceiling on the national debt immediately. The Secretary of Treasury says he needs \$750 billion of additional debt ceiling because the national debt is going up, it is not coming down.

Well, here we are, Mr. Chairman, and my problem with this Republican budget is that it presents no plan, no strategy, no way to get us out of this hole. It only leads to bigger deficits and greater debt.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) offered a process before the Committee on Rules and defended it on the floor. So did the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN). They at least had a way to back the budget out of Social Security, which is an objective we all profess at least to hold. It was not made in order. Nothing was made in order, except this resolution under the rule that was presented to us.

So we have a Republican budget in name, but in name only, because it does not have a plan. Oh, it has a default plan, all right. In the absence of any kind of constructive concerted plan, it has a default plan. That default plan is to keep on borrowing and spending Social Security, to revert to the practice that we all foreswore and said we would never ever do again once we reached that summit and were able to get away from that onerous practice.

Why do we have such little time then in the face of such serious matters to debate the most consequential vote that we will cast in this session? It is not because Republicans are eager to get home. It is because their budget will not stand scrutiny, not for long, and they know it. It will not stand scrutiny because it is just the tip of the iceberg. This is not the real budget. This is part of their budget.

Let me give you an example. Last year, in order to shoe-horn the tax bill into the amount allocated for the total tax bill, they phased it in over time, and then in 2010 they did something dramatic, they actually repealed everything that had just been imple-

mented. So we have a repealer in 2010 that undoes tax cuts that were done last year.

We asked, with this 5-year budget, does it provide or anticipate anything with respect to the repeal of the repealer in 2010? We were told emphatically "no." The next day the Speaker said absolutely, we will repeal the sunset provision in the Tax Code. Ari Fleischer at the White House backed him up. Those are pretty high sources.

But you search this budget in vain for any trace whatsoever of the repeal of the repealer in the year 2010. It is not in here. CBO tells us if you put it in there, you have to make a \$569 billion adjustment, deduction, to revenues. It is not in there.

Nor is there any provision for fixing the AMT, nor is there any provision for extending popular tax provisions that will expire, nor, for that matter, is there any of the President's request for \$675 billion in additional tax relief. It has all been pushed forward into the second 5 years.

This is not some policy wonk debate whether you should do a budget 5 years or 10 years. This is a concerted strategy to shove everything forward and make the first 5 years as good as you possibly can by ducking the issue that will come just over the horizon.

A budget is a plan, we all know that. We have household budgets, and if we had a plan here, if the Republicans had a plan in their budget, they would display it. They would roll it out. Because surely if they had a plan, one goal, one objective in that plan, would be to get the budget out of Social Security, to quit borrowing and spending the Social Security budget.

One of the reasons we have a 5-year budget, one of the reasons that we have Social Security, one of the reasons that we have OMB as a scorekeeper for this budget instead of CBO, is right here. It is this chart right here. These bar graphs right here tell an awful lot.

If you look to the far left axis, you see a little blue stub. That is where the Clinton administration got us. We were, for the first time in 30 years, out of Social Security, out of Medicare. We had a surplus over and above both of those accounts.

2001, you see a little stub below the line. That too is a partial Clinton year. The reason that stub is below the line is that the Republicans shifted a corporate tax payment, \$35 billion worth, from September 15 to October 1 to shore up 2002 numbers. Back that artificial shift out and it too is right at the line.

So this is the beginning baseline that the President inherited, the best fiscal situation any President has inherited in modern times. And these are the deficits that are entailed by his budget and these are the results to Social Security and to Medicare. Medicare, the yellow or orange line at the top. Fully consumes the Medicare surplus, \$650 billion over the next 10 years, every penny of it. Social Security, 70 to 75

percent of the Social Security surplus is fully consumed over the next 10 years.

The key thing is if you look in the year 2007, which is a terminal year in this budget, if you looked at their budget you might think, well, they have a plan. It looks like the amount of invasion of the Social Security surplus is about to diminish, they are about to turn the corner. But in truth, it keeps on keeping on. There is no plan. There is no result.

This is not the kind of budget that will put us back on the path we were on. We have had some fundamental changes since this time last year, I will be the first to acknowledge it, and I will be the first to say the debate today is not about national defense or homeland defense. We support both, on the same terms and in the same amount.

But we also support Social Security. We also thought we had a good thing going with our fiscal policy last year. We would like to get back on this path. This budget does not lead us back. This leads to more debt, more deficits, more invasion of the Social Security Trust Fund, and it has no plan for resolution of any of those things.

Before this year is out, I hope, earnestly hope, having been here 20 years and struggled and worked to put the budget on an even keel, I hope we will have some solution to this problem. But this is not a solution. This does not lead us in the right direction and this budget should be emphatically defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, this budget is deceptive in at least three respects, and I and a number of colleagues are going to elaborate on that in the next few minutes.

First, it uses a 5-year forecasting window instead of the customary 10-year window; secondly, it bases the forecast on projections generated by the administration's political appointees at OMB, rather than the nonpartisan CBO; and, thirdly, it omits the cost of major initiatives that both parties agree must be enacted.

Since the 1997 Balanced Budget Act, it has been customary to employ 10-year projections in budgeting. Last year, when Republicans were pushing a major tax cut, they were eager to use 10-year projections that put the aggregate cost of their proposal in a more favorable light. Now, when it does not work that way, when it does not suit their purposes, Republicans are providing only a 5-year budget outlook.

This budget further seeks to mask the effect of the Republicans' failed fiscal policies by using OMB projections instead of relying on Congress' official nonpartisan scorekeeper, the CBO. During committee markup, our budget chairman characterized this hat trick

as a simple use of the remote control. "If you don't like the weather report," he said, "you might as well change the channel. That is what we are doing."

Yes, indeed, they have changed the channel. Remember, though, that shutting down the Federal Government in 1995 was undertaken by our Republican friends precisely to force a Democratic administration to use CBO estimates. Now House Republicans have decided that CBO's figures are, well, inconvenient. And they are. Just using CBO's baseline estimate of spending under current law exposes a \$318 billion hole over 10 years.

It sounds like the bad old days of "rosy scenarios," and it goes straight to the resolution's bottom line and explains the majority's sudden affection for OMB figures.

Finally, this budget omits and understates the cost of things that the Republican leadership has already stated its intent to do. The administration is about to request supplemental appropriations for defense and homeland security. Congress will honor these requests.

The day after the committee markup of this budget, the Speaker himself announced plans to bring to the floor in April larger tax cuts than this resolution permits. The budget resolution accommodates none of this, nor does it provide for a workable Medicare prescription drug benefit, nor for natural disaster relief, nor for critical investments in education, nor for a fix for the Alternative Minimum Tax.

Mr. Chairman, the real Republican budget creates a huge permanent deficit. It spends at least 86 percent of the Social Security surplus and all of the Medicare surplus over the next 6 years, and it heaps up public debt for years to come. Smoke and mirrors cannot hide the fact that the Republican budget spends the Social Security surplus as far as the eye can see, and it has no plan to bring the budget out of deficit and back into surplus.

Clearly, supporters of this budget do not want to reveal the ultimate consequences of their choices, and in the next few minutes my colleagues and I will further elaborate on the ways this budget cloaks its full cost.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, we are here on a historic day. This is the first time in 19 years we have had a totally closed rule on the budget; no amendments, no alternatives, one shot, Republican, that is it.

Now, why is that? Well, you have come to the second annual meeting of the county fair where they play the three walnut shell con game. We are playing it again. We played it last year.

The fact is that the first shell here is the budget estimates. Are we going to

use OMB or CBO? These people closed the government down in 1995 over whether or not we are going to use OMB or CBO. They said CBO is the only numbers. Now this year, it is OMB. Well, they moved that around.

Then they said last year, we have a lot of money, oh, gosh, we have a lot of money. Look at them 10-year projections. Then things went to pieces. So this year they said let us just look at 5 years. That is enough. That is sufficient enough. That is a second shell.

If you think about it, they have understated the cost of mandatory spending. They talk about the stimulus package we passed last week with \$100 billion in it, and they ignore it, totally ignore it. And there is a budget coming within 2 weeks of our getting back here, we will have a supplemental budget out here for the military, and they act in this budget as though that does not even exist. It is like, well, it has to be that third shell. It is somewhere in there, I do not know.

They do not cut the tax cuts they plan to offer. The President put a budget out and said we are going to repeal those tax cuts. And he says no, I want to repeal the repealer. They voted no in the committee on that issue. They are not going to do that, they say.

Right now there are 3 million people paying the Alternative Minimum Tax. Within 5 years you are going to have 30 million people having to figure their income tax twice, and they are just closing their eyes to it. "Do not show me." They just hide everything.

Now, this is the slam-bam-thank-you-ma'am budget. It is going to go through here. It means absolutely nothing. It is a total sham. But what it really is is a generational mugging. It is a mugging of our kids. This shell game is trying to hide from our kids what we are doing to them.

We are starting down the same thing we did in the Reagan years. It was 1983 with a closed budget, a closed rule, and we started down like a rocket. And it took us 20 years to dig out of it. And here we are today, going down that same road.

Now, I hope the kids are watching, because they are playing a shell game on you. They are simply hiding what this costs. They do not want you to know. And they are taking it from Social Security. There is no plan in these shells for how you are going to get out of using Medicare and Social Security.

□ 1615

Everybody here knows that 40 million people are coming down the road toward Social Security and Medicare, and there is nothing.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for demonstrating that these arguments about 5 versus 10-year budget numbers and switching to OMB estimates are not just budget wonkery. They have real consequences for our

fiscal solvency and for the welfare of future generations.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, there is so much chicanery in this Republican budget resolution that it would make even an Enron auditor blush.

Our Republican friends are not happy with the estimates produced by the Congressional Budget Office. They say, we will just write a budget using the administration's far rosier estimates. Did not House Republicans demand 7 years ago that the Clinton administration use CBO estimates? My, what a difference.

Nor is the GOP happy with what the 10-year budget projection would reveal: A stunning loss of \$5 trillion in projected surpluses, largely due to last year's tax cut. No problem, we will just write a budget with a 5-year projection. It just disappears like magic.

Everyone in this Chamber knows that the shorter projection is an attempt to conceal the cost of making last year's tax cuts permanent, an estimated \$569 billion.

This resolution includes one purposeful evasion after another. But there is one thing our Republican friends cannot hide: The fact that their budget will raid the Social Security and Medicare trust funds every year for the next 10 years, for a total of \$2 trillion.

Last year, the majority leader offered these reassuring words: "We must understand that it is inviolate to intrude against either Social Security or Medicare, and if that means foregoing, or, as it were, paying for tax cuts, then we will do just that." They did not. They are not. That promise has turned out to be as empty as the GOP's lockbox.

This budget resolution, Mr. Chairman, is as irresponsible and as dishonest as were the Enron financial statements. And, tragically, the consequences of its adoption could be as negative. Let us reject this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, there's so much chicanery in the Republican budget resolution that it would make even an Enron auditor blush.

Our Republican friends are not happy with the estimates produced by the Congressional Budget Office.

They say, "We'll just write a budget using the administration's far rosier estimates."

Didn't House Republicans demand seven years ago that the Clinton administration use CBO estimates?

Nor is the GOP happy with what a 10-year budget projection would reveal—a stunning loss of \$5 trillion in projected surpluses largely due to last year's tax cut.

No problem, they say. We'll just write a budget resolution with a five-year projection.

Everyone in this chamber knows that this shorter projection is an attempt to conceal the costs of making last year's tax cut permanent—an estimated \$569 billion over 10 years.

This resolution includes one purposeful evasion after another.

But there's one thing our Republican friends cannot hide: the fact that their budget will raid the Social Security and Medicare trust funds every year for the next 10 years for a total of \$2 trillion.

Last year, the majority leader offered these reassuring words:

"We must understand that it is inviolate to intrude against either Social Security or Medicare and if that means forgoing or, as it were, paying for tax cuts, then we'll do that."

That promise turned out to be as empty as the GOP's lockbox stunt.

Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution is as irresponsible and as dishonest as were the Enron financial statements. And the consequences of its adoption could be as negative.

Let us reject it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, the reality behind this budget is that we are going to be spending Social Security cash on functions other than Social Security for the next decade.

The second reality is that most of that reflects budget choices that have nothing to do with the war in Afghanistan, the war our brave troops are fighting against the scourge of global terror. I believe the majority does a terrible disservice to our troops to try and hide behind their valor in selling budgets that raid Social Security.

The ultimate effect of the raid on Social Security will in all likelihood be higher taxes for the very men and women fighting this war as they are forced to support baby boomers in retirement years, because the baby boomers passed budgets that ran these terrible deficits.

Reject the majority budget and stop the raid on Social Security.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, when this debate started, the chairman referred to this as a wartime budget. We are united in the war on terrorism.

What exactly are we fighting for? We are fighting for a democracy. We are fighting for the right to have an open and honest debate on the floor of the House of Representatives about our Nation's priorities. We are failing that standard miserably today, because there was absolutely no response whatsoever to the fact that we are using a faulty set of numbers to have this debate.

For years, there has been universal support for using the Congressional Budget Office, which has been widely referred to as a nonpartisan, apolitical office, so we can discuss how spending proposals and how tax cut proposals affect our ability to have a balanced budget and pay down the massive Fed-

eral debt, which influences interest rates and has a lot to do with the solvency of Social Security and Medicare.

Instead of using those numbers, we are left with the flippant comment, "If you do not like the weather, change the channel." Also, we are using the politically-charged Office of Management and Budget numbers. No one disputes that fact. So we are not going to have an honest road map, an honest blueprint with which this body can judge how our spending and tax cut proposals affect our ability to get back to a balanced budget, to keep interest rates low, and to begin to prepare Social Security and Medicare for the solvency of the baby boomers.

We are failing one of the most fundamental tests of our democracy today. For that reason, we should reject the budget resolution.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important day because we are debating a budget that is a very important budget.

It is amazing to me that the other side is arguing, stop the raid on Social Security. When they were in the majority for 40 years, they took the surpluses of Social Security and spent them on big government programs. We are the ones that stopped the raid on Social Security and paid down over \$450 billion on the debt on our children.

Mr. Chairman, we have a choice to make today. We can stand with the President in funding the war on terrorism, defending our homeland, and balancing the budget, or we can align ourselves with those who offer no budget for national defense, no budget for homeland security, and no budget for Social Security.

The other party has come here not to praise any budget but to bury it. They are demonstrating the height of fiscal irresponsibility because they offer no budget at all for our country.

These charts offer a very clear picture of the Democrats' budget. This is the Democrats' budget on national security. This is the Democrats' budget on homeland security. This is the Democrats' budget on Social Security.

Republicans, though, Mr. Chairman, strike a very responsible balance. Our budget gives the President the resources he needs to wage a war against international terrorism and bolster our homeland defenses. It also puts us on the path to a balanced budget, and puts us on track to pay down more than \$180 billion in debt over the next 5 years.

Republicans are committed to returning to a balanced budget. We are the ones who balanced it in the first place. This is what our budget does: It returns us to a balanced budget so that we can protect the Social Security trust fund and pay down the debt on our children.

For decades, the Democrats have raided the Social Security trust fund, and for years Republicans, by fighting for a balanced budget, have protected seniors.

The attacks on September 11 and the recession forced a short-term wartime deficit spending, but as our economy rebounds and as we demonstrate fiscal restraint, we will move back into a surplus. That is why it is important to hold the line on spending right now.

So from the other side of the aisle we hear a chorus of criticism, but they offer no answers. Democrats all voted to raid Social Security just last year, and they have not offered a budget this year.

We know what they are against, but where is their solution? If they had the courage of their convictions, they would be forced to answer the question that they have been ducking all year long: Do they want to raise taxes, or raid defense and other priorities to pay for more spending?

The Democrats need to tell us whether they are raisers or raiders. Support this budget, and let us go forward for fiscal responsibility.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) be allowed to control 10 minutes of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I rise in very strong support of this budget resolution. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) for crafting a resolution that has the largest increase in veterans' affairs spending, especially discretionary spending, for our veterans.

There is a \$2.8 billion increase for health care in this budget. Let me just point out to my colleagues, it is needs-based. This is not something that was just "let us add it for the sake of adding," but it is needs-based.

Next year, there will be about 700,000 new, unique veteran patients. Veterans are flocking to our outpatient clinics and our community-based outpatient clinics and the like because they are getting good health care, 700,000. The budget would provide, like I said, about a \$2.8 billion increase.

Let me also point out to my colleagues that other important programs will be funded as a result of this. Last year, we passed historic legislation to help the homeless veterans. That is accommodated by this budget.

We have passed an increase in the G.I. bill, a 46 percent increase in that

college education benefit. That is accommodated by this budget.

I believe the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) deserves our thanks. He sat down with my staff and I and we spent hours going line by line over why this budget needed to be added to, and he met those needs.

I hope that every veterans' service organization, and I have spoken to virtually every one of them, they are happy with what we are doing. It is real, and I would hope my friends on the Democratic side would look at this provision and realize that we are doing justice to our veterans.

It is a good bill and a good resolution. I urge strong support for this.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

If we look across the array of defense requirements, what our men and women in uniform need in terms of ammunition, spare parts, equipment, pay, this budget starts to turn the corner from what I call the Clinton era.

If we look specifically at modernization, at the idea that we need more new trucks, tanks, ships, planes, good equipment for our people, we are spending about \$11.9 billion more than we were in the last year of the Clinton administration.

With respect to the ammo shortages, we are going to still have an ammo shortage, but we are cutting that shortage down. We are coming into it with about \$2.2 billion extra.

With respect to operations and maintenance, we are coming in with an extra \$3 billion or so.

Across-the-board, and we are coming in also with a 4.2 percent pay raise, to follow the minimum 6 percent pay raise of last year.

So we are starting to rebuild national security with this budget. We have a long way to go. I would like to have an extra \$50 billion or so in this defense budget, but on the other hand, at least we are starting to turn the corner from some very tragic days of the past 10 years or so, and I very strongly support this budget.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, who has been a leader on the issue of concurrent receipt.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this budget. For over 17 years, I have been working to eliminate the current offset between military retired pay and VA disability, which unfairly penalizes more than 500,000 military retirees nationwide.

The last Congress took the first steps towards addressing this inequity, and took an additional step towards eliminating the offset by authorizing my repeal legislation, H.R. 303.

I am very pleased, Mr. Chairman, that the budget resolution earmarks over \$500 million to fund concurrent receipt as a first step in fiscal year 2003, with increasing amounts over the next 5 years, providing a cumulative total of \$5.8 billion.

While this falls short of the funding needed to completely eliminate the current offset, it will provide for a substantial concurrent receipt benefit. And I am very, very thankful, on behalf of all of our veterans out there, to the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) and other members of the committee, especially the gentlemen from New Hampshire, Mr. BASS and Mr. SUNUNU, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK), and the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman STUMP) of the Committee on Armed Services.

The major veterans organizations support this. Let us vote for this budget so we can help our veterans and our military out there.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK), a member of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) for this outstanding budget.

As we can see from the chart, this budget keeps the promises made to our military families. For so many years, promises have been made and remain unfulfilled, but the buck stops here.

We are funding a military pay raise. Our men and women in uniform are grossly underpaid for the services they provide to this country. We have a 4.1 percent pay increase in this budget.

We are delivering on our promise to improve living standards by increasing pay. In addition, we are improving the living standards for our military families by funding over \$4 billion for improving current military family housing, as well as for building brand new housing.

□ 1630

It is unacceptable that we require military families to live in substandard housing facilities. We must support military families by supporting the budget. Finally, we are fulfilling the century-old promise of funding concurrent receipt for our disabled retired veterans. As a retired Naval officer, I believe the delivery of this promise is long overdue. This budget funds concurrent receipt for our veterans, those who need it most. It will send home a real check with real financial benefits. This year we are providing over \$500 million for this program and 5.8 billion over the next 5 years.

Our retired veterans desperately need our help. They dedicated their lives to the defense of our country, and it is time we show them how much we appreciate that.

This is a solid budget. It funds programs to improve the quality of life for our military families, and it keeps the promises to our veterans that were made long ago. I encourage my colleagues to support this budget. It is unacceptable for individuals to attack this budget when they do not offer a plan of their own.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, the events of September 11 have certainly highlighted the challenges of border security. This budget makes a commitment to the Customs Service, increasing their budget by \$619 million; substantially increases the Coast Guard as they meet the challenge of protecting our seaports; and takes a dramatic step towards reforming the INS, as has been so painfully clear that they are in need of reform in the past several days.

This budget keeps its commitment to veterans. It maintains our homeland security, and it reduces the burden of taxation on the American families. This budget is a responsible plan. Where is the other budget? It has been called chicanery. It has been called irresponsible. Where is your plan? Where is the alternative? If these things are so bad, if investing in defense, if investing in homeland security, if reducing the burden of taxation is so bad, where is the alternative? Where can the American people go to read your budget? They can get it online. They can call the Government Printing Office to get ours. Where might they go to read your budget? Where might they see what the alternative is to our plan? Where might they find those?

The Budget Resolution for FY2003 is a balanced, wartime budget that provides and prioritizes three fundamental securities of the United States: national security, economic security, and personal security.

Recently, there has been some discussion on the implications of using CBO's numbers over OMB's numbers. I believe that the use of OMB's number is the right choice and that our wartime budget will secure the future of every American family by making America safer and our economy stronger.

The bulk of the difference between CBO and OMB arises from differences in the starting point. The OMB baseline underlying over the President's budget projected a surplus of \$51 billion for the FY2003, increasing to \$109 billion in 2004, and totaling \$764 billion over the 5-year period 2003–2007. The CBO baseline projects a surplus of \$6 billion in 2003, and \$61 billion in 2004 and \$489 billion of the next 5 years.

There are two principal reasons for the baseline differences between CBO and OMB: (1) different treatment of emergency spending in response to the September 11 terrorist attacks on New York and Washington, and (2) different expectations of the future path of the

economy and their implications of tax collections and spending.

By adjusting CBO's surplus estimates to treat emergency spending increases as a one-time occurrence affords us the opportunity to make CBO's baseline estimates project \$16 billion for 2003, \$77 billion for 2004, and \$584 billion over the 2003–2007 period. Thus, the difference in baseline projections amounts to \$35 billion for 2003, \$32 billion for 2004, and \$180 billion over 5 years.

The principal difference between CBO and OMB is how the proposed increase in discretionary spending is portrayed. CBO measures from a baseline that assumes that last year's emergency response spending will recur. CBO also asserts that nondefense discretionary budget authority will be \$51 billion below baseline levels over the next five years. The President's policies for nondefense spending would actually exceed the baseline by \$34 billion over the next five years, under a baseline that treats the emergency response spending as a one-time event.

The difference in FY2003 between CBO and OMB is attributable to different revenue estimates. Over the next 5 years, slightly more than 60 percent (\$110 billion) of the \$180 billion difference is largely due to revenues. OMB expects that wages and salaries and corporate profits will constitute a larger share of GDP than does CBO. In addition, OMB projects that the average tax rate on corporate profits will be higher than CBO.

CBO estimates the costs of the President's policy proposals are quite similar to those of OMB. The cost of revenue policies are the same as OMB's for 2003 and 2004, and \$1 billion lower than OMB over the next 5 years. Similarly, mandatory policies are estimated to have the same cost for 2003, but are \$9 billion higher over the 2003–2007 period. Outlays for discretionary spending are slightly different because CBO assumes higher outlays from defense appropriations.

Our budget provides all the necessary resources to accomplish our three main national security goals: winning the war, strengthening homeland security, and modernizing the armed services. The wartime budget resolution makes the tough choices that are necessary to meet the nation's top priority of winning the war and strengthening our national defense, while continuing to invest in the modernization of the armed forces for 21st century combat. The top priority of the House budget is to provide all the resources necessary to ensure that Americans are free from terror. This budget resolution achieves this objective.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), a member of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just highlight two areas that demonstrate what a sound budget this is in dealing with national defense and homeland security. First of all, there is \$3 billion here for what I call "force security." That is to make sure that we protect our men and women in uniform and their families, whether they are here or whether they are abroad anywhere in the world. A lot of that money is going to go for physical assets that you can see and touch, just, for instance, to reinforce an entrance

gate to a military installation, to provide fencing to make sure it is off limits, to make sure unauthorized vessels cannot enter our military ports.

And then there is \$3.5 billion that goes to FEMA, that will go down to State and local governments, to let the State and local government spend the money as they see fit to equip or train or to hire more policemen, more firemen, more rescue workers, whatever they think is best. Maybe it is to use the money for increased, enhanced communications that we found we needed after a terrorist attack. But I think these are two points that make this a very sound budget. I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), the distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget, who has also been a leader on the issue of concurrent receipt.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman, and I rise in strong support of the House budget resolution and particularly for the provisions that it addresses in the issue of concurrent pay for veterans.

For over 100 years, soldiers disabled in the line of duty have had their retirement pay offset by disability payments. This is the only group of individuals that suffers from this tragic inequity, and now I am pleased to report that we have included in this budget provisions that will provide over half a billion dollars to start addressing this offset issue, a total funding over 5 years of over \$5.8 billion.

In the 7 years that I have served on this committee, 8 now, we have never been able to do this and we do now for the first time in that period of time that I have been on the committee.

I would also note that these provisions have the strong support of the American Legion, the VFW and these other national VSO's.

Mr. Chairman, this is a groundbreaking provision in this budget. I urge that the Congress support the pending budget resolution.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), a distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, this budget funds critical national security programs that will allow the United States to respond, not just to prosecute this war, but to respond to future threats. As this chart shows, the North Korean missile threat to the United States has grown enormously, originally from a scud missile, now to the taepo dong missile, which is able to deliver a weapon of mass destruction against the United States.

More worryingly, North Korean missiles are now being sold to the government of Iran, and these missiles are not only aimed at U.S. Armed Forces in the Persian Gulf but also our allies in Israel which can now be well hit

with the no dong and taepo dong systems. Likewise, the Syrian missile threat has grown, especially to our allies in Israel. If you are concerned about the security of U.S. allies, if you are concerned about responding to the missile threat, then you should support this budget. I wish the other side had produced a budget which would outline their program to respond to these threats to America and its allies. Our budget does that, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, the other side has said repeatedly in committee and on the floor that they support the President and his efforts to prosecute the war and to defend the homeland. But the fact is, without the specific budget alternative to compare, we do not know what trade-offs they would make. We do not know how they would achieve it. So what we are left with some verbal assurances without any numbers to back them up.

Mr. Chairman, I think we all understand the political frustration which bubbles up to the fore, particularly when you are facing a very popular President prosecuting a war which touches every American and has the support of the American people. But I would suggest that that frustration is no excuse to fall back on the old tactics of trying to scare people on Social Security. It is no excuse to fail to put forth a budget and only try to take pot shots at the President and this committee's budget.

I would suggest that this is a good budget. It supports the President 100 percent in his efforts to prosecute the war and defend the homeland. And it does it with more than just verbal assurances. It puts hard dollars, hard numbers behind those promises. I think we can all safely support it, and I suggest that Members vote for the budget.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say there is no difference between us when it comes to national defense or homeland defense. Republicans are supporting \$383.3 billion for national defense. So do we as Democrats. When it comes time to vote on appropriations bills that really put that money into play, we will be there. We will support it because we support the President in the war on terrorism.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 8½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) for the purposes of control.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are considering a budget resolution. A budget is a document where our Nation tells us what priorities are real to our Nation. It tells us who the winners and who the losers are. It is an area where we should consider our defense and our nondefense. It is an area where we should consider all people, and we should not put people who are vulnerable at risk.

Mr. Chairman, when we think about all the older citizens who are now getting their social security, we know they will now get their Social Security. So this issue is not about those who are getting their Social Security. No, this issue is about senior citizens who are fearful that they would not get their Social Security in the future. This issue is, indeed, putting those senior citizens at risk.

So when people are saying I am wondering, please, do not raid my Social Security, they are also talking perspective because this budget is a 5-year budget. Furthermore, when you consider our budget last year at April 2001, we had a surplus of \$5.6 trillion. It was August, August, not September 11 that we had found that we had spent down to 3.1. The surplus had gone. Indeed, when we began this year in February, we had less than \$1 billion, \$661 million. Indeed, we are raiding the Social Security trust fund, and they say we are not? We are.

We have now spent all of the unified surplus that is available. The only surplus, I heard my colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), say that what we should do and we would challenge each other, the only thing we can do is go to the surplus or raise taxes. Well, we are indeed spending a surplus. What surplus are we spending? We are spending the Social Security surplus.

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

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, very simply, all day long we are going to hear a lot of talk about billions and trillions of dollars. I like to make things simple for myself and for my constituents at home. If you take an average worker or maybe a married couple together making \$50,000 a year, over the 6 years this budget deals with, both this year and the 5 years projected, they will spend, they will pay \$37,200 in Social Security taxes, \$37,200. However, under this budget plan, \$11,328 of that money will not go into the Social Security trust funds.

They think they are paying taxes for Social Security. It does not go there. What will they get in return for that \$11,000? They will get an IOU put in. They will get a bill for interest to pay on the money that is been used to spend; and they might, I am not sure yet, they might get a promissory note sent to them by this Congress. Some people are proposing to send them a little note saying, Trust us; your Social Security taxes are okay.

My constituents do not trust us. They should not trust us. We should leave their Social Security taxes alone in the trust fund that they wanted to have their money put into that they have been told. Working people deserve the truth. They are not getting it today. They will not get it with this budget. We should vote no.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I was reading the committee report in the resolution, and there is a comment here about the real meaning of balance. It says, "The principle of a balanced budget is more than simply a numbers game in which spending and revenue match up. It reflects the sense that Members of Congress are controlling the budget, not being controlled by it."

Now all these Members on the other side got up and said, we increase spending for this and we increase spending for that. And believe me, I am for most of the stuff that you got up and said. But the fact is you are acting like it is being done for free and it is balanced. But this is where it costs. We are having to borrow against the Social Security trust fund money. That is not free money. That money costs today about 6.5 percent over a 20-year period. That money costs. Who is going to pay that back? Well, not the taxpayers today, but the taxpayers 20 years from now and the taxpayers 30 year from now. I hope to be around doing that. I know the chairman hopes to be around. Our kids will be paying for that as well.

That is the real macroeconomic picture of this budget.

Now this Member will say, I think the mistake we made was last year when we said we bet the ranch on 10-year numbers and the numbers did not pan out, and they did not pan out because of the recession, and they did not pan out because of the war. Many of us said at the time that is why you could not trust 10-year numbers because we did not know what the economy was going to do, and God forbid we might have a war or a flood or something else, and we had all three.

That is why we are in this situation now. This money will have to be paid back before, before we do anything about fixing Social Security for the long run. And that is what is wrong with this budget because the other Members are saying we are going to put more money in this, more money in defense, more money for customs, more money for veterans. We are all for that, but we are acting like it is free money. And there is nothing free about this. It is going to cost the taxpayers. If it will not cost them today, it will cost them tomorrow; and we will be back in the hole that we were in for

20 years beginning in the 1980's. And the taxpayers, unfortunately, myself being one and every Member here being one, will have to dig out. And I think that is what is wrong with this budget.

□ 1645

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, with today's vote on the Federal budget we have a clear choice. We can go back to deficit spending, raiding Social Security and increasing this Nation's debt or we can choose to travel down the path of fiscal responsibility, balancing the budget, saving Social Security and paying down our debt.

Our Republican friends suggests this is a wartime budget and it should be, but is it right to ask young men and women in uniform to fight this war and then come home and ask their generation to pay for it? I think not.

On at least four occasions since 1999 this House has voted overwhelmingly to put the Social Security Trust Fund in a lockbox, pledging never to use it again to cover the other expenses of government. If any corporate officer in America raided their employee's retirement fund they would be guilty of a felony and locked up for a very long time, but here in Washington, after promising never to do it again, the Republican leadership has presented us a budget that, without apology and without remedy, raids the Social Security Trust Fund.

This is the wrong choice for America and I urge my colleagues to vote no on this irresponsible budget.

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

What we have seen, indeed we have no other choice, they say, other than to raid Social Security, and indeed we had a choice. We had a choice. We could have paid down the debt. Paying down the public debt would have allowed to us to protect Social Security and the Medicare Trust Fund.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) for the purposes of control.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

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

We have worked in the Committee on the Budget to put together a budget that funds the priorities laid out by the President in his State of the Union address, funding the war against terrorism, funding homeland security and getting the economy moving again, and what we have heard over the last 10 minutes here are a lot of scare tactics.

First and foremost, the suggestion that Social Security taxes paid are not credited to the Social Security Trust Fund. That simply is not true and it is

outrageous to scare the American people, let alone to scare someone who is on Social Security today, by suggesting otherwise.

We have heard a lot of discussion about the Social Security surplus. Well, let us look at the budgets that the minority voted against in past years, setting aside the Social Security surplus, paying off \$450 billion in debt, and that is one of the reasons we start from a strong foundation.

The suggestion that the Social Security Trust Fund balances are changed one iota because of any tax relief legislation that was passed last year is completely false and misleading. We have put together a budget that funds our economy, encourages investments for small businesses and technology and equipment, strengthens agriculture, funds our highway priorities and keeps the economy moving forward, and I think those are the right priorities.

To criticize the budget without offering any alternative, without offering any other proposal is simply wrong, and those on the other side that voted against the tax relief package last year that would want to repeal it this year in increased taxes, I think are headed in the wrong direction. Those on the other side that would want to cut defense spending are headed in the wrong direction. We funded the right priorities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), someone who has worked hard and probably understands Social Security better than anyone else in this Chamber.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) for yielding this time to me.

Sitting here listening to this debate, I find it absolutely outrageous. Either the speakers that have been up talking about raiding the trust fund do not have a clue as to how it works or the debate has been absolutely dishonest. Anyone who says that there are dollars in the Social Security Trust Fund that we are raiding, it is not true. It is absolutely not true.

The whole question with regard to the Social Security Trust Fund from 1970 right up through 1997, every bit of that surplus was being spent yet the dollars were in the trust fund exactly the way they were before. They go into the trust fund. They are replaced by Treasury bills that are put in the trust fund. There are no dollars in the trust fund. There is no way we can go in and raid the trust fund unless we are grabbing Treasury bills out of there.

To listen to the argument that anyone tries to use as a scare tactic I think is below the dignity of this House of Representatives, and I think that this scare tactic is absolutely the low point that I have ever seen in this House of Representatives.

We have a once great party that is now bankrupt of ideas. They have no budget to bring to us. They have no

plan to save Social Security. All they can do is throw stones. Sit in the bleachers, sit on the other side and throw stones to us on this side. This is absolutely, I think, outrageous. It is below the dignity of this House.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, in early October of last year this House passed a new approach for farm legislation in a very strongly bipartisan manner and in a margin of over two to one. It was the intent of our committee at that time to have hopefully a conference report that we could bring back to this body and have signed into law a new farm bill sometime last year so that we would begin to be able to deal with the problems that have been confronting the agricultural economy for the last 4-plus years. Unfortunately, there was no item with which we could conference.

However, in February, on Valentine's Day, we finally had that item that we could conference. We are in conference now, and it is this Member's hope that early in April upon our return we will be able to provide to the body a conference report.

We, however, have lapped over into a new budget cycle. What made it possible for us to be able to write that farm bill last year was the strong commitment of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, and the good work of the Committee on the Budget in providing \$73.5 billion in last year's budget and providing \$73.5 billion in this year's budget to allow us to continue.

While much of the focus may be on the Committee on Agriculture as those farm bills are being written, the American farm family owes a great deal of gratitude to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and to the Committee on the Budget for holding their commitment to provide a strong agriculture because where we are today, Mr. Chairman, would not have been possible without that support.

I appreciate it very much. I commend the committee for the work they have done.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) for yielding me the time.

We have before us today a wartime budget. The fact is that is a difficult task to put together. We have done the responsible thing of assembling just that. It fully funds our national priorities with significant increases in defense spending because we need that for the war that is underway. Huge increases in homeland security, we need that so people will be more secure in their homes. Increases in education, in-

creases in veterans health care, fully funding a prescription drug benefit and, quite importantly, in my judgment, by limiting the growth in the rest of government, but for the extension of unemployment benefits that we all voted for a couple of weeks ago, this budget for fiscal year 2003 is balanced.

We have done the hard work of putting together a wartime budget, and my Democratic friends who are throwing stones, feigning horror, have done so without a single substantive alternative. Are not my colleagues just a little bit embarrassed that they do not have the courage to propose a budget of their own? The only idea frankly that we have heard from the left, although without the courage to put it to a vote, is to repeal last year's tax cut, raise taxes and spend more money.

What would that do for Social Security? Not much. Let me suggest that the idea of raising taxes, while the economy is as weak as it is now, is a terrible idea. We in Congress have a responsibility to be helping people get back to work, to help get this economy moving again, to help people get greater job security, increase the likelihood that people will get raises and improve their standard of living, and the best way to do this frankly is to tear down the barriers to economic growth, tear down the barriers that prevent job creation, and lower taxes do that.

Look at this chart. In the year 2000, as my colleagues can see from this chart, taxes had reached a postwar record high. Not since 1944 had the Federal Government imposed such a huge tax burden on our economy and there is no doubt that many economists agree that that huge tax burden helped to contribute to the economic slowdown, and the fact is we passed tax relief just in time, and this budget accommodates the continued phase-in, gradual though it is, of the tax relief that we passed last year, and that has got to be part of the reason that this slowdown has been relatively mild and it is going to help us get out of this economic decline that we have been in, lessen the severity of it.

The last thing we can do is go back and turn the clock back and go back to those record high taxes. For the sake of job security and economic security for our families, I urge my colleagues to vote for this budget.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER).

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues should be ashamed of themselves, trying to scare the American people on Social Security, making them believe they are not going to get a check. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader, came to the floor and he said, "We should be talking about another budget." The problem is my colleagues do not have a budget. He does not have a budget.

Last week in the markup in Committee on the Budget all my colleagues

presented were 40 amendments. Had we accepted the 40 amendments, we would have spent \$225 billion more than we are spending. Yet my colleagues accuse us of wasting Social Security moneys.

He said, "It shows deficits as far as the eyes can see. We have squandered \$4.5 trillion surplus, gone in the flash of an eye."

My colleagues like CBO numbers. So let us see what they say. We should have had a \$283 billion surplus this year, but because of a recession and a bad economy we are down \$197 billion. Because of 9/11 spending, we are down \$54 billion, and yes, we gave the American people, hardworking families, \$40 billion of their own money to keep, to prosper their own families. That is minus \$9 billion.

He said, "Our prescription program is paltry." Actions speak louder than words. Where is my colleagues' prescription drug program? They have none. At the same time he comes out and he says, by saying it is paltry, he wants us to spend more money, but my colleagues accuse us of spending the Social Security Trust Fund. Then he gave this sweet story about his mother, and she said what if I do not get my Social Security check next month or next year, what will I do, implying that somehow people are not going to get their Social Security check. That is criminal. This self-righteous hypocrisy on this floor is outlandish.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to this debate and watching back in my office, and I have to say it has not been a very proud day for our friends on the left. Here they are, they have got all kinds of complaints about our budget, but they have no budget of their own.

The other thing that came through as I watched this debate in my office on television, and I think it probably came through to the American people as well, what this is is a classic debate between those people who believe in America and those who do not, those who believe our brightest days are yet to come and those who think our brightest days are behind us. It is a debate between optimists who believe in America, who believe that we can fight a war, that we can strengthen our economy, that we can meet the legitimate needs of the American people with this budget, and those who believe we cannot.

I have not given up hope on the American people. I have not given up hope that we can have a brighter day. I believe that the economy is going to get stronger. I believe the tax cuts that we have passed were exactly the right medicine at exactly the right time, and I believe that there is better than a 50-50 chance that we not only will have a balanced budget next year, we are going to actually have a surplus.

That is what the American people want. They want responsible govern-

ment. They want a responsible budget, and they want people who step up and take that responsibility and pass this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) for the purposes of control.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, President Bush started with a balanced budget and budget surpluses as far as the eye could see, but today the GOP budget plan has squandered that surplus, and we will have to borrow \$1 trillion from Social Security over the next 5 years and \$2 trillion from Social Security and Medicare over the next 10 years just to pay their bills.

The lockbox that we all talked about a year ago has been smashed and the contents have been looted.

□ 1700

This budget does, indeed, represent a generational mugging. The majority is demanding spending programs and tax cuts for themselves, paid for by borrowing Social Security and Medicare dollars from seniors and leaving the bill for our children. This budget is putting money in the form of spending programs and tax cuts into the left-hand pocket of the taxpayer, but taking out money from their right-hand pocket where the trust funds are located.

The Social Security trust fund surplus is estimated to be \$2 trillion over the next 10 years. This budget spends \$1.5 trillion of those dollars by borrowing that money, plus all of the surplus, \$556 billion of the Medicare trust fund, in order to pay these bills. If we take Social Security and Medicare out of the mix, as we all agreed to last year, this year we will have a \$244 billion on-budget deficit with similar deficits of that size each year for the next 10 years.

Last year, the CBO, Mr. Chairman, estimated that we could pay off our entire debt by 2011. In just 1 year, after the tax cuts, 9-11, and a short recession, we are now projected to have a debt of \$2.8 trillion by 2011. The impact of debt, Mr. Chairman, is higher interest payments by the government. One year ago we were facing \$709 billion in interest payments over the next 10 years. Now we are facing \$1.8 trillion of interest payments, a \$1 trillion increase.

This budget plan alone for the 2003 budget year requires us to pay \$220 billion in interest payments, 11 percent of our Federal budget. The impact of higher debt and more borrowing is also higher interest rates paid by consumers. When we borrow in Washington, we drive up the long-term rates and the consumer costs for purchases,

such as homes and cars and college tuitions.

We need reduced government borrowing, Mr. Chairman, lower government debt, lower interest rates, and increased savings to continue the growth of productivity and the recovery of our economy. This budget plan will do none of these things and should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, when you find yourself in a hole, the wise man says, stop digging; stop making the problem worse. Stop the renewed borrowing, stop the return of deficits. Vote "no" on this budget resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. HOEFFEL. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we were just asked to raise the statutory debt ceiling to almost \$7 trillion. Why? Because of this budget. This budget increases the interest costs on our debt by over \$1 trillion over the next decade. We are going to increase the debt held by the public to over \$3 trillion.

The question is, Who pays off this debt? It is not going to be us. Most of us will be retired. We are going to retire with the baby boom generation. We are going to join those 77 million people that will double the number of people on the retirement rolls. We are going to leave it to our kids to pay off this debt and at the same time pay for our Social Security and Medicare costs, and that is not right.

That is why this budget is not right and why it should be defeated. Our kids deserve better.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, we face some clear challenges. We are in a recession, and we have a war on terrorism to fight. I have to say that some of the aspects of this budget are things I certainly agree with. I appreciate the commitment to our veterans; I can appreciate the commitment to defense spending and homeland defense.

The issue about the long-term plan, about how we get away from deficit spending, that is something we have to work on. And whether or not we pass this budget today, that problem is not going to go away. I would like to call on my colleagues to work together in a more bipartisan way in the future.

We do need to address this issue. It is important to us. Our constituents expect us to work together. We have not done that yet, but I hope we do so sooner than later.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a very distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

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

This budget is a cash-flow management plan for fiscal year 2003 and for 4 years beyond. It is a cash-flow plan that is, in many ways, similar to the cash-flow plans that individuals must manage for themselves, those which families plan while sitting around the kitchen table and small businesses establish when determining how many employees they will hire or how many equipment purchases they will make in the coming year.

In fact, there are over 1 million families today, due to the tragic events of last September, who are planning their finances to weather the emergency situation they are facing in their lives: loss of a job, slowing business revenues, and so forth. Many of these families will borrow or have borrowed from their savings or retirement, life insurance or home equity to ride out the storm.

Mr. Chairman, it is from the cash flow of the taxpayer all across the country that the Federal Government receives its income. When individual family and business budgets are healthy and strong enough to make the necessary and often the discretionary purchases, when they are thriving enough that they are adding jobs to the workforce and expanding business opportunities, the Federal Government's budget is the strongest. Today, we have a deficit cash flow. It is from the lack of consumer confidence caused by the lack of job confidence.

Mr. Chairman, we must examine what has eroded consumer and job confidence. The 7 o'clock news reports tally the market and the unemployment numbers. In February of 2000, the NASDAQ began to plunge from almost a high of 4,700 points; "dot coms" were folding at a rapid pace. In February, the Dow Jones began to fluctuate and plunged in November of 2000. Unemployment numbers began to rise in November of 2000. With such numbers, is it no wonder that job confidence and consumer confidence were eroded?

This decline in confidence, coupled with the significant and unexpected expenditures of the last months, are the major reasons we find ourselves working to establish a responsible budget plan. How has this administration and Congress addressed this decline in confidence? The Congress passed the 2001 Economic Growth and Tax Relief Act for American workers, extended taxpayer cash flow, where our cash flow comes from, by \$74 billion in 2001, by over \$60 billion in 2002, and by over \$90 billion in 2003, plus the stimulus package of \$43 billion that we just passed.

In 3 years, Mr. Chairman, the Congress will leave over \$300 billion in cash flow to the taxpayers. So, let us look at what has happened when we have had major tax relief over the last few

decades. In the 1960s, revenues increased; 1961, \$92 billion in revenue for the Federal Government; in 1970, it doubled, \$196 billion; in the 1980s, 1981, we had revenues of \$599 billion. In 10 years, it increased to over \$1 trillion.

Mr. Chairman, the same will happen with the tax relief package that we passed yesterday. This budget is evidence that the Congress trusts the people at home, the people we live with, the people we work beside, the people who are our neighbors running the small and large businesses that are the engine of our economy. And as a reminder, my colleagues, they supply the money we spend here each year.

I trust them and I want them to have more money to spend, to invest, and to use as they see fit. That is why I support this responsible budget, and I urge others to.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority whip.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and I want to recognize first off the excellence with which he has dealt on this budget, and commend him, the members of his committee, and the staff for their excellent work.

Mr. Chairman, today we should have had the opportunity to be engaged in a debate over our Federal budget. This budget debate should reflect the professional judgment and our most imaginative thinking to create a budget for America's future. We do not all agree on every issue, but we should have been able to have a debate about those issues. Instead, we are faced with a closed rule which forecloses some of that debate; and we are, instead, faced with a budget from the Republican side which is a sham.

It is a sham because it hides from view the billions and billions of dollars the Republicans are draining from the Social Security trust fund. It is a sham because it disguises the inadequate prescription drug benefit for seniors as it drains the Medicare trust fund. It is a sham because it ignores the cost of the supplemental appropriations that we know President Bush will be sending to the Congress.

When we review the Republican budget, we have to wonder what happened to all of the budget deficits on the Republican side. Have they become an endangered species? Indeed, I think they have become extinct. For such a long time they fought so fiercely to reduce the Federal deficit and eliminate the national debt, and now they are extinct.

And where did all the Republicans go who voted five times, five times, for a lock box to prohibit using Social Security trust funds for anything but Social Security? Those same Republicans have broken promises to the American people by an all-out raid in this budget on the Social Security trust fund.

In addition to being a sham, this Republican budget is a shame, because it

misses an opportunity to create a fiscally sound balanced budget which invests in America's future and grows our economy by creating jobs and lowering interest rates.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that our Federal budget should be a statement of our national values. I ask my colleagues if it is a statement of their values to raid the Social Security trust fund and decimate the Medicare trust fund; is it a statement of their national values to undermine the ability of Americans to retire in dignity; is it a statement of their values to put our children into oppressive debt to bolster a failed Republican economic plan?

The Republican leadership's budget is a desperate attempt to cover up the total failure of their economic plan. In an attempt to cook the books, the Republicans used the more optimistic OMB estimates, even though they shut down the government in 1995-96, if my colleagues remember that, to insist on CBO estimates.

One year ago, the Republicans promised to protect Social Security, provide a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and pay down the Federal debt. But their budget fails to balance the budget, fails to protect Social Security, fails to provide adequate funding for prescription drugs, and fails to fund the education promises signed into law by President Bush. The request from Treasury Secretary O'Neill to raise the debt limit by \$750 billion to finance the government past the 2004 election is an ultimate symbol of the failure of the Republican economic plan.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no," a billion, billion, billion times no, on the Republican sham budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN) involving Social Security.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding to me.

Social Security is one of our Nation's most successful anti-poverty and retirement programs. Currently, 45 million seniors, their spouses, and their dependents receive Social Security benefits. The strength and viability of this program is a priority for all Members of Congress, Republican, Democrat, and Independent alike. Our Democrat colleagues, however, claim that this budget will somehow endanger Social Security and erode the ability of the Social Security trust fund to pay benefits.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this budget will not have any impact on the status of the Social Security trust funds whatsoever; is that correct?

Mr. NUSSLE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, that is totally correct; and I want to thank my colleague for

not only his concern but his leadership in the brief time he has been here in the House.

I would also like to reiterate my own personal commitment to the strength and stability of the Social Security program. Social Security is a promise that neither I nor my Republican colleagues around here take lightly.

The gentleman is correct in his understanding that the budget in no way alters the financial position of the Social Security trust fund. The status of the Social Security trust funds is unchanged by this budget.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, is it true that under this budget the Social Security trust funds continue to grow throughout the 5-year budget horizon?

Mr. NUSSLE. Yes. In fact, we add about \$1 trillion to it over the next 5 years after this budget is in effect.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this budget provides full funding for Social Security benefits and cost of living adjustments for all recipients; is that correct?

□ 1715

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, that is correct. The gentlewoman from North Carolina made a comment earlier about how somebody was concerned whether they would get their benefit check. There is not a senior in America that is not going to get their benefit check under Social Security. Nothing in this budget changes that. I wish Members on the other side would stop that scare tactic.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman guarantee me that my grandmother, Katherine Boudreau, will continue to receive her Social Security benefits next month and the months to come for the rest of her life? Also, will the gentleman guarantee me that my constituent, Daisy Burris, with the AARP of Tulsa and the people she represents, will receive her Social Security benefits in the next month and the years to come?

Mr. NUSSLE. Not only are the Social Security benefits of the gentleman's grandmother safe, but all of our Social Security benefits are safe under this budget. By voting for this budget resolution, Members will honor their commitment to their constituents and to the seniors of America. Certainly there are concerns about Social Security on the horizon that we need to be concerned about, but this budget does not change the trust fund whatsoever. Every senior will get those benefits.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for purposes of control.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN).

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

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, one of the issues that I hear most about is the high cost of prescription drugs and the incredible struggle that senior citizens have to pay for them. It is clear that this is a major source of worry and distress for seniors and their loved ones. It is time for Congress to listen to our greatest generation and make affordable prescription drug coverage a priority. Unfortunately, a prescription drug benefit that is affordable for all Medicare beneficiaries is not a priority in this Republican budget.

This budget replaces the President's inadequate proposal with its own inadequate proposal. What they are calling a Medicare reserve fund, using numbers from the OMB, this budget claims to increase Medicare spending about \$89 billion over 5 years, and \$350 billion over 10 years. However, if we used the CBO numbers rather than OMB, this is drastically reduced. Like the rest of the budget, using OMB numbers makes their increase in Medicare spending appear higher than it actually is.

And if this were not enough, the budget also holds the Medicare prescription drug benefit hostage to Medicare reform and a provider payment adjustment. The Medicare reserve fund can only be tapped when a proposal that includes modernization, prescription drugs, and provider payment adjustments is before this House for consideration.

All three issues must be addressed before we can assist our seniors with their prescription drug crisis. A detailed plan for Medicare reform has not yet even been proposed. Meanwhile, seniors have to continue to struggle and wait for prescription drug help. In addition, an independent commission which advises Congress about Medicare provider payments estimates that the adjustments that are coming will consume half of this Medicare reserve fund that has been set aside for all three purposes.

How long must American seniors wait to see a Medicare prescription drug benefit? I believe that this is not the way to treat the retirees of the greatest generation who worked hard, lived through a depression, won a war, raised their families and created the strongest economy in the world. They deserve access to the affordable drugs that they need to stay healthy. I urge my colleagues to vote against this flawed budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my Democratic colleagues in opposition to the budget on the floor today. I would like to talk about how unfairly this budget treats the senior citizens in our country.

Last year the President and House Republicans went on record saying that the Social Security and Medicare surpluses should be protected and pushed several "lockbox" bills. However, this year their budget spends more than 86 percent of the Social Security surplus in the next five years and spends the entire Medicare surplus for the foreseeable future.

While the Republicans want to send "certificates" to seniors guaranteeing that Social Security checks will keep arriving, they are raiding the Social Security and Medicare surpluses. Then they try to hid the extent of their invasion of these funds by using Office of Management and Budget (OMB) numbers and obscuring from view the effects of their tax policies after 5 years. Seniors are not going to be swayed by this sham budget, especially when it puts their future and their health at risk.

When I'm home in Wisconsin, one of the issues I hear about most (whether in the grocery store on main street or in listening sessions) is that middle class seniors cannot afford to pay for their prescription drugs. It is clear that this is a major source of worry and distress for seniors and their families.

It is time for Congress to listen to our greatest generation and make affordable prescription drug coverage a priority. Unfortunately, a prescription drug benefit that is affordable for all Medicare beneficiaries is not a priority in this Republican budget.

This budget replaces the President's inadequate proposal with its own inadequate proposal: What they're calling a Medicare reserve fund. Using numbers from the OMB, this budget claims to increase Medicare spending by \$89 billion over 5 years, and \$350 billion over 10 years. However, if we use the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) rather than OMB numbers, this increase is drastically reduced. Like the rest of the budget, using OMB numbers makes their increase in Medicare spending appear higher than it actually is.

But if this were not enough, this budget also holds a Medicare prescription drug benefit hostage to Medicare "reform" and provider payment adjustments. The Medicare reserve fund can only be tapped when a proposal including "modernization," prescription drugs, and provider payment adjustments is before the House for consideration. All three issues must be addressed before we can assist our seniors with the prescription drug crisis. A detailed plan for Medicare reform has not yet even been proposed. Meanwhile, seniors will have to continue to struggle and wait for a prescription drug benefit.

In addition, an independent commission that advises Congress about Medicare provider payments, estimates that provider payment adjustments will consume half of the Medicare reserve fund that has been set aside for all three purposes.

How long must American seniors wait to see a Medicare prescription drug benefit? I believe that this is not the way to treat the retirees of the greatest generation who worked hard, lived through the depression, won a war, raised their families and created the strongest economy in the world. They deserve access to the affordable drugs they need to stay healthy. I urge my colleagues to vote against this flawed budget.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to myself.

Mr. Chairman, here we are with another variation of the three shell game. This budget purports to offer a prescription drug benefit. Now if we take the numbers of last year's program and look at how much the Congressional Budget Office says they will cost, it is \$400 billion. Do we have \$400 billion? No, we have \$350 billion. But in Sunday's New York Times, many doctors

say they are refusing Medicare patients because they are not being paid enough. Out of that \$300 billion, we are going to pay for drug benefits, and we are going to pay for provider reimbursement. We are going to give more money to doctors and hospitals.

If we use the Congressional Budget Office figures, we have only \$124 billion. So the reason the other side uses the OMB figures is because it is \$350 billion. Which number would Members take? Of course the other side would take the \$350 billion.

If we look at this chart, we can see if we pay back the providers what we said we are going to give them, it costs \$174 billion out of that \$350 billion. If we are using the \$124 billion, we cannot even cover the providers. The doctors alone cost \$128 billion. So there is not enough money under this one to provide even for the doctors.

Now, let us say we take the \$350 billion and we say we are going to do only the doctors, so we are going to do \$128 billion. That gives us what, 225, 222. Now, is that enough for a drug benefit? Remember, I said it was \$400 billion to do a decent benefit? That is a benefit where seniors pay 50 percent and the government pays 50 percent. Do Members think that is an adequate benefit?

There are 9 million widows in this country who live on Social Security. They make less than \$10,000 a year off Social Security. They are supposed to come up with half the drug benefits. If they just have a few things, that is fine. But where are they going to get \$1,000 or \$2,000 to pay while the government pays the other \$2,000?

This simply is an inadequate benefit that they are talking about. Yet the other side tells the people, the President said in the campaign, we will have a prescription drug benefit. The President stood in this well twice and said we are going to have a prescription drug benefit. But there is no money. It is a shell game. They are hiding it and confusing people with statements, but the figures do not lie. Vote "no" on this thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PENCE) assumed the chair.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2356. An act to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2003

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS).

(Mr. WATKINS of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATKINS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the work that the gentleman from Iowa has done as our chairman on the Committee on the Budget. I left Congress in 1990, and one of the things that always bothered me was the fact that it seemed like when I sat on the other side, we could never come close to balancing the budget. I would like to say that it is great that we have not only balanced the budget since I have returned, but with the economy growing, we have reduced over \$450 billion in debt that was on the backs of our children. I would like to think that has done a great deal to help us in the future.

Yesterday Chairman Alan Greenspan and the Feds decided not to increase interest rates. They realized that there is still some softness out in the economy. I am thankful that we passed the tax relief package nearly a year ago, and also just last week, the job creation and work protection bill in a bipartisan vote. That vote was 417-3. Yes, even with the economic indicators that were soft and started downward in September, the last quarter of 2000 before the Bush administration took office, but really took a downward spiral after September 11, creating a loss of about a million jobs. Let me say, with this job creation work protection bill, not only are we allowing the uninsured to have 13 extra weeks of unemployment insurance, we want to make sure that those who are unemployed have a check and are meeting their obligations.

Also we have done some things with 30 percent expensing which is accelerating activity. Tractor implement dealers in my area, they are out buying. Farmers and ranchers are buying equipment. That is going to help us a great deal more, not only in just the facts, but in the spirit of things in moving this economy forward.

This budget is a compassionate budget because in it we have dealt with unemployment insurance. Yes, we have helped business, and we have helped a lot of individuals. There are work tax credits for welfare to work. It also deals with Native Americans, trying to work with them with accelerated depreciation, and letting them have jobs instead of relying on just gaming and some of the other interests. Native Americans have the worst economic conditions of any group in the United States.

We have a budget here that gives us an opportunity to move this country forward. I encourage a bipartisan vote on it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 9 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) for purposes of control.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, we will not find a Member on this side of the aisle who is not 100 percent supportive of winning this war against terrorism and bolstering our homeland security. However, we cannot forget our domestic priorities. Over the next 5 years, we will cut over \$96 billion below what it costs to maintain these programs at their current level.

For the next few minutes what I would like to do is put a human face on some of these funding cuts, and maybe people watching this debate back home will have a better understanding of what this budget does. For example, everybody knows that health care costs are skyrocketing on an annual basis. As a result, 40 million Americans cannot afford health insurance. That includes 9 million children. This budget pretends that these people do not exist.

Compounding that situation is the fact that there are some programs that provide some minimal health care. For example, the rural health care program, it is cut by 41 percent. Telehealth programs are cut by 84 percent. Another problem is the freezing of funding for the Healthy Start program. It is for expectant mothers for prenatal care. I cannot think of any Member here who thinks that depriving mothers of prenatal care is something that we should be doing.

Then there is the matter of our homeland security. The people on the front line are police officers. Yet this budget completely eliminates, not cuts, eliminates the Department of Justice local law enforcement block grant, which is designed to put more cops on our streets. As a result, hundreds of communities across the United States, large and small, will see less cops on the street, meaning we can expect an increase in crime because this budget, as I just stated, eliminates this program.

□ 1730

Then there are our public schools. Every State is having problems with revenues and high enrollments. Just a little over 2 months ago, we had the No Child Left Behind Act signed into law. Most people voted for it. If Members will recall, President Bush made this a pillar of his State of the Union address and rightly so, ensuring that every child has a right to a first-rate education. So what happened to this program? You can see that is what is authorized, that is what we enacted last year, and this is what we are proposing, a \$100 million cut just from last year.

As a former teacher, I have also talked to educators in Oregon. One of the things they begged me not to do was pass another Federal program and another Federal mandate without the funds. We are not giving them the funds. Then there is special education.

We are funding that at 18 percent. What did the Federal Government promise to do? Twenty-seven years ago we said we would fund it at 40 percent. Are we doing that? No.

We are now starting down the same path with the No Child Left Behind Act. Again we make a promise we are not going to keep.

Mr. Chairman, to talk further about education, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA), a former teacher and principal.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, as a former teacher and principal, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget, a budget that claims to leave no child behind, but in reality leaves many children behind.

Just a few months ago, the President and the Congress heralded the enactment of H.R. 1, the Leave No Child Behind Act. Yet as we all know, a bill is meaningless without the necessary funding and many of us wondered if the White House and the House Republicans would put our Nation's money where their mouths were for H.R. 1 when it came time to pass the budget. After looking at the House Republican budget offered today, it has become clear to me that the Republicans have no intention of making good on their promise to improve educational opportunities for our Nation's young people.

The Republican budget cuts funding for H.R. 1 by \$90 million. It cuts education programs by \$1.8 billion, including programs for teacher quality and after-school centers. The Republican budget also eliminates 28 education programs, including dropout prevention and technology training.

The Republicans say we on the other side of the aisle have no right to voice our beliefs on their plan because we have none to offer. Let me remind my colleagues that last week I offered an amendment in the Budget Committee that would have increased funding for professional development and teacher quality by \$325 million, title I funding for disadvantaged students by \$2.15 billion, and after-school programs by \$250 million from levels proposed in today's Republican budget. Every Republican on the committee voted it down.

Mr. Chairman, I support the President when it comes to the war. I, like all of us in this body, am confident that we will win the global war against terrorism. But I fear this budget may cause us to lose the battle at home to protect and educate future generations of Americans. As a former educator, I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution that leaves so many of our children behind.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely concerned whether this education budget is adequate. It is true that there are some program increases; but at a time of increased need and urgency, this increase is the smallest in a decade.

In the end, this education budget leaves me wondering whether we are truly keeping our commitment to our children and our teachers. I know my spirits were up when just 2 months ago the President signed into law the new education bill promising to leave no child behind. I am afraid to say that we are leaving more than a few children behind.

The budget we are debating today actually cuts funding for these programs by \$90 million. In fact, this budget funds the No Child Left Behind Act at \$4.2 billion below the authorized level. One cannot help but ask if we are keeping our promise. In fact, I fear this budget falls far short of that promise.

Looking at the details, this plan cuts or freezes many elementary and secondary education programs. It cuts programs to improve teacher quality at a time when we need them the most, down by \$105 million. It cuts the safe and drug-free schools program, down \$102 million. By the way, these programs are working in our communities. And it freezes funding for after-school programs when we need after-school programs more than ever.

However, the truth is that it did not have to be this way. During the Budget Committee markup, we offered amendments to strengthen education, to stand with the President on what he wanted in his education bill. But amendment after amendment to keep the President's promise to leave no child behind were rejected. Republicans rejected an amendment to provide \$3 billion more for elementary ed programs. They rejected raising the maximum Pell Grant award for our college students. They rejected an amendment to allow Head Start to serve 1 million more children.

While I could argue that education should always be a top priority, properly investing in education is more critical than ever. A strong commitment to education is good for the economy, and it is good for national security. We support the President on the war and homeland defense. We should be doing more for our children in education.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, there is much in this budget that is not as it appears. We have just now heard the fact that this actually cuts \$90 million from the President's much touted Leave No Child Behind Act. It cuts back on educational funding. In the area of the environment, the authors of the budget claim to fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund; but in fact if you remove from this the account that funds open space and parkland and preserving critical natural resources, if you remove the items that do not belong in there, that are added,

that are not really new spending, budget accounting gimmicks, it actually is a reduction. It does not fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

With regard to research and development in science, the authors here have claimed that there is an 11 percent increase. Actually if you do their math correctly, it is really closer to 8 percent. But then if you remove the accounting gimmicks, the things that have been added in there that are not new spending in the National Science Foundation, for example, the sea grant program and EPA education programs, you find out that there is really a growth of perhaps 1 percent. This is not enough.

If we shortchange research and development in the United States, we cannot hope to have the kind of economic growth that the authors of this budget resolution are counting on in some magic wand way to get us out of deficit spending. As a Nation we underinvest in research and development. This budget resolution not only fails to balance, it fails to fund our Nation's critical needs.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I urge my colleagues to vote against this budget so we can go back to work and put together a genuine bipartisan plan that truly addresses the ever-growing needs of our country.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), a very distinguished gentleman, who has some concerns with our budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is the toughest vote that I have made in my 16 years in Congress, because I campaigned for this President and made 200 speeches on his behalf in 25 States and raised a significant amount of money. I do not like to stand up here and announce that I am going to vote against the budget resolution. I have the highest respect for the budget chairman. But, Mr. Chairman, my job in this Congress has been to work on defense issues for our country. I take it seriously like all of my colleagues do.

I took the President at his word when he announced in his State of the Union that he would increase defense spending by \$48 billion to make up for the shortfalls of the past decade. But when you analyze that \$48 billion, you end up with a potential increase of \$38 billion because \$10 billion is being set aside for some future uncertain time and need. Of that \$38 billion, you end up with about \$10 billion to be used for the shortfalls that we have. The other money is going for health care costs; it

is going to make up for the unfair budgeting or the unfair accounting process that was used during the Clinton administration where they did not properly account for the cost of the ships and the airplanes that we ordered but did not pay for. The Rumsfeld leadership is trying to correct that and make it right, but the bottom line is \$10 billion does not come anywhere near the \$25.4 billion shortfall that the service chiefs have testified this year they need beyond the President's budget request. My colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services know that.

Mr. Chairman, the shipbuilding accounts, which I heavily criticized the Clinton administration for over the past 6 years, decrease under this budget by \$1.3 billion. We built 19 ships a year under Ronald Reagan. We go down to five ships next year. We just heard in a hearing I chaired, 15,000 more shipbuilders and workers are being laid off. Tactical aviation, our aircraft, the need is 180 aircraft a year. We bought 90 last year. This budget has us buying 87 aircraft.

I realize there are other pressures. I realize you have to fund all the priorities. I am an educator. I want to fund education. I want to fund the environment and other issues. But we have \$10 billion that the President said was for defense in that \$48 billion that all Americans agree should be spent on the military, and you know as well as I do we will give the President whatever amount of money he needs for a supplemental to pay for the war. This Congress voted 420 to one. The Senate voted 99 to zero. We are not going to deny him whatever he needs to pay for the war. But this \$10 billion needs to go for the shortfall we have.

I cannot intellectually and honestly stand up here in spite of the aggressive and successful effort of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and my colleagues who fought this good fight and did get some movement. The President has now said he will come to us and that \$10 billion may have a partial request for modernization. We do not know how much, and we do not know when.

Mr. Chairman, because of these reasons, I cannot in good conscience vote for this budget. President Bush is my President. I support him. It pains me unbelievably to stand up here and have to say what I am saying. But my job and the job that you have given me as my colleagues is to tell you honestly what we need to provide for our military and this year more than any other our military is being tested. Our soldiers, sailors and Marines are flying aircraft and working on ships that we are not properly replacing.

Unfortunately, I tell my colleagues, and I have not lobbied anyone on my position, that I just cannot in good conscience vote for this bill and I will vote "no" on the budget resolution. I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South

Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding time to me.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the budget resolution. I wish to commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the House Committee on the Budget. Just think of it: as a conservative, I believe we must keep careful watch of the public resources that we are given. Balancing the Federal budget must be a priority. Because of the work of the House Committee on the Budget and Chairman NUSSLE, but for our recent effort to help hurting families with an unemployment benefits package, this is a balanced budget. During war and recession, that is an astonishing accomplishment. We do fund our national defense and our homeland security as America's priorities.

And this budget demonstrates fiscal discipline. We just heard from the gentlewoman from Oregon some of what our friends on the other side of the aisle would like us to be spending more in this budget. The truth is, of the 17 amendments that the Democrats offered, it totaled \$205 billion in new spending and \$175 billion in tax increases to pay for it. Funding national defense, helping hurting families, cutting spending rather than raising taxes, are all good reasons to support this budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve the balance of the majority's time. We would be prepared then to move to the Joint Economic Committee's time under the rule.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

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

□ 1745

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

Mr. Chairman, as a Member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I have a special appreciation for the work our military does in defending our great country. There should be no doubt, absolutely none, that my colleagues and I stand behind the President as he prosecutes the war on terrorism.

However, in a genuine attempt to work with both parties and the President, I join the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHE-SON) in offering a budget substitute that was denied fair consideration by the Committee on Rules, even though it included the President's own prior-

ities and spending levels and simply adjusted them to reflect the CBO's nonpartisan numbers; fully funded the war on terrorism and homeland security initiatives; held the line on spending; provided for a clean debt limit increase; and required the administration to provide a plan to get our budget back into balance and put Social Security surpluses off limits.

It is mind-boggling to think that the House leadership could have opposed these aims. But they did. I am disappointed that our good faith attempt at cooperation was dismissed, and I urge my colleagues to vote no on the budget resolution.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

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

Mr. Chairman, let me first begin by commending the members of the Committee on the Budget for the very commendable job they did in bringing forward this budget proposal, and particularly the hard work of the chairman, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), who has worked untiringly throughout the last 6 months, under difficult circumstances, I might add, and often without thanks, for bringing this budget proposal to us. It has been a great job, and I am pleased to stand here and say that I fully support the bill.

Let me also say that, aside from being the chairman of the Committee on Joint Economics, I am also one of the senior members of the Committee on Armed Services, and it is true that the members of the Committee on Armed Services had some reservations about the budget because of the way certain monies were being set aside.

I must say that I have a different read of the current situation than the gentleman who just spoke, however. Throughout the last 48 hours or so, the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman STUMP) has led us in the direction of defining what will ultimately happen with that seemingly elusive \$10 billion, and I am perfectly satisfied, after having sat in the Oval Office with the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman STUMP) and most of the senior members of the Republican side of the Committee on Armed Services, to talk with President Bush this morning about what his intentions are, and his intentions are to recommend that those monies be spent this year on measures yet to be defined.

I think it is important to point out that the Committee on Armed Services, upon which I and the just-completed speaker serve, will help define those needs. That is our job.

I am particularly thankful to the President for taking time to explain his position to us this morning, and I

am perfectly well satisfied that those monies can be well spent and invested in our national security through this mechanism.

So let me turn now to my real reason for being here today, and that is to try to put into the context what is going on currently with the economy and how this budget proposal fits into that scenario. The budget policies under debate today should be considered, I believe, in the context of the current economic situation and the recent economic history. In that spirit, I would like to say a few words about where the economy has been and where it is going.

My remarks will center on five or six areas. First, where we have been; second, why we got in trouble; third, how the stage was set for recovery; fourth, how the events of September 11 affected our economy in the context of setting the stage for recovery; fifth, where I believe we are now; and, finally, what policies do we need to address to provide for healthy economic growth in the future, and all that in the context of this budget.

Where we have been. In the eighties and nineties we had a phenomenon that many people did not recognize early on in the eighties. We had almost two complete decades of continuous economic growth.

Beginning in 1984, the economy started to grow, and it grew right on through 2000, the first half of 2000, and did not begin to slow until the latter half of 2000. What I said is almost precisely true. There was a very short and mild recession in the second half of 1990 and the first half of 1991. It was 8 months long. But aside from that very short period of interruption in economic growth, that is, and that is very unusual, the longest period of economic growth in our history, the most robust period of economic growth in our history, and we ought to recognize it as being so.

In the middle of 2000 we began to experience a significant slowdown in economic growth. More specifically, the growth of real Gross Domestic Product, consumption, investment, manufacturing activity and employment all began to slow down substantially around mid-2000.

There were several reasons to explain this sharp slowdown. First, the Federal Reserve raised interest rates six times, 175 basis points in total. That put a drag on the economy, and it was intended to slow the economy, because there were certain members of the Federal Reserve Board who believed that the economy was going to overheat, and so a conscious effort was made to increase interest rates.

Second, substantial energy costs, particularly oil prices, increased from early 1999 through 2000, and that additionally created a drag on the economy.

Third, higher interest rates and higher energy prices worked together to produce enough drag on the economy

that it weakened the somewhat overvalued stock market, and in turn the downturn in the stock market had a broad effect on the economy.

Finally, fourth, the tax burden or fiscal drag which was present in 1999 and 2000 also had its weakening effect on the economy.

These factors were all influencing the economy by mid-2000, thus the seeds for the slowdown were sown prior to mid-2000. Because of long lags, these factors continued to influence the economy for quite a long time.

I would also like to talk for a minute about how the stage then in 2001 was set for recovery. As the economy remained sluggish or continued to weaken, however, these casual factors moderated or unwound themselves during much of 2001.

For example, the Federal Reserve began to lower interest rates, and, over the next period of time, lowered short-term interest rates by 475 basis points, a very significant thing in terms of our monetary policy.

Second, energy prices retreated. Happily, as people watched the pump price, when they went to the gas station prices dropped dramatically, having a positive effect on the economy or setting the stage for a recovery.

Then stock prices stopped falling and the stock market stabilized, again unwinding one of the factors that produced a drag on the economy the year before.

Finally, the Bush tax cut plan was passed and signed into law in June, setting the stage for a rejuvenation of consumer and business rebound. As a consequence, by late summer of 2001, many economists were expecting a near-term rebound in activity, which began to occur.

The economic impact, however, of the terrorist attacks of September 11 changed this economic outlook in a number of ways. This is very important. We were set to begin a recovery by the end of the summer of 2001, and had it not been, I believe, for the terrorist attacks, that recovery would have proceeded forward.

In the short term, after the attacks, the attacks increased apprehension in the financial markets and adversely affected consumption and investment as confidence waned. So, over the long term, as people looked at the decision process of what they were going to do over the long term, uncertainty created a pessimistic attitude on the part of business people and others which affected our economy. Consumption was down, investment was down, and that acted as a new drag on the economy.

Second, the attacks had a direct adverse impact on certain industries, most notably the airlines, the travel industry, insurance, hotels, and, of course, activities that are related to those businesses.

Also in the long term, increased security costs, it became clear, would raise the cost of running a business and adversely affect productivity and earnings.

If you believe, as I do, that an economy has just so much value, and if, as was true during the eighties and nineties, we were making investments to increase productivity which in turn helped to build our economy, and if we now have to divert some of those investment dollars for security purposes, obviously those purposes, while necessary, do not create the productivity that investment in technology does. So, this was a factor which we believe was very important.

Similarly, spending on unnecessary military and security buildup to some extent crowds out more productive private investment. Consequently, the terrorist attacks may adversely impact productivity growth and the economy's long-term potential for growth.

In sum, as a consequence of the terrorist attack the economy was tipped into recession, as certified by the National Bureau of Economic Research, which now the recession is said to have begun in March.

Where are we now? Currently the preponderance of evidence suggests that the economy is finally coming out of the recession. If so, this recession will be one of the mildest on record. There are reasons for the rebound, which include the Federal Reserve's lower interest rates policies, lower energy prices and tax cuts which were put in place.

Recently, for example, most data are being reported as stronger than expected. For example, real GDP for the fourth quarter was up 1.4 percent, due to particularly strong consumption.

Second, leading indicators are up for the fourth month in a row, another positive sign.

Third, monthly consumption in retail, in auto sales and personal income are improving and holding up extremely well.

Fifth, housing continues to hold up very well.

Sixth, payroll employment gains were registered in February for the first time since last summer. That is right, we gained 66,000 jobs in payroll gains in the month of February.

Finally, there are even some signs of improvement in manufacturing activity, which has been the hardest hit sector. The purchasing managers survey is above 50 and durable goods orders are up, all positive signs.

Further, prices remain behaved and inflation is currently not a problem.

The most likely outcome for the economy is to continue to rebound for at least several more quarters, due in part to inventory rebuilding and continued low interest rates.

□ 1800

Let me move now to the future and why this budget and the policies surrounding it are important.

We should have learned some things from the last 20 years in the economic growth that we saw, and we should have learned some things based on what went wrong in 1999 and the first half of 2000.

Policies. The policies that we need to keep the economy moving are important, particularly important now, as we consider this budget. Given these developments, the question is, what types of economic policies are appropriate to keep the economy moving forward at a healthy pace without inflation?

I believe there are several policies that foster the favorable set of circumstances that we need to create.

First of all, we need to recognize that not all of this has to do with the Congress of the United States; not directly, anyway. The Federal Reserve, as I noted earlier, had a lot to do with both the period of economic growth that we had and something to do with the recession that began or the slowdown that began in 2000.

The Federal Reserve policy of gradually pursuing price stability can foster growth in a number of ways. Such policy lowers interest rates, reduces unnecessary uncertainty in the economy, enables the price system to work better, and acts like a tax cut because it provides for less cost in doing business.

The second factor that I would point out is that, just as was pointed out by John Kennedy in 1963 and just as was pointed out by Ronald Reagan in 1980, low marginal tax rates promote incentives to work, save, and invest, and to innovate. Entrepreneurial activity is fostered, and individuals are encouraged to enter market activity. All this promotes growth without inflation.

So the policies that we saw put in place early in the Bush administration are extremely important, and that is why we have advocated for additional stimulus packages by using tax cuts.

Third, and of particular interest in the context of this budget, government spending constraint had a lot to do with where we were during particularly the last decade. Keeping government spending shrinking as a share of GDP enables more economic resources to be allotted and utilized more efficiently and with productivity in the private sector, so tax policy remains an extremely important factor, as well as restraint in government spending.

Fourth, investment in technological innovations, which I alluded to a few minutes ago, is also extremely important. I will not go into a long explanation of this, but there is something that economists used to refer to which is called the Phillips curve, which says that essentially we cannot have long-term economic growth without inflation. That is because when the economy reaches full employment, because there is a continued demand for labor and a very limited supply, it produces upward wage pressures. Those upward wage pressures are inflationary.

We proved that not to be true in the 1980s and 1990s. It is not true, it did not happen, and the reason we believe it did not happen is because we were successful, as entrepreneurs and as members of society, with introducing new forms of technology that helped pro-

ductivity, which relieved the pressure on labor costs.

So investment in technology and promoting investment in these things, and innovation, can add productive capacity, thereby allowing for sustained economic expansion without inflation.

Finally, foreign markets play a continuing important role in our understanding of how to promote growth in our economy. Reducing tariff barriers and promoting open markets increases the size of the international sector, and all this helps with economic growth while fostering lower prices.

Increased international integration enables the economy to take advantage of larger markets and become more specialized and more efficient, productive, and competitive. This allows the economy to produce more goods with the same or less input, and to grow faster without inflation; the remarkable strategies that were used by the government, by the private sector, and by the Fed during the eighties and nineties.

Finally, the economic data released in recent weeks suggests the recession appears to be over and the recovery is now under way. In terms of budgetary policy, this means that we can expect the same kinds of things to happen in the future growth period that happened during the last growth period in terms of Federal revenue.

The economic outlook looks positive, and with sound policies in place, longer term prospects for an extended, sustained expansion look promising. The budget resolution sustains the Bush tax cuts and provides for restraint in Federal domestic spending.

Policies that will enhance the prospect for economic growth are present in this budget. I hope in the future we can also agree to make the tax incentives enacted in 2001 permanent, and maximize their positive effect on economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) be permitted to control the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Joint Economic Committee has been granted the debate on the budget message since the passage of the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978 authored by Senator Hubert Humphrey and Congressman Gus Hawkins, and it is our duty to present the views on the current state of the U.S. economy and provide input into the budget debate before us.

Members have just heard the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) give us a tremendous amount of economic data and explain very succinctly his opinion of what it will take to get the country growing again.

I am proud to be here today to continue the tradition begun by Senator Humphrey and Congressman Hawkins. However, the budget before us is not one of which either of those gentlemen would be proud.

Rather than leading us down an economic path of balanced growth and full employment, the budget before us today is nothing more than a political document seeking to hide the fact that the House Republicans' fiscal irresponsibility has led us into deficit spending for years to come, and endangers the future of Medicare, Social Security, and our children's education because the trust funds for the two programs for the elderly are used to finance the misplaced priorities of the Republican Party and their fat cat contributors, and the Leave No Child Behind Act has not been left with enough money for a bus ticket to bring the children along.

What this budget is is a document that outlines the Republicans' philosophy, and that is to reduce government and pay no attention to the poor or the disadvantaged among us.

It is interesting that the louder they talk about free enterprise, the more we find that very few of my Republican colleagues have ever had a job in a company they did not inherit, except at the public trough. And the louder they scream about free enterprise, the more we will find they probably earned their money at the expense of taxpayers, and probably we will benefit very little from these \$1.5 trillion tax cuts they passed out but it will go to their rich contributors, for whom they seem to spend all their time working in the House to protect, because they certainly are not doing anything to help the people who depend on Social Security or Medicare.

Last year, for example, the House passed the Social Security Lockbox Act by a vote of 407 to 2. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) voted for the bill, and said on the House floor, "This legislation prevents Congress from using the Social Security and Medicare surpluses to cut taxes or increase spending." My goodness.

And the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) during last year's budget debate on the floor said, "The bottom line is that the HI trust fund is part of the larger fund, and it can be only used for Medicare. And it can be used for Medicare reform, but the Democrats voted for a lockbox, as did we, by a vote of 407 to 2. Everybody voted for it, and the money will stay in the trust fund and it will only be used for Medicare and Medicare reform, so that is just that," said the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Apparently the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) were wrong about the effects of that legislation, and apparently they no longer care about protecting Social Security and the Medicare trust funds.

I hope the voters in their districts in Connecticut and Florida will ask them,

because I am sure that they will both support this Republican budget today; I challenge them not to. And the budget today will decimate the Medicare and Social Security trust funds.

So here we have the Republicans talking about the lockbox, and they are voting and they are going to vote tonight, Mr. Chairman, to destroy Medicare and Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) opposed amendments to the economic stimulus bill recently.

We had an amendment to extend an increase of employment benefits for displaced workers. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) voted no and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) voted no.

We had a bill or an amendment to extend COBRA coverage with a 75 percent subsidy. Both of these stalwart Republicans voted no on that.

We had an amendment to make tax cuts contingent upon not breaking into the Social Security and Medicare surpluses. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) both voted no.

So, as I say, Mr. Chairman, the budget here tonight is a farce; it is a sham; it is a joke. The Republicans are here to undermine critical Federal programs so they can give tax cuts to their rich fat cat friends. Who are the losers? Seniors, children, women, working families, poor people, immigrants, the homeless, the environment. The list goes on.

Last year we added we had a \$5.6 trillion surplus, and now, after a faltering economy and an enormous tax cut, the surplus is gone. This budget eats up 86 percent of the Social Security surplus over the next 5 years, the entire Medicare trust fund is obliterated for the next decade, and just last year, the Republicans were passing Social Security and Medicare lockboxes to protect these trust funds.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the lockboxes are gone. They not only threw away the key, they gave a duplicate to every one of the rich fat cats who have been supporting their campaigns. There is no drug benefit, there is no education benefit. We are leaving a lot of children behind.

Do Members know what they are going to do? They are going to say, let us have everybody get married. That will resolve the problem of poverty among the poor. What I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, is that poor people, having them get married just gives us a poor couple.

Mr. Chairman, we have education gone, special education funds gone, TANF money increases gone.

Housing? The Republicans think that the homeless, when the weather is nice, are campers, so they would offer them youth hostels, not money for housing. We have here an example of the arrogance of the people who care only for a

few rich people in this country turning their backs on the people that the Democrats are trying to help and protect.

Would I raise taxes? In a New York minute. Would I do away with the inheritance tax repeal that the Republicans made to give a few thousand people \$40 billion while they will not give the rest of the people drug benefits? You bet.

It is time we start seeing what the American people want. Do they want a few rich fat cats helped, or do they want to continue to see Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security as some of the safety nets for the seniors?

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), a member of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to lift this debate above the grotesque ad hominem quality we have been hearing too much on the floor today and focus instead on the real direction this budget takes us in.

I have to say, Mr. Chairman, it is important that people understand that I came here in 1994 with the first conservative and the first fiscally responsible Republican majority in my lifetime. At the time we inherited the House, we discovered that we had deficits as far as the eye could see.

In those 8 years, we have seen a radical change in the landscape because we have had a fiscally conservative Congress not spending on impulse, like the previous Congress had. We have trimmed the deficit, we have cut taxes, we have encouraged economic growth.

What is particularly important, Mr. Chairman, we have made a commitment to stay within a range of fiscal responsibility and activity that has allowed us to balance two budgets, and now this year we face the acid test: Can we maintain fiscal discipline under very adverse circumstances.

As this budget evidences, we can do that. Our answer is yes. This is a budget that will meet America's needs while keeping us on a path to balancing the budget as we come out of the recession.

As the Treasury Secretary testified before our Committee on Ways and Means, it is important to understand, the United States has never run a surplus during a recession. The last time someone tried that was Herbert Hoover, and it did not work very well.

□ 1815

And we have never run a surplus during war time. Well, Mr. Chairman, we are in the midst of a serious conflict, and we are trying to work our way out of a recession. And in that context this budget keeps us on a path to a balanced budget. The projected deficit is less than 1 percent of GDP. For most of the other industrialized nations that deficit would be a marvel. And it proves that this budget maintains sen-

sible funding levels. It is a fiscally responsible budget.

Contrary to what we have heard here today, despite the over-heated partisan rhetoric, this takes care of our social needs by funding Medicare with a prescription drug benefit and funding highway projects while adequately funding our national defense. It keeps outside a growth path by preserving tax cuts. We have heard them abominated here today, but the fact is that we need to have a continuing commitment to tax relief in order to provide economic opportunities for millions of Americans. As this country entered into the recession, American working families were suffering under the largest tax burden in history. And I do not doubt that some on the other side would raise taxes in a New York minute.

According to the Joint Economic Committee study: "Delaying, reducing or rescinding the tax cuts for working families would only reduce economic growth." This budget spends money responsibly while not punishing working Americans with back-door tax hikes.

Now today we have heard a lot of very unrealistic figures being thrown around by the other side, but that does not change the fact that this budget reflects the priorities of America and the priorities of the Bush administration. It is virtually unprecedented, Mr. Chairman, that the minority lacks the unit and focus and leadership to offer its own budget blueprint. The majority had the courage and leadership to stand up and offer a workable budget blueprint. We met the needs of working families and workers facing the challenge of finding good-paying jobs.

By contrast, the other party finds itself unable to be all things to all people, and accordingly, has recoiled from offering its own budget. We must support critical homeland security initiatives, fully fund highway and highway safety programs, and provide for the needs of our military. This budget does it, and I hope all of my colleagues will join us in supporting this difficult, but important, compromise.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, it is March madness like I have never seen it before. But I am not talking about college basketball. I am talking about the budget free-fall off the deficit deep end that the Republicans are creating for our country. This creates a \$46 billion 1-year deficit. President Bush still has an \$800 billion tax break, mostly for the wealthy, still pending in his budget. What is sacrificed? Well, the Social Security trust fund is sacrificed. It is not put in a lock box. It is allowed to be looted. Prescription drugs, it underfunds the promise the Republicans made to seniors on prescription drugs. Education, it undercuts by 60 percent the money that was supposed to have been spent on the poor children in our country.

And where did the March madness begin? It began a year ago when the Republicans said we can have a \$1.7 trillion tax cut and it will not effect the Social Security trust fund; it will not effect the Medicare trust fund. But what is happening now? They are both hemorrhaging. This is Enron-onomics. It takes from the poor, from their pension funds, from their health care funds while the wealthy walk off with the vast bulk of the wealth that was being created by everyone.

The greatest generation in nursing homes, the greatest generation with health care bills. And what are we telling them? We are going to loot their social security trust funds, their Medicare trust fund.

March madness. I will tell you who will be mad. The seniors will be mad, they will be angry, they will be outraged when they find out that the Republicans rather than shoring up Medicare, Medicaid. Medicare, half of all the seniors in nursing homes are on Medicaid because they have Alzheimer's. Where is the money 10 years from now for those seniors with Alzheimer's, for those seniors with Parkinson's? Where is the money? Where is the budgeting?

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself half a minute.

Where is your plan? Where is the plan? This is a terrible crisis, it sounds like the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) just laid out, and you would think the great Democratic Party would come forward with a plan to take us out of this crisis. What do they do? They run to the floor and play politics, they run to the floor and scare seniors, they run to the floor and what do they propose? Absolutely nothing. If we are in a crisis, where is your plan? If we need solutions, where is your budget? If Americans want answers, where are your answers? You have none.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN).

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

Mr. Chairman, and I came back to the floor when my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), was talking about seniors; and he made me very concerned because he was not talking about our budget. There is nothing in this budget that reduces funding for Medicaid. In fact, Medicaid increases. There is nothing in this budget that reduces funding for Social Security. In fact, the trust fund is totally protected. All that has happened since I have been in Congress in the last years with regard to Social Security is two things: one, the Republican-led Congress increased the earnings limit to let people who want to work who are seniors keep their Social Security money. So it increased benefits. The second is in 1993 Bill Clinton proposed reducing benefits by increasing taxes on Social Security bene-

ficiaries. That is all we have done. Otherwise, we have retained the guarantee in law that the social security trust fund is sacrosanct, and it is.

The tax cut last year had nothing to do with the Social Security trust fund. It did not touch the Social Security trust fund. The question is very simply, Are we going to use a surplus to pay down more debt, which is what we have been doing? And we paid down almost a half trillion dollars worth of debt.

I think the seniors out there deserve to get a little truth and honesty in budgeting. What we have done over the last 4 or 5 years is we have reduced the national debt by using the surplus to pay down the debt, and I am all for that. Now we are in a situation where because of the recession and a lowering of receipts and because of the need for us to fund the war on terrorism and protect this country, we are, instead of using more money to pay down the debt, using some money to defend this country and increase our economic performance in the future. That is the facts. None of this relates to the Social Security trust fund.

I am on the Committee on Ways and Means. I work on these issues, as does the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK); and he knows as I know, as does the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), that the trust fund is sacrosanct. We cannot and will not touch the trust fund. The question is what we do with the surplus. In this budget we in a very responsible way deal with the three issues we have facing this Congress. One is national security, increasing defense, the biggest increase in 20 years. Second is homeland defense. We more than double what we need for homeland defense. And the third is economic security, including retirement security.

And that same tax relief bill that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) talked about as hurting retirement security, helped retirement security. It provided substantial resources for all of our seniors to be able to save more for their own retirement by letting them save more in their IRAs, 401(k)s, defined benefit plans. It increased economic security. It did not risk our seniors' economic security. This is a sound budget.

I urge my colleagues to support it because in fact it keeps the promise to our seniors. It does not touch Social Security. It does not touch Medicare except for an unprecedented \$350 billion increase in Medicare funding. More than the United States Senate, with almost every Democrat voting for it, proposed to increase just a year ago. This is something that is unprecedented, to allow our seniors to have prescription drug coverage and to modernize Medicare. This will increase the kind of retirement security we want to provide for all our seniors.

I urge my colleagues to strongly support this budget. Do what is right by our seniors and vote "yes" today.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) has 20 minutes remaining of this hour. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

I am about to yield a few seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), who realizes that the Democrats had a plan that they took to the Committee on Rules that was not made in order. They had several amendments, none of which were made in order. So we are operating under a gag rule. Our plan and amendments were not allowed. This is kind of the fascism of democracy that operates in a Republican-controlled Committee on Rules. The gentleman from Massachusetts also understands that it is a good thing that lawyers do not teach economics.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

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

We are operating under an economic plan, the Republican plan of last June. It is only 8 months ago. They said we have plenty of money for a \$1.7 trillion tax break. It would not affect our ability to deal with Social Security or Medicare or Medicaid or education. Eight months later with the wealthy taking the bulk of the \$1.7 trillion, the greatest generation are now looking out 5 and 10 years from now with our nursing homes flooded with 91 percent of all nursing homes with inadequate care, and no additional funding in order to deal with that long term. That is not right.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget said a couple of minutes ago that we had no plan, but we do have a plan. It is a very simple one. The plan is to defeat this budget resolution which is oppressing the American people and bring to the floor of this House a budget resolution that makes sense; one that does not do what this budget resolution does, which is to invade the Social Security trust fund every year over the course of the next decade.

A decade from now under this plan the Social Security trust fund will have \$1.5 trillion less than it has today because this budget resolution invades the social security trust fund every year over the course of the next decade.

This year it spends every dime of the surplus in the Medicare budget. So our principal objection to this budget, first of all, is it does not play straight. It does not play fair. It is not honest with the numbers. And it jeopardizes Social Security and Medicare at a time when we are going to be calling upon those programs because of the larger numbers of retirees that are coming into play. Furthermore, this budget resolution does not live up to its promises. It

takes money out of education. We promised money to the State for increased education funding. It does not deliver on that. And it makes virtually impossible a prescription drug program for the elderly.

All of that so it can continue the ruse, the farce, that we can afford the \$1.7 trillion tax cut which you rammed through this Congress last year. The money just is not there. And you want to continue to pay for that tax cut and the only way that you can do it is by borrowing money from the Social Security trust fund, \$1.5 trillion over the next 10 years, and taking all of the surplus out of Medicare, and by failing to deliver on the promises of health care and education which you have made. That is our plan: get a real budget on this floor.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, Republicans who control the House denied the most responsible fiscally conservative Members of the Democratic Party the right to their alternatives on this floor. You act as a big bully, and now you want to hold it out there as where is your alternatives, where is your suggestions. No matter how you want to paint it, a deficit is a deficit is a deficit; and the Republican budget is swimming in red ink and broken promises. President Bush and every Republican leader promised that they were committed to a balanced budget.

□ 1830

President Bush and every Republican leader promised that they would put the Social Security surplus in a lockbox and never use it again for other spending, but today, no matter, one thing my colleagues do deny is that Republicans want to take a sledge hammer to that lockbox so they can bust it open and loot the money that hardworking Americans have spent a lifetime contributing. It is that bad and it is that ugly.

The Republicans are doing this because they believe it is the only way that they can cover up the deficits they created as far as the eye can see, and that is why they are only giving us 5-year numbers instead of the 10-year numbers and that is why they are using the overly optimistic OMB estimates instead of nonpartisan CBO numbers.

Democrats spent 8 years putting this Nation on a sound fiscal course, and it has taken Republicans 14 months to undo that. Now they want to blame the recession for everything, but no one here or in the country really believes that this recession can be blamed for deficits 10 years from now.

The fact is we Democrats saved enough for a rainy day like this, but the Republicans spent every penny of it on an irresponsible economic plan, leaving few priorities that they claim to support like education, prescription drug coverage for seniors and environmental protection.

So vote against fiscal irresponsibility. Vote against red ink and deficits. Vote against looting the Social Security and Medicare, and vote against this budget resolution.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I think the plan is starting to materialize. I have been saying the Democrats do not have a plan, but what they are against was the tax cut. Okay. Their plan is to raise taxes. We are starting to see the plan. Starting to see the plan. Raise taxes on the American people. If it is not that, one would think they would come forward with an alternative.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), who understands that our plan would only raise taxes on the 1 or 2 percent of the very richest people in this country who the Republicans gave the \$1.4 billion tax cut to. It would help low income people for whom the Republicans do not really care.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate both of these fine gentlemen for setting the table for me because the comments I have to make play right into this. I did, during the debate, try to prepare my constituents for this possibility. The problem is that nobody believed what I was saying, and I guess I even had trouble believing it myself. How could over \$5 trillion in surpluses, projected surpluses disappear within 1 year? I mean, it was impossible for anybody to comprehend that.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Iowa would allow me to control my time, that would be helpful to me.

The problem is nobody would believe that this was even possible, but I want to just go through the facts.

This administration has been in office just over 1 year. We had \$3.12 trillion, not even including the Social Security surplus projected as a surplus for the next 10 years, and 1 year later it is gone.

Despite the administration's claims that this is all about September 11 or some economic downturn, over 40 percent of that vanishing surplus is due to the tax cut, and the commitment to hold Social Security in a lockbox has vanished. There is no commitment anymore.

A year and a half ago, we were out there worrying about whether or not we were going to pay the debt down too fast in this country and whether that would be detrimental. What are we doing now? We are talking about another trillion dollars or more in additional interest on debt over the next 10 years.

This is all in 1 year. So why could not my constituents believe it? Nobody could believe that this could happen in 1 year. What is the plan? We played out the plan over the last 8 years, and you have done away with it within 1 year.

You have done away with it. So if you want to know the plan, the plan is to get you all out of office so that we can have some responsibility in this place again. That is the plan, and I think the American people will understand that that is the plan.

The seniors, the children, the people who care about the environment, they will understand what the plan is when we worked so hard to put this country back on sound economic footing, and you will not even allow a proposed amendment to come to the floor, and you have got the nerve to come in here and say where is your plan. Where is the rule that allows anybody to offer a plan? The Blue Dogs cannot offer a plan. The Black Caucus cannot offer a plan. The Democratic Caucus cannot offer a plan because your rule does not allow any plan other than the demise of this country. That is what your plan is and the American people know what your plan is. They understand.

Now, do you want to give more tax cuts to wealthy people? This is about priorities. This is about priorities. We can either give more tax cuts to wealthy people or we can give better education. We can give more tax cuts or we can give more assistance to prevent AIDS from spreading around the world. We can give more tax cuts to wealthy people or we can do more employment training so people who have been laid off by this recession, so that they can get some jobs. That is what this is all about, and our plan is to get rid of this administration and bring some responsibility back to government.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I rest my case. We are seeing the plan develop before our very eyes. The gentleman said it. Get us out of office, raise taxes and then increase spending. Increase taxes, increase spending; increase taxes, increase spending. Here we go again. Do not tell me my colleagues do not have a plan. They have got a plan. It is called tax and spend.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), who had a plan to offer and was denied in a rather fascist manner his right to offer amendments here and led by the example by our new Attorney General who feels trampling on the Constitution is the way that fascist governments should run and I guess the way we are going under the Republican leadership, but we will let the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) tell us what his plan was and what the Republicans refused to allow him.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, could the RECORD be read back? Did the gentleman just call our government a fascist government? I am just wondering

if that was what was just said on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, no. I talked about the fascist wing of the Republican Party.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, excuse me?

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, the fascist wing of the Republican Party.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, let me just say, that we are in a time of war and the President called for unity, and in that spirit, four of us, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESSON) and myself, went to the Committee on Rules last night and asked that this amendment be made in order.

Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2003, we used their numbers, the Republican numbers. We offered this using their numbers. We offered to extend the debt ceiling till the end of this fiscal year without any strings attached save one, that was that we would be able to review the numbers in August when the CBO numbers come out again to see if we are on the right track and what they say today is actually coming to fact and coming to fruition. We were denied that. That is a plan. This is a budget that we tried to offer last night. Not in order.

People watching may wonder, why is all this arguing going on. I want to tell them. Only the majority can make a legislative body bipartisan. The minority cannot do that. We are like a jack-rabbit in a hailstorm, all we can do is just hunker down and take it, and if my colleagues do not want to be bipartisan, when we offer a budget based on their numbers, offering to extend the debt ceiling, without the approval really of our leadership and they turn us down and then come here today and say there is no plan, we do not have plan. Some of us did, I tell my friends. I saw naked raw partisanship work when I was in the majority here and my colleagues are practicing that today when they deny us the ability to at least debate using their numbers, a different approach.

People are not dumb in this country. They know unfair partisanship when they see it, and if they insist on keeping on doing this, we are going to have a very difficult time solving the problems that the people of this country face.

So I would just tell my colleagues that I am very disappointed in the way this debate has gone today, and I hope we can do better in the future.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

The very distinguished gentleman who just spoke, his plan does not raise taxes. I thought the plan was to raise taxes. That is what the last four gentlemen just said, to raise taxes. The gentleman basically came to the Committee on Rules with my budget and a trigger.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, we submitted a budget proposal, concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year 2003, using my colleagues' numbers and they were denied. How can my colleague say there is no plan. At least four of us had a plan, and now they come here and say our plan is to raise taxes. Our plan was not to raise taxes. Their plan was. All we asked was to review the numbers in August to see if what they say today is coming true, and we were not even allowed to do that, and naked partisanship is going to get my colleagues in trouble eventually. Got this side in trouble.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), who understands democracy and the right of debate and free speech.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, here we are for round three of the shell game.

This is Humphrey-Hawkins, and we are supposed to be talking about employment. We have got people who are getting off welfare, right? We have got all these women, we want them to go out there, and we are increasing the number of hours they have to work. So we are getting them out there, staying away from their kids even longer.

HHS says under this shell are 15 million children who need day care. Under this shell we find out what the Republicans take care of, 2.7 million children. One would think that if there were 15 million who needed it and they were only covering 2.7 million that they would put in some additional money. I mean they are not going to leave any child behind certainly. They really do care about children. I have heard them come out here and get almost weepy eyed over children, but there is only 2.7 million.

What is under this shell? Nothing. They flat-lined it. They said the money we gave last year is exactly what we are giving this year. What that means, according to the Children's Defense Fund, is 30,000 more kids are going to be out from under this shell. They are not going to be covered by day care, and at the end of 10 years of this they are going to have 114,000 more kids if they keep flat-lining it.

Now, we can try and confuse people, but when a mother leaves the house in the morning and she is going off to a job, she wants to work, raise her level of dignity. She feels good about herself, but she does not feel good and cannot concentrate on what she is doing if she does not know her kid is in good child care, and if we do not supplement what people making \$7 an hour in those jobs making beds in the hotels are making, they cannot get good child care.

Do not come out here with that rhetoric about leave no child behind. Vote no on this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Would the gentleman from Washington look under one of those shells and see if there is a Democratic plan? I mean they are leaving the entire country behind by not having a plan. The entire country is left behind by the Democrats today. Please look under that shell and look for a Democratic plan.

Mr. Chairman, I yield ¾ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS), the very distinguished chairman of the Republican Conference.

□ 1845

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I have heard a lot over the last couple of hours about what the Republican budget does not do, and it is ironic that in this budget we take care of IDEA, which we have been fighting for; we take care of seniors and prescription drugs; we protect the homeland security; we do things for national security; we do things to try to get some growth in the economy.

So I continue to ask the question, Where is the Democrats' plan? Where is their budget? And the fact is they have no budget. That tells the American people there is no vision.

I just want to share something. I could come up here and I would not have to say a word but point out what the Democrats are doing, because they have nothing. Wanted: Democrat budget plan. Suspected of raising taxes on American families; increasing wasteful Washington spending.

And I could go on forever. Again, I ask the question, Where do we go from here? Give me a plan on what you propose to win the war against terrorism. Give me a plan. It is easy to beat up ours, but give me something to show where you want to take the Nation.

Again I ask you the question, What do you want to do to secure the homeland? Are you going to raise taxes? Are you going to cut other programs? What are you going to do?

Give me a fiscal break. What are you going to do to protect America's homeland? Again, I ask the question, since we have taken care of families, we have done things to try to grow the economy, what is the Democrats' plan to grow the economy? Give me a fiscal break. If you are going to beat us up, give us your plan.

We have seen nothing over the last 2 hours, over the last 2 weeks, over the last 2 months. We have seen nothing.

Again, I ask the Democrats, What do you do to help workers? I see nothing in your budget. I have seen no budget

that you have submitted. I have seen no vision you have provided. Again, do you want to raise taxes? Do you want to cut programs? Do you want to take care of workers? What do you do to take care of workers? No vision. No budget.

What are you going to do for prescription drugs? We have money in our budget to take care of that need. Again, are you going to raise taxes; cut programs somewhere? Are you going to cut national defense? Give me a fiscal break. If you are going to beat us up, give us your plan.

Nothing for prescription drugs. Again I ask, Where is your plan for health care? No plan. Are you going to raise taxes? Are you going to increase wasteful Washington spending? Are you going to cut homeland security? Are you going to cut national security, the defense budget? What are you going to do to take care of the health care needs?

No plan. No budget. No vision. No nothing. My colleagues just come to the floor and beat us up over the things that we have done trying to help people. What are you going to do for Social Security? Nothing. Zilch. Not nothing. Not nothing do you do. No budget. No vision.

Give me a fiscal break. If you are going to beat us up over our budget, surely somebody's got a budget of their own; surely somebody's got some vision in that party; the great party that once said "All we have to fear is fear itself." Now all you have to offer is fear itself.

Give me a fiscal break. Offer your plan. No budget. No vision. Case closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) has 6 minutes remaining on the subject of economic goals and policies.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), who understands that gagging people and preventing them the right to speech is not incumbent in our democracy, and remembers a time when not all people in this country were allowed to speak out. The Republicans obviously are reverting to those times because they are afraid to hear another plan.

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

I wish the gentleman from Oklahoma had been here 3 hours ago when we were asking for a chance to speak, to present a budget, to not be gagged, to have a chance under the rules of the House of Representatives, the people's House, to debate. But under the Republican rule, which manages and controls all the time, we do not have an opportunity to present any plan because my colleagues will not give us a chance to present any plan. So what we have to deal with is what you give us.

I remember 2 years ago we had a President who said, and this was during harder times, he said we are going

to save Social Security first. It seems now we have a President and colleagues on the other side who say because we have hard economic times, and because we have to pass a budget, we have to take from Social Security first; take these tax cuts, that will go mostly to the well-to-do and large corporations, like Enron; take from Social Security first to fund programs like Star Wars, and you are going to take from education.

Mr. President, please explain to me why you will not fund drug-free school programs. Mr. President, please explain to me why you will not fund dropout prevention programs in our schools. Mr. President, please explain why you and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will not fund school construction monies so we can build more schools in our overcrowded systems. Mr. President, please explain to me why we gutted the monies for classroom size reduction so our kids would not have to be 30 in a classroom to learn.

Take from Social Security first? I intend to try to save Social Security first. And if I had a chance to present a budget, I would show you how we could save Social Security first. But you do not. Instead, we have a security blanket that is thrown around this budget. Everything is security.

Well, by your raiding Social Security and Medicare by about \$1 trillion, we could fund eight wars on terrorism. Instead, we are giving money to the well-to-do and corporations like Enron. Vote against this budget because it does not deserve our vote and the American people do not want it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to the President.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this budget.

The budget before us today reflects a failure to meet the promises made to members of the House Education and the Workforce Committee as we worked to make the compromises needed to create a bipartisan education reauthorization bill known as The No Child Left Behind Act.

One of the key issues was that if we voted to require extensive testing by all schools in the country in order to achieve accountability, we would also supply funding to support the improved teaching that may be needed to help school districts achieve their required goals and avoid expensive penalties. However, this budget cuts The No Child Left Behind Act by \$90 million.

It is unconscionable that programs have been cut that were integral to members agreeing to the compromises that led to passage of the Act. Yet, forty programs would be termi-

nated. These include such critical support for children as funding for elementary and secondary school counseling. A second area of support called for in the Act is to place qualified teachers in every classroom; however, the budget eliminates teacher technology training. The list of terminated programs includes the National Writing Project, which gives teachers experience in improving their writing and models best practices. It also cuts funding for another program that sets the standard for identifying accomplished teaching, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, which administers a highly lauded national process for identifying the highest quality teachers.

I have selected just these few examples of eliminated programs that would improve teaching quality so that indeed no child would be left behind. But this budget decreases resources for teachers by 4 percent and eliminates high-quality training for 18,000 teachers.

Many members of the House wanted the opportunity to vote to provide funding for a much older federal mandate which has been shamelessly under-supported since 1975, special education. Yet, we have not even been allowed to show our support for phasing in this commitment over a period of years. The modest increase in funding contained in this budget is only a third of the amount that real commitment would offer. Although the Education and Workforce Committee will be working on the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in the next Congress, there is no justification for holding this funding commitment hostage in order to implement whatever needed reforms may be agreed to by Congress at that time.

The list of other gaping holes in this budget for education is long—freezing funding rather than providing the \$500 million called for in the No Child Left Behind Act to support the 21st Century Community Learning Centers, which provide safe, healthy places for children to learn after school.

While the bill is targeted at the lowest income, lowest performing children, the key portions of that effort contained in Title I are woefully under-funded while the number of poor children mushrooms.

There are no funds to subsidize interest on school modernization bonds needed to address the \$127 billion backlog in school repairs, again a program that many members supported.

Finally, high quality child care must be available to enable more children to be ready to learn when they reach kindergarten. Yet, this budget freezes child care funding. What will be the value in reauthorizing the child care block grant this year, when we are told in advance that long overdue reforms cannot be made because there are no additional funds?

As members should be aware, virtually every national education support organization—such as the Parent Teachers Association, the National School Boards Association, and the 100-member consortium of education organizations called the Committee for Education Funding—have expressed their outrage at the inadequate funding for education in this budget.

Is this what our constituents want? Clearly not. A study released yesterday, conducted by the Ipsos-Reid polling and research organization, reported that education was, by a wide

margin, the highest national priority for spending on non-military or homeland security programs. An astonishing 85 percent agreed that a good reason to increase federal spending on education was that "our national security depends on our ability to successfully equip our children with the skills and knowledge they will need to function in today's increasing complex world."

The public supports a substantial increase in spending. Their commitment to our children must start with this budget so that no longer will so many be left behind.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are some of us who remember this world in the 1930s, when Hitler suspended the Bundestag to promulgate conservative ideology and not let people speak. It is a shame that the Republicans in the House, Mr. Chairman, have taken up that same ideology and are denying a chance for debate and open discussion of a budget. It does smack of fascism; and it is too bad, because the American people will recognize that and understand that in a free economy, and in a free country that created programs like Social Security and Medicare and special education and aid for dependent children and aid for people who are unable to care for themselves, for the disabled, that to deny them care is obscene.

I think it will be quite clear that, for whatever reason, whether it is deficits or anything else, that the overwhelming desire of the Republican Party is to destroy programs in the Federal Government, except those few intended for the very wealthy.

Most of the colleagues who are screaming about the war never wore a uniform other than the Boy Scout uniform. And I would like to suggest, as I said before, none of them have worked in free enterprise, which they tout so loudly. And yet, because that is where the campaign contributions come from, in the hundreds of millions of dollars, that is where their allegiance is. They are forsaking the seniors who need health care and who need an economic safety net. They are forsaking our children by denying them the chance to come along and get an education.

I am sure the American public is going to recognize this, and I am sure they are going to recognize it when they see wasteful money spent on things like Star Wars, which will not work, and programs which do nothing except to pay for large defense contractors, who are related to former Republican Presidents, and I think they are going to see that this is an obscene, corrupt, and undemocratic attempt to harm those people who are most fragile in this country only to benefit the 1 or 2 percent of the very wealthiest. And I hope my colleagues will vote down this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South

Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 8½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 9½ minutes remaining on the debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend and colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget is irresponsible, irrational, and just plain wrong. It is a sham, it is a shame, and it is a disgrace.

The Republican budget buries us in a pile of debt and puts us in a much deeper financial hole; and it is the obligation of the Republicans, the majority party, to dig us out.

The Republicans have destroyed the lock box and thrown away the key. Mr. Chairman, Social Security is a sacred trust, a covenant with the American people. It is a promise that should never, ever be broken. But the Republican budget spends \$225 billion of the Social Security trust fund on other government programs.

Social Security is a safety net for many Americans, allowing them to live with dignity. But the Republican budget takes away that safety net. Republicans are stealing the Social Security trust fund. The Republicans are taking the security out of Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues tonight to vote for the people, vote for the old folks, vote for the disabled, and vote against the Republican budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of strong words, I think even sometimes inappropriate words, disturbing, extreme words this evening, as we have been discussing this budget, particularly from the other side.

All of us agree that these are unusual times. It is a time for tough decisions, a time that defines people. Do they rise to the occasion, or do they cower when they should stand tall? Do they sit quietly when they should speak? Do they freeze when they should lead? I am amazed this evening that at a time like this the Democrats have not stood, they have not spoken, and they have not led. At a time when your country needs vision, they have none.

This year's budget reflects the tough decisions of those willing to lead when

events call for a clear vision and clear priorities. Our budget meets the demands of these historic times and provides for our national defense, it provides for homeland security, and it provides for personal security.

Let me talk about health care just briefly. Our plan provides \$350 billion to expand and enhance Medicare; to provide a prescription drug plan for our seniors, which is needed; to provide for the reform of Medicare. Would we like to add more? Yes.

□ 1900

But we have added a very reasonable amount. If Members look at prescription drugs, approximately 72 percent of our seniors are covered by prescription drugs. Yet the only thing that we have heard from the other side of the aisle is a plan that would control everything in the medicine box of our seniors, and would displace this money that already provides prescription drugs with an increase in taxes or an increase in deficit.

We also have expanded and enhanced our community health centers, which provide health care for those who fall through the cracks. We have expanded health care for the poor, the children, and the uninsured. We have increased funding for research by doubling the funding for NIH, and we have provided fiscal responsibility.

The other night in the Committee on the Budget when Democrats offered a string of amendments, the sum of those amendments would have increased our deficit by \$200 billion. That is why we do not see them offering a budget. That is why we did not see them offering a budget when we marked it up during the committee. If we combined all of those amendments, it would require us to increase taxes by \$150 billion to pay for the additional amendments they wanted.

We have not cowered. We have taken a stand, a tough stand in these days that require tough stands. We have provided a budget which establishes the needed priorities, and yet it is remarkable to me that we hear chilling silence when it comes to offering a budget of responsibility.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of anger on the floor today, and to me this is such a sad day. It is total reversal of all our former self-congratulation. The last administration took credit for beginning our deficit reduction course to save Social Security and Medicare. The majority said oh, no, we are doing it, and the country gave us both the credit. There will be no question where the blame lies for dynamiting the lockbox. The Social Security and Medicare lockbox will be remembered as the most fraudulent metaphor the majority has ever used on this floor.

The majority has taken us back to the dark budget ages of using budget

estimates by political appointees rather than by the professionals of the Congressional Budget Office. The American people are always willing to take domestic cuts in time of war. Members will never convince them. They are too smart to be convinced by a budget that tells them we can do tax cuts, fight a war, and defeat a recession at the same time. The seniors and the baby boomers deserve a lot better.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to myself to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio.

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

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, in an earlier colloquy today on transportation spending, I understood a couple of things. One is that although the budget provides for \$1.8 billion in outlays, I understood the colloquy to indicate that if the Committee on Appropriations only wanted to appropriate \$23 billion for 2003, and not the \$27 billion, a little over \$27 billion, we on the Committee on Transportation and the Infrastructure expected.

Secondly, I would query the chairman about the firewalls. I understand in the budget resolution we cannot construct firewalls to protect the TEA-21 dollars, and I am wondering where that will come and what the commitment is.

Thirdly, today the Senate marked up their budget and provided for an additional \$5.7 billion of Federal highway spending in 2003. I would solicit an opinion from the chairman.

Mr. NUSSLE. Number one, we have a reserve fund for the extra transportation dollars so it would only be released to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure if in fact they marked it at that higher level, 4.4 of contract authority, 1.3 in outlays.

Second, on the firewall that was discussed, that is for a future potential budget enforcement act reform bill that we intend to move on the floor.

The third question was whether or not we would try for a higher number with the Senate. We are working to try to get as much money to stimulate the economy as possible. We agree transportation is one of the ways. We will work for as high a number as we can.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my disappointment and discouragement with respect to the Republican budget proposal. We are failing the working men and women, children and seniors. My constituents elected me to come here to talk about issues that we are not having a fair chance to discuss. That is why the other side of the aisle hears our loud tone of voice and our cry. There are thousands of people in our districts who are unemployed who were affected

long before September 11, who had some hope, who thought that our leadership, that our President, was going to leave no child behind.

The President has decimated our budget with respect to education. He has made promises and broken them. People will have their energy bills cut. The LIHEAP program is going to be slashed. People will have to make a decision whether to buy food or pay the light bill. This is a harsh reality of the Republican proposal, and I stand here to say this is not acceptable and that my constituents in the 31st Congressional District want their voices heard. We want to be able to have our amendments in our presentations in our committees. I ask for a "no" vote on the Republican budget proposal.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have heard often on this floor today for a call of calm and reconciliation. I have also heard the discussion about the Democrats having no plan. Well, Mr. Chairman, let me say, these four volumes indicate why Democrats cannot have a plan because the Republicans and the administration have squandered the surplus. There is no surplus. This plan invades Social Security. This plan blows up the lockbox.

In fact, my constituents will be asking me why over the last 3 years, when the Democrats had a plan for a prescription drug benefit, why there was no response from the Republicans. Why Social Security is at the point it is when we had a trillion dollar surplus. No plan? We do not need a plan. Those who have destroyed the plan destroyed the surplus, and need to present us with something that Americans can be proud of.

It is interesting that Republicans would talk about homeland security and the war against terrorism. A minuscule amount in this budget is for homeland security. Most of it is squandered away by the invading of Social Security. I ask my colleagues to vote a resounding "no" for this budget because this is not a budget that Americans can stand on. It is a budget that is nothing but smoke and mirrors and walls that do not respond. This is a budget that does not work.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to myself.

Mr. Chairman, well, we are coming to the end of this very important debate. We have heard a lot of discussion and debate today about plans and who has got a plan and who does not have a plan. Let us review the bidding very quickly.

The President in response to September 11, the national emergency, the war against terrorism and a recession in our economy put a plan on the table in February. It was not a perfect plan.

There has never been in the United States history a perfect budget plan, but he has one.

What did we do in committee last week? We took that plan and we made it better. How? We said special education is going to get a little bit extra. Veterans are going to get a little bit extra. Science is going to get a little bit extra. Homeland security can get extra. We are going to treat defense, and all sorts of things that we thought were important priorities with a little extra, and the President today said the Republican plan is better.

We have taken the President's plan and we have made a better plan. So the President has a plan and the Republicans have a plan. During the last 6 months of the most crucial time in American history, what have the Democrats been doing? Well, three very important things that we did together in a bipartisan way. We said we are going to respond to the national emergency. So we dipped into that surplus, and we took some money out and we said New York needs some help. We did that in a bipartisan way. Every Member voted for it.

Then we said we are not going to let people come into this country and do what they did to the people of America ever again. We will find them. We will beat them. We will win this war, and we will do whatever it takes. In a bipartisan way, we stood together and we funded that war. Every Member voted for it.

Just last week, finally, we all said the economy is just too important for us to allow it to languish or for it to possibly falter. In a bipartisan way, we dipped in there again and took some of that money and said that is what we are going to do. All of this hand wringing about where did the surplus go, my gosh, it just vanished. Members, it did not vanish. Have Members forgotten Osama bin Laden? Have my colleagues forgotten what happened on September 11?

Members are saying the seniors are not going to understand. The seniors won World War II. Our kids understand. Our parents understand. The teachers understand. The nurses understand. Our veterans, by God, understand. So for the other side to run in and tell us now that nobody understands where the surplus went is a bunch of malarkey.

So what did the other side do over the weekend? Instead of writing their own plan, 96 pages of criticism. That is fair. We are living in America. We will fight to the death anybody's right to disagree. That is what America stands for, but at some point in time the other side does not just get to disagree. They have to lead. The great party on the other side of the aisle has led many times in our history, but now it fails.

The minority leader said, "We think the Republican budget in the House is a failure, an absolute, total failure in dealing with the big problems in America," and he let his voice drop.

Did the gentleman come down here with a plan? No. Did he say I have got some ideas? No. Did he criticize? Sure, and he has a right to do that. I will fight for his right to do that. But Members are not allowed to just complain. Members are not allowed to just play politics. At this most crucial time in American history, Democrats have to stand up and say what is important and put their plan on the table. They are not allowed to just snipe from the sidelines and say, oh, we are for national defense and homeland security. Yes, we want a prescription drug benefit. Gosh, we want more than the Republicans do for education. Oh, yes, in fact, we want more for science, and let me think, we want more for all of these things.

We cannot do that without a plan, or without raising taxes. So please, I ask the other side of the aisle to demonstrate their leadership by coming forward with a plan. I beg them. This is too crucial a time in American history for them to let us down.

I implore Members to vote for a plan to win the war and get this country secure again.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, the reason the sign used by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) was made yesterday was because the majority knew last night when we went to the Committee on Rules with our plan that we were not going to be able to offer it. So these nice charts we see about not having a plan, we would have a plan today, but the other side of the aisle would not let us offer it.

We would like to look in August and see if what the gentleman says tonight is actually coming true. What the other side of the aisle said last year we know has not come true, and we only ask to review it in August. We used the Republican plan as a gesture of bipartisanship. The other side of the aisle will not let us have a plan, and then they bring all of these charts down here that they made up yesterday and say the Democrats do not have a plan.

□ 1915

This raw partisanship, people are not dumb, they see it. It is going to get you in trouble just like it got this side in trouble sooner or later.

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

Here is one reason that we have not produced a plan. It is because the plan that we are confronted with, the budget, so-called, before us, is not a real budget. As I said earlier, it is a tip of an iceberg.

Here are just a few of the things that it does not include. It uses OMB scoring, and therefore it picks up \$225 billion because OMB estimates the cost of Medicare by that much less than CBO. It fails to fully fund discretionary spending at the level of inflation, that is all, current policy, and picks up another couple of hundred billion dollars.

We do not think that is realistic. If we had to put up a plan that would be comparable on an apples to apples basis, we would have to adopt these and many other devices in this budget which we think would be a bad precedent. That is why we declined to do it. There will be a Democratic plan. Senator CONRAD is producing one as we talk.

Let me just say once again with respect to the war, when the votes come on the defense appropriations bill and on the other appropriations bill with homeland security and national security, Democrats' names will be the board because we back the President and we support those appropriated items.

Let me say something else about the key concern that we have in this budget and the situation we are in today. This graph here shows the extent to which previous administrations have invaded Social Security. The Clinton administration came to office in 1993 inheriting a budget deficit of \$290 billion, a record deficit. On February 17, less than a month after being in office, they put on our doorstep a deficit reduction plan which passed this House by one vote. As a result, every year for the next 8 years the bottom line of the budget got better to the point where in the year 2000, we were literally in surplus without counting Social Security or Medicare, the first time in our fiscal history that that happened. It happened under the aegis of the Clinton administration. Sure you cast some of those votes and I cast some of those votes, they were costly votes in most cases; but this is where the handoff occurred to President Bush.

I have seen at least five Republicans come here to the well and tout the fact that you have had \$400 billion in debt reduced in the last several years. All of that happened on the Clinton administration's watch. Why did it happen? When you move your budget out of deficit into surplus, you have got money to pay off debt. That is why it happened.

But look what happens. Here at the pinnacle of this summit, there is a handoff to President Bush and immediately things go south. Some of that is due to the fact that we have had fundamentally unexpected, terrible tragedies to occur in this country; and I would be the first to admit that that has had an impact, no question about it. But your tax cuts had an impact, too. Your miscalculation of what the economy was going to do has had a big impact as well. It is at least 40 percent of this. But look at this. And the reason we cannot go with your budget tonight is it has no plan, it has no strategy, it has no way for us to reverse that course which is graphically laid out there, showing you that we are backpedaling right to where we were 10 years ago. After 10 years of progress on the deficit, we are literally backsliding.

Since everybody seems to be poo-hooing the deficit, as if this is a tem-

porary, transitory phenomenon, let me read CBO's analysis, dated March 6, of the President's budget. It says that this year we will incur a deficit under President Bush of \$248 billion; \$297 billion next year under his budget. Over the next 10 years it says we will incur deficits of \$1.8 trillion. The consequence of that is we will be invading Social Security to the tune of \$1.8 trillion.

Here is this chart which we have used before. You start with a blue stub there, you start with a blue stub there which shows that we handed off the budget to the Bush administration with a budget out of Social Security and out of Medicare and look what happened. Immediately the red lines below the line begin to appear. The yellow lines up here indicate that every year over the next 10 years we will consume the Medicare surplus. Every year over the next 10 years we will consume the Social Security surplus. There is no way around it. You do not have a plan in your budget to reverse course here. So everyone voting for this budget tonight should understand this is the bottom line that you are voting for, an invasion of the Social Security surplus for the next 10 years. That is the bottom line. What it means is that we will be incurring more debt. We will not be achieving our promise of paying off the debt so that we can alleviate the burden on the Treasury and make it able to meet its Social Security obligations.

This is a 180-degree reversal of where we were last year. That is why we respectfully decline to vote for this budget resolution. We think it is a badly designed element, and we think it will take us back to where we were. We hoped that we had recovered from that from a long time ago, but it does not appear that we have.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. HASTERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the President's budget, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this budget as well. The budget process helps the Congress to decide the spending priorities of this Nation. I am disappointed that some folks on the other side of the aisle have decided not to propose a real substitute. Instead of making tough decisions, some would rather complain from the sidelines.

This Congress has a responsibility to govern. I believe that this budget fulfills our responsibilities to our constituents and to our Nation. I want to congratulate our budget chairman for a job well done. I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Our first responsibility is to defend our Nation. Folks, we are at war. We must spend money to win this war. This budget contains a historic increase in defense spending. Our troops need this money so that they have the

weapons, the supplies, the equipment to do the job. Some say that there is not enough money in this budget to fight this war. I assure you if the President needs more money to fight this war, this Congress will make sure that any man or woman who wears the uniform of the United States military and puts themselves in harm's way, they will have the training, the equipment and the weapons and whatever they need to win.

This budget also contains the necessary money for homeland security. On September 11, we found out that terrorists can attack in the most unconventional way. We do not know where they will strike next. We do not know, but we have to be prepared. This budget helps our Nation prepare for these contingencies.

This budget also helps prepare our Nation for other challenges on the domestic front. It includes money to implement the President's ambitious education agenda, so that our schools will teach our children better. It includes the largest financial commitment to a prescription drug benefit in our Nation's history. We reserve \$350 billion to Medicare and prescription drugs for seniors in this budget. It also includes important funding for our Nation's veterans and for our Nation's farmers. The President's budget sets the right priorities for our Nation.

My friends on the other side of the aisle, some have criticized our budget with great enthusiasm; but they have failed to offer a real alternative. Why did they not offer an alternative? Some would like to play politics with Social Security. Any realistic budget would have to confront the fact that the surplus disappeared because of the economic slowdown, because of the war and certainly because of domestic terrorism in this country and our willingness to prepare ourselves for it.

Folks, we made a real decision last year. I heard some of our friends talk about surplus. We had a great surplus. We made a conscious decision to take some of that surplus off the table, because we thought moms and dads and local people who make money, punch a time clock, own their small business, they make better decisions with that money in their pocket than the Washington bureaucrats. We also made a conscious decision to pay down debt. During this period of time, we paid down over \$450 billion of public debt. I think that is probably better than having that surplus sitting there and being tempting for people here in Washington.

I know people have big plans, big thick books on how to spend that money. But times have changed. We must prepare this Nation to continue to fight the fight that we are in. We must prepare our people for domestic violence and prevent people from coming into this country and have terrorist attacks across this Nation. We need to take care of our senior citizens. We need to take care of our veterans.

We need to take care of farmers. This budget does exactly that.

I ask you tonight, put politics aside, put demagoguery aside, and vote for this budget so that we can move forward and this Congress can get its work done.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Chairman, I am having this statement placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today, although I am not physically present. As you know, I have been granted a leave of absence so I can be with my family in Mississippi to attend the funeral of a close relative. For this reason, I was away from the House floor yesterday, March 19, 2002, and am away today, March 20, 2002. I want this statement placed in the RECORD today so that I can be on record on today's most important proceedings pertaining to the Federal budget for Fiscal Year 2003.

Today the House is considering the Federal budget for Fiscal Year 2003. I stand by our President as he leads us in the war against terrorism. But I cannot vote for this budget proposal because I have serious concerns over this Budget's treatment of health care for seniors, veterans and retired military. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee refused to make in order the Blue Dog Coalition budget alternative. I cannot support a rule that will not allow for open, honest debate on a matter as important as the Federal budget.

This proposed Budget fails to address pressing health care needs but includes new unspecified tax cuts—tax cuts that have not even been proposed by anyone or considered by Congress. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), Congress' own accounting agency, there is no budget surplus. Therefore, funding for these tax cuts could only come from Trust Funds that are set aside for health care entitlements such as Social Security and Military Retiree Health Care. I cannot support a budget that threatens the well being of our nation's seniors and veterans, or those who will soon be part of those venerable segments of our society.

A particular matter affecting military retirees is Concurrent Receipt. Certain military personnel qualify for both military retired pay and veterans disability compensation. Current law requires that military pensions be reduced, dollar for dollar, by the amount of VA disability compensation received.

This is an injustice that should have been corrected long ago. The United States government promises certain benefits when young Americans are recruited to serve a career of military service, including health care and pensions upon retirement. Veterans who become disabled in the line of service also earn and deserve their health care benefits.

The proposed FY2003 Budget calls for concurrent receipt for a limited number of disabled retirees, but his Budget is woefully inadequate because it would continue to deny earned benefits to many other disabled retirees.

Yesterday, Congressmen GENE TAYLOR and I attempted to introduce an amendment to the Budget proposal, to fully fund concurrent receipt for military retirees who are also service-connected disabled. Funds for this proposal would have come from funds allotted in the budget for unspecified tax cuts that have not even been proposed or considered by this House. Unfortunately, on a party line vote, the House Rules Committee refused to allow the full House of Representatives to even consider the Shows-Taylor Amendment.

Reducing these promised and earned benefits—to disabled war heroes, of all people—is wrong. The FY2003 Budget Resolution that is being considered is called a "wartime budget." How can we recruit soldiers to fight the War on Terrorism if we continue our legacy of broken promises? Too many military veterans are telling their children and grandchildren not to join the service because the government does not keep its promises. This is precisely why we must keep our promises to our military heroes this year, today.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 353. As a senior member of the House Budget Committee, I am profoundly disappointed with this measure which unrepentantly retreats from the fiscal policies and practices that fostered enormous federal budget surpluses. In the Majority's push to craft a "nominally balanced budget," they have failed to put forth a plan to get our budget on the path to recovery. Further, Mr. Speaker, this budget blatantly ignores what everyone here knows—and what all the major economic forecasters, including CBO, OMB and GAO, told us well before September 11th—the federal budget will be overtaken by escalating budget deficits as the Baby Boom generation begins to retire in just six short years. This budget, which calls for cumulative non-Social Security deficits of \$1.052 over the next five years, spending all of the Medicare trust fund surplus and 86 percent of the Social Security surplus, actually worsens our long-term fiscal picture.

Mr. Chairman, last year, I stood on the floor of the House and cautioned against betting the ranch on ten-year estimates that the CBO itself has stressed are highly uncertain. Based on its own track record, CBO concludes that its estimated surpluses could be off in one direction or the other, on average, by about \$52 billion in 2001, \$120 billion in 2002, and \$412 billion in 2006. This year, the Majority seems to have come around to my view—why else would they put forth a budget based on five year numbers? Why indeed? It couldn't be because ten-year numbers would reveal just how much of the Social Security and Medicare surpluses this budget will really consume, could it? It wouldn't be to cloak the fact that over ten years, over half of the projected Social Security surplus will have to be diverted to cover other government functions, according to both the CBO and OMB, would it?

Mr. Chairman, to arrive at a "nominally balanced budget," my colleagues on the other side of the aisle not only ignore the impending budgetary pressures out past 2007 but, for the first time since 1988, discard CBO's projections, now that they have become inconvenient, in favor of rosier OMB estimates. Have they learned nothing from the dramatic reversal in our nation's budget picture? Mr. Speaker, last year, the Majority was more than willing to accept the CBO's estimate of a \$5.6 trillion surplus. Now that applying CBO's baseline to their budget resolution will result in a worsening of the non-Social Security deficit, to the tune of \$318 billion, over the next decade, the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, my colleague, Mr. NUSSLE, has decided that since he does not like the "weather report" as prepared by CBO, he will simply "turn the channel." Well, Mr. Speaker, while I respect my colleagues right to hope for the best, it does not erase our affirmative duty to prepare for the worst. The hallmark of responsible budgeting is leaving room for error. Last

year's budget left no room for error. In fact, by August, we were projecting that for the next seven years, virtually all of the non-Social Security, non-Medicare surplus would be spent, not to improve the programs, not to create a prescription drug benefit under Medicare or even enhance the solvency of these critical programs, but to cover other government expenditures. And, Mr. Chairman, that was well before September 11th and the resulting war on terrorism.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman I would note that to arrive at their "nominal balanced budget" for 2003 the Majority has put the blinders on with respect to the supplemental defense request that we all know is coming next week and has blocked out the memory of their much-touted stimulus bill that was enacted just over a week ago and has a five-year cost of \$94 billion. When the stimulus bill is included, this budget has a deficit of \$224 billion in 2003 and \$830 billion between 2003 and 2007, excluding the Social Security surplus.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, adding insult to injury is the Majority's proposal for a national prescription drug program for seniors. H. Con. Res. 353 claims to create a \$350 billion reserve to be spent, over ten years, for not only a drug benefit but also the Medicare "modernization" and provider givebacks. Without ten-year numbers for the rest of the budget, how can this proposal be credible? Further, the budget condition release of monies for a drug benefit on enactment of a Medicare modernization bill and provider payment adjustments. Last week, during the House Budget Committee's mark up of this bill, I offered a reasonable, budget neutral amendment that I offered to create a meaningful voluntary prescription drug benefit within Medicare for all Medicare beneficiaries. Regrettably, it was summarily rejected along party lines. Under my amendment, \$69 billion would be added over three years to the Medicare service, raising the total commitment to \$158 billion by 2007 and \$500 billion over ten years. These additional funds are essential if a Medicare prescription drug benefit is to be available to and affordable for the majority of those receiving Medicare benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this "spend today, borrow tomorrow" measure that turn its back on hard-learned fiscal of the passed decade and undermine longstanding domestic priorities, such as strengthening Social Security and Medicare, providing a universal prescription drug benefit. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to make the right choice today and reject this sham budget.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H. Con. Res. 353, the FY 2003 Congressional Budget Resolution. The budget resolution is fiscally irresponsible. It spends more than 86 percent of the Social Security surplus and uses up the entire Medicare surplus. There are only six years left before the baby-boom generation begins to retire, and now is not the time to deplete the Social Security and Medicare surpluses.

Over the past eight years we have had budgets culminating in real debt reduction, and a growing surplus that did not rely on Social Security or Medicare. The budget resolution before us today, quickly creates an on-budget deficit of \$974 billion over five years according to the Congressional Budget Office.

The tragic attacks on September 11, 2001, the short and shallow recession, and the con-

tinuing war on terrorism taken all together did not precipitate the budget deficit. Mr. Chairman, while I support the war on terrorism, and increased homeland security, I did not support the irresponsible tax cut passed last year. The fact is, it consumed approximately 43 percent of the budget surplus and led to our current poor fiscal health.

This budget does not lead to debt reduction or Social Security and Medicare solvency and it does not ensure that our other national priorities are met. Last year, the leadership went down the primrose path by enacting a tax cut that cost our country nearly 2 trillion dollars. But before this year is out we must get the budget back on track.

Further, for the first time in years, the budget resolution is only a five-year budget instead of a ten-year budget. It remains in deficit throughout the next five years, which leaves us to infer the damage that will result in the second five years. In effect, this budget cloaks the large amount of Social Security and Medicare surpluses that will be spent after FY2007 and it allows the Leadership to avoid deciding whether to sustain the sunset provision of the tax cut passed last spring or extend the tax cuts at an additional cost. This lack of a ten-year plan leads me to believe that either the House Leadership has no long-term plan of recovery or they have a plan that will not stand scrutiny under the public eye. Regardless, this resolution offers no targets, no objectives, and no strategies to return to budget surpluses.

In addition, this budget resolution attempts to make the deficit appear smaller by authorizing non-defense, and non-homeland security discretionary spending at almost five percent below the level necessary to maintain current levels of services. Perhaps, even more disappointing, the resolution cuts funding for the bipartisan No Child Left Behind Act recently signed into law, as well as other cuts in education, health care, and environmental protection.

Mr. Chairman, I am saddened that we are being forced to vote on this irresponsible budget resolution without any opportunity to create a bipartisan fiscally responsible budget. As Members of this great institution, we often deliberate important issues that effect our own and our children's futures. During debates of this nature, I frequently ask myself one simple question; will the vote I am about to cast make the nation and our society better and safer for my two sons, Johnny and Matt, as they live, learn and grow in the 21st Century. For once, lets put their future first, ahead of Washington politics.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the budget resolution for the fiscal year 2003.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution and I want to thank Chairman NUSSLE for the hard work he and his staff did pulling it together.

I just want to point out one feature of the Budget Resolution that may go unnoticed as we debate defense spending and tax policy and other macroeconomic issues.

This budget provides a healthy and needed boost for scientific research—a boost that goes significantly beyond what the Administration called for. I'm especially pleased with the funding for Function 250, the General Science function, which is based on an 11.1 percent increase for Research and Related Activities at the National Science Foundation (NSF).

Our nation's long-range future depends in no small measure on the investments we make today in research and development, and in science and math education. NSF spending is critical to ensuring a health R&D and education enterprise. The Budget Resolution recognizes that.

I want to thank Chairman NUSSLE for working so cooperatively with me and with other Members of the House Science Committee to ensure that the Budget paid proper attention to science funding and to balancing the federal research portfolio. We obviously haven't solved all our science funding problems, but this Budget Resolution is an important step in doing so, especially given how tight overall domestic discretionary spending is.

I urge my colleagues to support this Resolution.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my concerns about the budget resolution that is under consideration. I feel very strongly that the budget we are debating is seriously flawed because it contains cuts and funding amounts that are frozen at previous year levels.

Furthermore, the priorities reflected within the budget are a clear indication that vital needs and programs are being sacrificed. I am dismayed about this budget because the majority failed to make in order any of the amendments offered before the Rules Committee that would have restored many of the cuts proposed by the president.

None of the (4) amendments I offered in committee were ruled in order. Consequently, my efforts to restore \$379 million for Community Development Block Grants (CDBG's) to the purchasing power level of FY 2002 will not become a reality. These grants are critical to local communities. They fund programs that promote economic development in low and moderate-income communities and are used to eliminate or prevent slums and blight and to address needs that pose a threat to the health and safety of our communities. The cuts, if implemented, would affect wealthy and low and moderate-income communities that receive CDBG's.

I also advocated restoring funding for employment and training programs, which was cut by \$686 million from the 2001 level. My amendment would have restored the funding for the Youth Opportunity grants program back to its current 2002 level which would have amounted to a nominal add-back of \$180.6 million to the program for 2003.

Youth training services prepare low-income youth for academic and employment success. They are vital to curtailing high school dropout rates, increasing college enrollment, and improving the unemployment rate of young adults.

I also sought to restore a modest amount of \$3 million to the Public Health Service's Office of Minority Health that is located in the Department of Health and Human Services. The funding would be used to reverse the tragic imbalance and racial disparity in terms of babies born in the African American and white communities in our country whereby a black baby born today is twice as likely to die within the first year of life than a white baby. That baby is twice as likely to be born prematurely and at a low birth weight.

We must do all that we can to determine why out of 1,000 births, 14 African American babies die, while for their white counterparts it is only 6 out of 1,000.

Had my amendment been ruled in order, I would have been able to make the case to have the Secretary of HHS undertake research, in collaboration with other relevant agencies, to help address and eliminate racial health disparities in birth outcomes. This is one of our Government's Healthy People 2010 target goals.

Finally, I offered an amendment that would reduce the proposed \$28 billion in new tax cuts in order to pay for the additional highway spending. This amendment adds \$1.3 billion to the highway program for 2003 with similar increases in the following years, adjusted for inflation. This would put the total add-back from the President's budget to \$5.7 billion, since the budget committee has already added back \$4.4 billion.

Continued investment in highway infrastructure will contribute to job creation and protection as the economy recovers from recession. We simply cannot afford to shortchange our infrastructure needs.

Mr. Chairman, these are just some of the shortcomings of the budget being offered today. At this time in our nation's history, we can ill-afford to withdraw our important legacy of social and health services.

Too many Americans are in need and feeling the impact of September 11th. Our Government's support is more vitally required than ever in these difficult days. Our funding of key programs must be sustained, if our fellow Americans are not to lose faith in our leadership.

Money counts for all Americans but if you are unemployed, hungry, elderly and sick, homeless and or a dependent child, it is a lifeline and a commitment that must be kept. Our Government should shortchange no American and that is why this budget is so disappointing. The gap between our socioeconomic reality and this proposal is daunting. The Budget does not add up, Mr. Chairman, and should be voted down.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the budget offered by the Republican Majority.

Today's Washington Post contained a remarkable report that an Antarctic ice shelf the size of Rhode Island just shattered and collapsed into the sea. Scientists say that they have never seen as large a loss of ice mass and that the disintegration was all the more remarkable because of the extraordinary rapidity of the collapse. An ice mass 1,200 square miles in area and 650 feet thick that had existed for 12,000 years disintegrated in 35 days.

I bring this to my colleagues' attention because the disintegration of the Federal Government's budget position over the last year has been nearly as staggering. Eight years of hard-won budgetary gains and fiscal discipline were thrown out the window in a single year. Last year's projected ten-year budget surplus of \$5.4 trillion dollars collapsed literally before our eyes, sacrificed to the irresponsible tax and budget policies of the Administration and the Republican Majority in Congress.

Just nine months ago, the Chairman of the Budget Committee said, "This Congress will protect 100 percent of the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds. Period. No speculation. No supposition. No projections." This promise echoed similar pledges by the Speaker, the Majority Leader, and the Majority Whip to place the Social Security and Medicare sur-

pluses in a lockbox and build a firewall between the Social Security and Medicare trust funds and the rest of the budget.

Well, here we are twelve months later and \$4 trillion poorer. The lockbox has been smashed open. The firewall has been breached. The promises of the Republican Majority have been broken. The budget before the House today raids Social Security and Medicare this year. It raids Social Security and Medicare next year. It raids Social Security and Medicare the year after that. It raids Social Security and Medicare for as far as the eye can see.

Last year's budget resolution placed our nation's finances in a deep hole. The budget before the House today digs the hole deeper. It robs us of a chance to address critical needs, like a real prescription drug benefit for seniors and adequate funding to modernize our kids' schools and reduce class size. The return of large, multi-year budget deficits will also make it much more difficult to strengthen the Social Security and Medicare programs in advance of the Baby Boom generation's retirement, which begins in 2008 when the leading edge of the Baby Boom enters their retirement years.

I urge the House to vote down this budget so we can begin work on a bipartisan budget resolution that meets our responsibilities, restores our fiscal health, and keeps faith with the promises all of us have made to the American people.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican's fatally flawed budget resolution. Here we go again. The Republican resolution is simply smoke and mirrors. It's a "pretend" budget so deceptive that if it were an ad, the public would sue for violations of the truth in advertising laws and they would win!

Not even the transparent ploy of using five-year budget estimates from the President's Office of Management and Budget rather than the usual ten-year budget estimates from the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office can hid the fact that the Republican budget resolution would raid virtually all of the Social Security and Medicare surpluses over the next five years in order to pay for the fiscal chaos caused by last year's irresponsible tax bill.

Five times last year, here in the House, we voted almost unanimously for a Social Security "lockbox". The President and the Republican leadership repeatedly pledged their commitment to that Social Security lockbox. In this budget, the Republicans don't just pick the lockbox. They shatter it with a sledge hammer!

Don't be fooled. When you get rid of the accounting smoke and mirrors in the President's budget, the non-defense domestic spending is not even a "current services" budget. This budget is replete with severe program cuts. Cuts that low income Americans simply cannot take. We are left with much less than we had to begin with. Where is the money for a real prescription drug benefit? For affordable housing? For Head Start? For Education? For Job training? For worker health and safety?

The deceptive "pretend" Republican budget ignores the cost of the Supplemental that will be offered as soon as this budget resolution leaves the House. It ignores the cost of providing relief to millions of middle class taxpayers to keep them from being subjected to the alternative minimum tax. It ignores the cost of the Republican proposal to make permanent the tax cuts from last year's bill. It pro-

vides woefully inadequate resources for a prescription drug benefit and makes any prescription drug benefit compete with both the cost of provider "givebacks" and the costs of unspecified Medicare "modernization".

Mr. Chairman, we need a budget that provides a real prescription drug benefit, improves education, ensures the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, and pays down the national debt. We need an honest budget, not this sham Republican press release.

Securing our national defense and homeland security, adopting a real prescription drug benefit, improving education, providing affordable housing for the poor and the homeless, maintaining the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, paying down the national debt—that's the American agenda, not continuing to squander our resources on overly large tax cuts tilted toward those who need it least. We can and must do better. Reject the Republican budget.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, like all Americans, I believe that we must meet our most pressing priorities of protecting our country against terrorism, improving our international relations, and growing our economy. I agree with the president that these current challenges warrant small, short-term deficit spending.

However, I am concerned about the lack of sound budgeting practices in the Republican Budget offered today. Under their plan we cannot both address our most pressing current needs, and establish a framework for a long-term, sustainable revenue and spending plan without relying on massive borrowing.

The Republican Budget spends most of the Social Security surplus and all of the Medicare surplus, putting us in terrible position to deal with the impending entitlement crises when the baby boomers retire. Despite promises last year from both the White House and Congress to save every single dollar of the Social Security surplus and Medicare surplus, and Congress' votes for a Social Security "lockbox" five times in the past few years, this budget uses nearly all the Medicare and Social Security surpluses—more than 86 percent of the Social Security surplus and every penny of the Medicare surplus.

The Republican budget also just isn't honest—it doesn't take into account the tax and spending programs that both Republicans and Democrats know Congress is going to pass.

For example, the individual Alternative Minimum Tax will balloon twenty-fold by 2012, affecting 39 million households (34 percent of all taxpayers), but fixing that problem isn't in the budget. Republicans also support making permanent last year's tax cuts, which would cost \$569 billion and Speaker Dennis Hastert plans to bring up an additional tax cut bill this spring. None of these items are in the budget.

And in terms of spending, the White House has said that it will submit a supplemental appropriations request for defense and homeland security that will certainly be approved by Congress—but that isn't in the budget either. They are assuming non-defense, non-homeland security discretionary spending will be kept at only five percent of the levels necessary to maintain current levels of services in 2003. We all know that's an unrealistic projection—even under Republican control of Congress, spending has always increased on these programs.

Another problem with the Republican Budget is that it uses the optimistic, rosy projections from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) rather than the more conservative Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projections. Over the next five years, the difference between CBO and OMB revenue projections is \$110.4 billion. OMB also plans on the government spending \$48 billion less over the same five year period on mandatory spending programs like Medicare and veterans' benefits. That's a lot of ifs.

To be perfectly honest, I don't really care whether the numbers we use are labeled CBO, OMB or UFO, but I do believe that it's sound budgeting practice to use more conservative numbers when you're balancing your checkbook.

The bottom line is that even with all of these budget tricks and gimmicks that make it look like we can have everything we want, the budget is still in deficit and our debt is still climbing. The budget deficit for next year is projected to be \$46 billion, and we'll be in deficit every year for ten years. By 2007, when the baby boomers start to retire, the government will owe more debt to the public—nearly \$3.5 trillion—that it does today.

Our federal budget needs to be more balanced and fiscally responsible than today's Republicans proposal.

I had hoped that House Republicans would recognize the need and the real possibility for bipartisan cooperation on developing a proposal for the federal budget. If the House leadership is willing to invite more people to the table, to go to an economic conference as we've suggested, I am confident that we can have a federal budget that will protect the country against terrorism, lend needed support to our military, take care of workers at home, and pay for needed programs like education, healthcare and social security as well as ensuring a strong economic foundation for the future.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Fiscal Year 2003 Budget Resolution and to commend my colleagues on the Budget Committee for their hard work and efforts to produce a strong wartime budget that meets the needs of our nation. This budget directly addresses America's security needs—fighting the war on terrorism and protecting American citizens—without neglecting our domestic priorities.

I am especially proud of the way this budget addresses the needs of our nation's 25 million veterans. First of all, discretionary spending for veterans totals \$26.8 billion for 2003. That is a 12 percent increase over 2002 levels. VA medical care funding is increased to \$23.9 billion and another \$1.145 billion is included to prevent instituting a \$1500 deductible for Priority 7 veterans.

In addition, this budget provides the funds necessary to correct the concurrent receipt restriction for veterans with 60 percent or higher disability ratings. Current law requires that a veteran's retired pay be reduced by the amount of disability benefits he or she receives. This is an unfair practice and I am proud to support a budget that will end this restriction.

The FY03 budget has the support of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AMVETS and many others. Their support further indicates that we are on the right track to meet the critical needs of vet-

erans. I would like to thank Chairman NUSSE and the Budget Committee for putting this sound resolution together and urge all of my colleagues to support this measure and ensure adequate funding for our nation and our veterans.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, on July 11, 2001, Republican House Majority Leader DICK ARMEY said, "We must understand that it is inviolate to intrude against either Social Security or Medicare and if that means forgoing or, as it were, paying for tax cuts, then we'll do that." Unfortunately, the Republican Budget Resolution does not reflect that sentiment in the least. The House Republicans are offering a budget that virtually spends almost the entire Social Security surplus to pay for last year's tax breaks that mostly benefit the wealthy.

I urge all my colleagues to oppose this Budget Resolution and here is why:

First, the Republican Budget Resolution would take over \$1 trillion from the Social Security Trust Funds and eliminate the Medicare surplus over the next five years.

The President and every House Republican leader promised last year that every single dollar of the Social Security and Medicare surpluses would be saved for Social Security and Medicare. With this Republican budget, virtually no dollar of the Social Security and Medicare surpluses will be saved for Social Security or Medicare.

The Congressional Budget Office reports that the single biggest factor in the disappearing surplus is the Bush tax cut, not the war on terrorism or the recession.

Second, the Republican Budget Resolution abandons domestic priorities.

The Budget Resolution: cuts \$90 million from last year's bipartisan legislation that funds our nation's main elementary and secondary education programs; eliminates the Community Access Programs (CAP) and Health Professions Training program, freezes funding for the Ryan White AIDS Programs, and slashes funding for Rural Health Activities by \$54 million; cuts the Violence Against Women Act Grants, and funds the Legal Services Corporations well below needed levels; cuts state and local law enforcement grants by \$1.7 billion; funds the Community Development Block Grant program at \$379 million below what is needed to maintain current levels; does not include an additional \$1.3 billion in federal highway funding requested by the Democrats.

Third, the Republican Budget Resolution does not offer seniors a comprehensive, affordable, and voluntary prescription drug benefit under Medicare.

Finally, the Republican Resolution does not take into account future impending costs like additional funding for homeland security, response to natural disasters, which will require more funds for FEMA and other federal agencies. None of these or other certain or likely contingencies are accommodated in the resolution, making its projections highly suspect.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, this year's budget provides the resources for education reform while funding a nation at war.

As one of the authors of the bipartisan education bill signed by the President in January, I'm proud to support this budget. It's a compassionate one that reflects our nation's priorities and helps states and local schools meet the promise of education reform.

It's a clear statement that this Congress and this President will not turn its back on our children and their future, even in a time of war.

This budget builds on the significant increases provided for education in recent years—an average annual increase of 14.3 percent over the past four years.

[TEACHERS.] I'm particularly proud of the support this budget provides for school teachers. President Bush and Congress have provided a 35 percent increase in federal teacher quality funds to help states and local schools put a quality teacher in every classroom by 2005. The President's budget request this year maintains this historic level of support. We're asking a lot of teachers, and they deserve our support.

[SPECIAL EDUCATION.] The budget provides a \$1 billion increase for special education, putting us on track for full-funding of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act within 10 years. It also paves the way for us to make long-overdue changes to IDEA to ensure that children with special needs are not left behind. I'm especially grateful that our Budget Committee colleagues have taken this step.

Building on last year's reforms, the budget also:

[LOW-INCOME SCHOOLS.] Provides a \$1 billion increase in Title I grants to low-income schools—on top of last year's \$1.6 billion increase—focusing resources on the highest-poverty school districts.

[READING FIRST.] Provides a \$100 million increase for the President's plan to improve reading instruction by addressing reading difficulties at an early age through proven scientific methods.

[HEAD START.] Increases Head Start by \$130 million to increase children's preparedness for learning when they enter school.

[CHARTER SCHOOLS.] Provides \$100 million in new funding for charter school facility financing.

[EXPANDED PARENTAL CHOICE.] Funds new tax relief measures, such as education tax credits, to assist parents transferring their children from chronically-failing or dangerous schools.

[HISTORICALLY-BLACK COLLEGES & HISPANIC SERVING INSTITUTIONS.] Provides a 3.6 percent increase for assisting historically black colleges, universities and graduate institutions, as well as Hispanic-serving institutions.

[PELL GRANTS.] Maintains the maximum Pell Grant at a historic high of \$4,000.

The budget also paves the way for other priorities such as welfare reform and child care. Funding for the Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG) has more than doubled in the last five years to \$2.1 billion. This budget keeps that commitment to help move more Americans toward independence and self-reliance.

I also want to commend the committee for providing significant increases in funding for two key Department of Labor offices that help to safeguard the pension assets and retirement security of American workers. The budget provides a \$3 million increase for the Office of Labor Management Statistics, and a \$7 million increase for the Office of Inspector General.

Budgets are about tough choices. But there are some who don't want to make choices. There are some who dare to suggest that this budget somehow shortchanges our children.

They say they want more funding for education, but they won't put forth their own budget to tell us how they'd get to that goal. Students, teachers, and parents deserve to know: Which tax would they raise? Which program would they eliminate?

Last week's action in the Budget Committee offered a hint. Last week, Democrats offered 17 amendments to the proposed budget. Taken together, the amendments totaled \$205 billion in new spending and \$175 billion in new taxes over five years.

Mr. Chairman, in this time of national emergency, what Americans want is leadership—not gamesmanship.

I'm proud to support this budget, which responds to our nation's challenges without forgetting the promise to the children who are our future.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, last year, when the Republican leadership brought their budget resolution to the floor I commented that they were "leading us down a fiscally dangerous path." Now that we are debating the fiscal year 2003 budget resolution, it is clear that the Republican leadership has no intention of exiting that treacherous route.

This 2003 budget resolution, like its 2002 predecessor proposed by the same Republican majority, is fiscally irresponsible and puts at risk Congress's ability to live up to our commitments to public welfare, the environment, and important infrastructure projects.

The Social Security trust fund is being invaded for more than \$1 trillion over the five-year budget window. In addition the entire Medicare surplus will be sacrificed. At the same time, the purchasing power of our domestic programs is being reduced by more than \$20 billion in fiscal 2003 alone. Instead of providing necessary funding for critical domestic needs, the Republican leadership is taking Social Security and Medicare funds paid from the wages of working people and returning it through tax cuts to the corporations and individuals who are least in need.

The public deserves an honest, long-term budget, but Congress is not able to provide one when there is such a broad disconnect between what the Republican leadership promises and what they deliver. The opportunity for an honest debate with alternatives and amendments has been stifled by the closed rule the Republicans have put into place for the debate of this resolution.

In addition to funding the war on terrorism and ensuring homeland security, my constituents in Oregon want the federal government to fulfill its commitment to domestic priorities, which includes Social Security, the environment, education, and necessary infrastructure projects. This budget resolution fails our domestic priorities and, therefore, I oppose its passage.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, this is truly an Enron budget. The Republican Budget Committee has cooked the books and produced the most seriously flawed budget in my career.

The accounting gimmicks are spectacular. We have a 5-year budget instead of the customary 10-year budget. This is because it hides dwindling revenue from the gradually implemented Bush tax cut. If refashioned, a 10-year budget would show much larger deficits. Republicans also chose to use the politically crafted OMB numbers, instead of the non-partisan CBO numbers. Whether we insert political or non-partisan numbers into this resolu-

tion, the story is no different at the end of the day. Because all of the accounting tricks in the world cannot hide that we are still raiding Social Security and Medicare. And we are still growing the national debt. The Republican Party is trying to hide a budget deficit of \$257 billion next year and that is just plain wrong.

In this budget, providing a Medicare prescription drug benefit and increasing provider payments do not reflect half of what is necessary according to reasonable forecasts. And this budget does not even take into account the additional spending and further tax cuts proposed by the President. This time next year it is very likely we will have a budget deficit double or triple what is reflected in this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, we need an honest budget, one that provides a prescription drug benefit to our seniors, keeps Social Security solvent for the baby-boomers, and does not further saddle the national debt we are leaving to our children. We can provide a budget that does all this by simply ending the greed. So much of our revenue surplus was squandered on a tax cut that benefitted the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans. And last week, the President invited them back to the feeding trough. We must not pay for this giveaway on the backs of our seniors, children, and all those looking to Social Security for their retirement needs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to keep your promises to your constituents and vote down this budget.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget resolution for fiscal year 2003.

I understand that the nation is engaged in a vital enterprise in response to the vicious attacks of September 11th. I know that fighting to break up terrorist organizations and protecting our country and our people, which I support, are expensive undertakings and the highest national priorities.

But, Mr. Chairman, they are not our only priorities.

From September 11th on, the President has exhorted the American people to continue our normal activities—perhaps being more aware of what's around us, perhaps putting up with more security hassles and delays—but starving the domestic budget is not going to keep us moving forward as I thought the President meant we should.

We still need to invest adequately in health care, education, job training, law enforcement, clean air and water, energy efficiency, economic development, housing, science and technology.

We particularly need to address the impending retirement of the baby boom generation, strengthening Medicare and Social Security, not diverting their surpluses to general government operations.

At bottom, Mr. Chairman, what we need to do in this budget resolution is identify and provide the resources needed to do both of these things—defend and protect ourselves, and invest in the future—which means we must take another look at the huge, irresponsible tax cuts for the wealthy that were enacted last year.

Some people thought we could make the tax cuts and have plenty of money left over to meet the Nation's needs. They were wrong. This budget misses or avoids opportunities as it promises years of deficit spending. This demonstrates that we must revisit the revenue

side and, at a minimum, suspend further cuts until we can afford them.

Mr. Chairman. I am certain we can do better than this budget resolution. I urge my colleagues to vote against it and commit to working together to fashion a new budget resolution that provides the resources to provide both for our security and for our Nation's domestic needs.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to address the issue of funding veterans military retirement in conjunction with veterans disability compensation. I am pleased that the House fiscal year 2003 budget resolution includes funding to eliminate the veterans retirement and disability concurrent receipt offset. The \$6 billion over the next 6 years to gradually provide full benefits to all disabled retirees is long over due.

I firmly believe veterans should not have money taken out of their military retirement to pay for their disability compensation because these are two separate entities that serve two different compensations. I was pleased to co-sponsor legislation to repeal this offset, and I am pleased that by providing funding for concurrent receipt, Congress has finally recognized the importance of keeping its promises to those men and women who have risked their lives, and have suffered injuries in preserving our freedom.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Budget Resolution. This is a good budget that will serve our Nation well during this time we are at war with terrorists. It funds our national security as well as addressing our homeland security needs while ensuring that many other problems are addressed.

To touch upon just a few of the many worthy items in this budget, I want to highlight the support in this budget for local firefighters, disabled military retirees, home healthcare and IDEA funding.

Firefighters often provide the backbone of both rural and urban communities in our Nation. They risk their lives in order to save the lives and property of others. I am gratified that the Budget Committee was able to recognize their important contributions by encouraging this Congress to continue to provide grants directly to local firefighters.

I am also pleased that this resolution provides funding to address the concurrent receipt problem facing our military retirees who are disabled. This budget puts us on a path to eliminate the concurrent receipt problem within 5 years for our military retirees who are the most severely disabled.

I also want to applaud the Committee for continuing its commitment to ensure that home healthcare remains available to our elderly. A 15 percent cut in reimbursements to home health providers scheduled for October 1, 2002 will devastate the industry and ultimately force many of our elderly out of their own homes and into hospitals and nursing home facilities.

Finally, this budget continues the commitment of this Congress to work hard toward fully funding its commitment to assist schools in educating students with special education needs. We include \$1 billion over last year or a 12 percent increase. Further, we commit to providing 12 percent increases every year over the next 10 years so that we fully fund the commitment made by Congress on IDEA funding.

This budget also does so much more to protect the American people. I commend it to all

of my colleagues and urge you to support H. Con. Res. 353, the Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2003.

Mr. PASTOR, Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this misguided budget resolution.

After 28 years of deficit spending and digging our children into deeper and deeper debt, in 1998, we finally balanced the budget and experienced budget surpluses. This lasted for only 5 years, and then a misguided \$1.4 trillion tax cut threw us into fiscal irresponsibility once more. Now, this budget sends us into deficit spending as far as the eyes can see.

As bad as deficit spending may be, what is worse, we are once again raiding Social Security and Medicare.

We have taken endless votes in this House to ensure that we protected Social Security. We voted time and time again to place the Social Security trust fund into a "lockbox." But this lockbox has been smashed open and Social Security has been raided so that we can give the wealthiest among us a huge tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the President's efforts to stop terrorism. We must fund our military and homeland security. We must ensure that we are safe to travel our country and the world. We must support our President in this effort.

But, we cannot neglect the other needs of our people. We should fully fund education programs for all ages. We should ensure that our Nation's infrastructure is modern and safe. We must find a way to provide health care for those millions who have no health care options. We must find a way to provide prescription drug coverage for our elderly. And we must do whatever it takes to protect Social Security.

It is my contention that this budget is broken. We might be better served to start over, to sit down with the President and come up with a new plan, a plan that protects us from those who wish to do us harm, a plan to protect our children from ignorance, a plan to protect our elderly from sickness, a plan to protect our children from added fiscal irresponsibility, and a plan to protect Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, I regretfully oppose this budget. Let's start over with the President. If we work together we can do all these things.

Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. Chairman, the budget resolution we are considering today is more of a campaign pamphlet than it is a deliberative piece of legislation. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I'm pleased to say that the work of the Budget Committee is no longer grounded in fiscal reality but more apt to produce what we call soundbite legislation. Once again, we are seeing that budget resolutions can engage in flights of fancy, while the Appropriations Committee will be forced to do the hard work of deciding how the real money will be spent in this place. This resolution really makes the budget process a sham. This is a budget that's based less on sound economic assumptions and more on the principles of Enronomics.

The supporters of this budget are working on a selling job to make you believe that this plan will provide a balanced budget by fiscal year 2010. But what we are told is far different from the fiscal reality. This is feel good legislation that will exact fiscal harm and pain in the out years. To hide the real truth, the Republican budget purposely uses 5 year numbers instead of 10.

The Republican budget is simply irresponsible. In its budget, the GOP proposes new tax cuts and funds these cuts by spending hundreds of billions from the Social Security trust fund to pay for other programs. Moreover, the Republican leadership plans to bring to the floor next month even larger tax cuts and has expressed support for making permanent the provisions in last year's tax cut. CBO estimates that by making these tax cuts permanent, revenues would be reduced by \$569 billion over 10 years.

Democrats want a budget that reflects our Nation's priorities. Unfortunately, key Democratic amendments on key issues that the majority of Americans care deeply about were blocked by Republicans from reaching the House floor.

An amendment I offered relating to prescription drugs, which would have ensured that seniors receive a prescription drug benefit that is comprehensive and meaningful, was blocked from being considered on the floor. Unfortunately, the \$350 billion that the Republicans have proposed in their budget for Medicare reform and prescription drugs would barely make a dent in helping seniors and the disabled in getting the prescription drug coverage they need—and deserve. We have all made this a pledge with our words—the test is to show it with the numbers laid out in the budget resolution. The Republican resolution fails miserably at this test.

Their budget also fails to adequately fund other key priorities so important to Americans and our future, such as education, child care, and environmental protections.

The Republicans budget aims to hide the truth and the real costs over the years. I oppose this budget resolution and urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 107-380 is adopted and the concurrent resolution, as amended, is considered read.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 353) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2003 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2007, pursuant to House Resolution 372, he reported the concurrent resolution, as amended pursuant to that resolution, back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 209, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]
YEAS—221

Aderholt	Goss	Peterson (PA)
Akin	Graham	Petri
Armey	Granger	Pickering
Bachus	Graves	Pitts
Baker	Green (WI)	Platts
Balenger	Greenwood	Pombo
Barr	Grucci	Portman
Bartlett	Gutknecht	Pryce (OH)
Barton	Hansen	Putnam
Bass	Hart	Quinn
Bereuter	Hastert	Radanovich
Biggert	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad
Bilirakis	Hayes	Regula
Blunt	Hayworth	Rehberg
Boehler	Hefley	Reynolds
Boehner	Herger	Riley
Bonilla	Hilleary	Rogers (KY)
Bono	Hobson	Rogers (MI)
Boozman	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Horn	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (SC)	Hostettler	Roukema
Bryant	Houghton	Royce
Burr	Hulshof	Ryan (WI)
Burton	Hunter	Ryan (KS)
Buyer	Hyde	Saxton
Callahan	Isakson	Schaffer
Calvert	Issa	Schrook
Camp	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Cannon	Jenkins	Sessions
Cantor	Johnson (CT)	Shadegg
Capito	Johnson (IL)	Shaw
Castle	Johnson, Sam	Shays
Chabot	Jones (NC)	Sherwood
Chambliss	Keller	Shimkus
Coble	Kelly	Shuster
Collins	Kennedy (MN)	Simmons
Combest	Kerns	Simpson
Cooksey	King (NY)	Skeen
Cox	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Crane	Kirk	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Cubin	Kolbe	Souder
Culberson	LaHood	Stearns
Cunningham	Latham	Stump
Davis, Jo Ann	LaTourette	Sullivan
Davis, Tom	Leach	Sununu
Deal	Lewis (CA)	Sweeney
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Tancredo
DeMint	Linder	Tauzin
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	Lucas (KY)	Terry
Dreier	Lucas (OK)	Thomas
Duncan	Manzullo	Thornberry
Dunn	McCrery	Thune
Ehrlich	McHugh	Tiahrt
Emerson	McInnis	Tiberi
English	McKeon	Toomey
Everett	Mica	Upton
Ferguson	Miller, Dan	Vitter
Flake	Miller, Gary	Walden
Fletcher	Miller, Jeff	Walsh
Foley	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Forbes	Morella	Watkins (OK)
Fossella	Myrick	Watts (OK)
Frelinghuysen	Nethercutt	Weldon (FL)
Gallegly	Ney	Weller
Ganske	Northup	Whitfield
Gekas	Norwood	Wicker
Gibbons	Nussle	Wilson (NM)
Gilchrest	Osborne	Wilson (SC)
Gillmor	Ose	Wolf
Gilman	Otter	Young (AK)
Goode	Oxley	Young (FL)
Goodlatte	Pence	

NAYS—209

Abercrombie	Boucher	Cummings
Ackerman	Boyd	Davis (CA)
Allen	Brady (PA)	Davis (FL)
Andrews	Brown (FL)	Davis (IL)
Baca	Brown (OH)	DeFazio
Baird	Capps	DeGette
Baldacci	Capuano	Delahunt
Baldwin	Cardin	DeLauro
Barcia	Carson (IN)	Deutsch
Barrett	Carson (OK)	Dicks
Becerra	Clay	Dingell
Bentsen	Clayton	Doggett
Berkley	Clement	Dooley
Berman	Clyburn	Doyle
Berry	Condit	Edwards
Bishop	Conyers	Engel
Blumenauer	Costello	Eshoo
Bonior	Coyne	Etheridge
Borski	Cramer	Evans
Boswell	Crowley	Farr

Fattah	Lowey	Rodriguez
Filner	Luther	Roemer
Ford	Lynch	Ross
Frank	Maloney (CT)	Rothman
Frost	Maloney (NY)	Roybal-Allard
Gephardt	Markey	Rush
Gonzalez	Mascara	Sabo
Gordon	Matheson	Sanchez
Green (TX)	Matsui	Sanders
Hall (OH)	McCarthy (MO)	Sandlin
Hall (TX)	McCarthy (NY)	Sawyer
Harman	McCollum	Schakowsky
Hastings (FL)	McDermott	Schiff
Hill	McGovern	Scott
Hilliard	McIntyre	Serrano
Hinches	McKinney	Sherman
Hinojosa	McNulty	Skelton
Hoeffel	Meehan	Slaughter
Holden	Meek (FL)	Smith (WA)
Holt	Meeks (NY)	Snyder
Honda	Menendez	Solis
Hooley	Millender-	Spratt
Hoyer	McDonald	Stark
Inslie	Miller, George	Stenholm
Israel	Mink	Strickland
Jackson (IL)	Mollohan	Stupak
Jackson-Lee	Moore	Tanner
(TX)	Moran (VA)	Tauscher
Jefferson	Murtha	Taylor (MS)
John	Nadler	Thompson (CA)
Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)
Jones (OH)	Neal	Thurman
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Tierney
Kaptur	Obey	Towns
Kennedy (RI)	Olver	Turner
Kildee	Ortiz	Udall (CO)
Kilpatrick	Owens	Udall (NM)
Kind (WI)	Pallone	Velazquez
Kleczka	Pascarell	Visclosky
Kucinich	Pastor	Waters
LaFalce	Paul	Watson (CA)
Lampson	Payne	Watt (NC)
Langevin	Pelosi	Waxman
Lantos	Peterson (MN)	Weiner
Larsen (WA)	Phelps	Weldon (PA)
Larson (CT)	Pomeroy	Wexler
Lee	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Levin	Rahall	Wu
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Wynn
Lipinski	Reyes	
Lofgren	Rivers	

NOT VOTING—5

Blagojevich	Gutierrez	Traficant
Ehlers	Shows	

□ 1955

Mr. JOHN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. RILEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 79, adoption of H. Con. Res. 353, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for FY 2003, I was too late to cast my vote because I was detained in a meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, regarding rollcall votes on today, March 20, 2002:

On rollcall 69, I would have voted "yea" on Approving the Journal.

On rollcall 70, I would have voted "yea" on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree, as Amended H. Res. 339, urging the Government of Ukraine to Ensure a Democratic, Transparent, and Fair Election Process Leading Up to the March 31, 2002 Parliamentary Elections.

On rollcall 71, I would have voted "yea" on Passage of H.R. 3924, the Freedom of Telecommute Act.

On rollcall 72, I would have voted "yea" on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree to H. Res. 371, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding Women's History Month.

On rollcall 73, I would have voted "nay" on the Motion to Adjourn.

On rollcall 74, I would have voted "nay" on the Motion to Adjourn.

On rollcall 75, I would have voted "nay" on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 372, providing for consideration of H. Res. 353, the Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2003.

On rollcall 76, I would have voted "yea" on the Motion to Table Motion to Reconsider H. Res. 372.

On rollcall 77, I would have voted "nay" on Agreeing to H. Res. 372.

On rollcall 78, I would have voted "nay" on the Motion to Table the Motion to Reconsider H. Res. 372.

On rollcall 79, I would have voted "nay" on Agreeing to H. Res. 353, the Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2003.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3694

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3694, the Highway Funding Restoration Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 353, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, Fiscal Year 2003.

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

There was no objection.

COMMENDING MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE AND STAFF FOR WORK ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 353, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2003

(Mr. NUSSLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first of all thank our competitors today. As the old saying goes, I think it was a saying by a former Speaker, the Democrats are just our opposition; it is the Senate that is the real enemy around here. I realize that is probably not appropriate.

The point I am trying to make is that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the Democrats on the Committee on the Budget did an admirable job of presenting their

points of view, both in committee and here on the floor today. I want to thank them for that, and I would also like to thank our staffs.

We get to come on the floor and do all of this debating, but the preparation to put this budget together, like it or not, is done by a lot of work during a lot of hours, many of them late nights, by our staff. Rich Meade and Tom Kahn and the whole gang at the Committee on the Budget do an excellent, professional job.

Again, as I say, like the budget or not, it is professional work and they need to be commended for that.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, throughout this year, the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) and I have tried to maintain an amicability and civility in the committee, which has worked between us because there is a natural relationship of friendship between us to start with.

I commend him for the manner in which he has handled this on the floor. We have deep disagreements, but nevertheless, we have been able to disagree yet not be disagreeable. It is partly because of the manner with which the gentleman has tackled this whole thing, and I commend him for that.

Let me also say to the House staff, they have worked, on both sides, long hours, hard hours. If Members want to see some evidence of the output, look at the walls of this place, at all of the posters they have presented, only a fraction of which ever made it in the well of the House; but nevertheless, they will be seen between now and the next several weeks.

They won, but we will revisit this, I am sure, many times in the future. In any event, I thank the gentleman for the manner in which he has worked.

Mr. NUSSLE. Probably much to the chagrin of many Members who had to listen to this part of the debate.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 2002, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 3762

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and the Workforce have until midnight on Thursday, April 4, 2002, to file a report to accompany H.R. 3762.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF HOUSE AND SENATE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 360) providing for an adjournment or recess of the two Houses, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 360

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Wednesday, March 20, 2002, or Thursday, March 21, 2002, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, April 9, 2002, or until Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, March 21, 2002, Friday, March 22, 2002, or Saturday, March 23, 2002, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, April 8, 2002, or at such other time on that day as may be specified in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10, 2002

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, April 10, 2002.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER, MAJORITY LEADER, AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, April 9, 2002, the Speaker, majority leader, and minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

□ 2000

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE TO TUESDAY, APRIL 9, 2002

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House ad-

journs today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Friday, March 22, 2002, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 360, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3924.

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, COMMITTEE ON BUDGET, AND COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on the Budget, and the Committee on Education and the Workforce:

MARCH 20, 2002.

Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Having been notified of my appointment by the Steering Committee to the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, I hereby tender my resignation from the Committees of Agriculture, Budget, and Education and the Workforce, effective Wednesday, March 20, 2002.

Thank you for your leadership, and I look forward to continuing to work with you on issues important to our party and the nation.

Sincerely,

ERNIE FLETCHER (KY-6),
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 375) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 375

Resolved, That the following Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

Energy and Commerce: Mr. Fletcher.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

DIRECTING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 2356, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 361) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 361

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 2356) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:

(1) Amend section 103(b) to read as follows:
(b) BUILDING FUND EXCEPTION TO THE DEFINITION OF CONTRIBUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(8)(B) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431(8)(B)) is amended—

(A) by striking clause (viii); and

(B) by redesignating clauses (ix) through (xv) as clauses (viii) through (xiv), respectively.

(2) NONPREEMPTION OF STATE LAW.—Section 403 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 453) is amended—

(A) by striking “The provisions of this Act” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the provisions of this Act”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) STATE AND LOCAL COMMITTEES OF POLITICAL PARTIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a State or local committee of a political party may, subject to State law, use exclusively funds that are not subject to the prohibitions, limitations, and reporting requirements of the Act for the purchase or construction of an office building for such State or local committee.”.

(2) In section 304(f)(2)(E) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by section 201(a) of the bill), strike “as defined in section 1101(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(2))” and insert “(as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(20)))”.

(3) In section 316(c)(2) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by section 203(b) of the bill), strike “as defined in section 1101(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(2))” and insert “(as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(20)))”.

(4) Amend section 212(b) to read as follows:
(b) TIME OF FILING OF CERTAIN STATEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 304(g) of such Act, as added by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) TIME OF FILING FOR EXPENDITURES AGGREGATING \$1,000.—Notwithstanding subsection (a)(5), the time at which the statement under paragraph (1) is received by the Commission or any other recipient to whom the notification is required to be sent shall be considered the time of filing of the statement with the recipient.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(A) Section 304(a)(5) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(5)) is amended by striking “the second sentence of subsection (c)(2)” and inserting “subsection (g)(1)”.

(B) Section 304(d)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 434(d)(1)) is amended by inserting “or (g)” after “subsection (c)”.

(5) In section 214(b), strike “the second sentence of section 402(c)” and insert “section 402(c)(1)”.

(6) In section 313(a)(4) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as amended by section 301 of the bill), insert “, without limitation,” after “for transfers”.

(7) In section 607(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code (as amended by section 302 of the bill), insert “not” after “imprisoned”.

(8) In section 301(25) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by section 304(c) of the bill), strike “The term” and insert “For purposes of sections 315(i) and 315A and paragraph (26), the term”.

(9) Amend section 402 to read as follows:

SEC. 402. EFFECTIVE DATES AND REGULATIONS.

(a) GENERAL EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in the succeeding provisions of this section, the effective date of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, is November 6, 2002.

(2) MODIFICATION OF CONTRIBUTION LIMITS.—The amendments made by—

(A) section 102 shall apply with respect to contributions made on or after January 1, 2003; and

(B) section 307 shall take effect as provided in subsection (e) of such section.

(3) SEVERABILITY; EFFECTIVE DATES AND REGULATIONS; JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Title IV shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) PROVISIONS NOT TO APPLY TO RUNOFF ELECTIONS.—Section 323(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by section 101(a)), section 103(a), title II, sections 304 (including section 315(j) of Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 304(a)(2)), 305 (notwithstanding subsection (c) of such section), 311, 316, 318, and 319, and title V (and the amendments made by such sections and titles) shall take effect on November 6, 2002, but shall not apply with respect to runoff elections, recounts, or election contests resulting from elections held prior to such date.

(b) SOFT MONEY OF NATIONAL POLITICAL PARTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except for subsection (b) of such section, section 323 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by section 101(a)) shall take effect on November 6, 2002.

(2) TRANSITIONAL RULES FOR THE SPENDING OF SOFT MONEY OF NATIONAL POLITICAL PARTIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 323(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by section 101(a)), if a national committee of a political party described in such section (including any person who is subject to such section under paragraph (2) of such section), has received funds described in such section prior to November 6, 2002, the rules described in subparagraph (B) shall apply with respect to the spending of the amount of such funds in the possession of such committee as of such date.

(B) USE OF EXCESS SOFT MONEY FUNDS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clauses (ii) and (iii), the national committee of a political party may use the amount described in subparagraph (A) prior to January 1, 2003, solely for the purpose of—

(I) retiring outstanding debts or obligations that were incurred solely in connection with an election held prior to November 6, 2002; or

(II) paying expenses or retiring outstanding debts or paying for obligations that were incurred solely in connection with any runoff election, recount, or election contest resulting from an election held prior to November 6, 2002.

(ii) PROHIBITION ON USING SOFT MONEY FOR HARD MONEY EXPENSES, DEBTS, AND OBLIGATIONS.—A national committee of a political party may not use the amount described in subparagraph (A) for any expenditure (as defined in section 301(9) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431(9))) or for retiring outstanding debts or obligations that were incurred for such an expenditure.

(iii) PROHIBITION OF BUILDING FUND USES.—A national committee of a political party may not use the amount described in subparagraph (A) for activities to defray the costs of the construction or purchase of any office building or facility.

(c) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Federal Election Commission shall promulgate regulations to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act that are under the Commission’s jurisdiction not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) SOFT MONEY OF POLITICAL PARTIES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Election Commission shall promulgate regulations to carry out title I of this Act and the amendments made by such title.

(10) Add at the end of section 403 the following:

(c) CHALLENGE BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Any Member of Congress may bring an action, subject to the special rules described in subsection (a), for declaratory or injunctive relief to challenge the constitutionality of any provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) INITIAL CLAIMS.—With respect to any action initially filed on or before December 31, 2006, the provisions of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to each action described in such section.

(2) SUBSEQUENT ACTIONS.—With respect to any action initially filed after December 31, 2006, the provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply to any action described in such section unless the person filing such action elects such provisions to apply to the action.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object

Mr. Speaker, it has been a long and difficult road to campaign finance reform. But it has been a road well worth taking.

With the adoption of this package of technical amendments, the legislative branch will have worked the people’s will and taken an important step forward in taming the influence of special interests.

I commend the other body for moving expeditiously on Shays-Meehan.

I urge the President to sign immediately this landmark legislation.

The technical amendments before us, with the exception of one, are just that: Technical. They simply correct minor drafting errors and clarify provisions of Shays-Meehan that this House overwhelmingly passed on February 13.

These amendments will help ensure that this historic reform legislation achieves its central purpose: Banning unregulated soft money donations to the National parties.

The foes of Shays-Meehan have lost the battle in Congress. But they are determined to continue the battle on a new battleground, the Judiciary, and they are apparently determined to do whatever it takes to become lead plaintiff.

Under our system of laws, that is their right.

To help them gain standing, one amendment before us authorizes any member of

Congress to challenge this legislation. Supporters of Shays-Meehan are confident the legislation will withstand Constitutional challenge, just as it withstood legislative challenge.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Shays-Meehan to be sent to the White House.

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

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 361.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. TOM DAVIS OF VIRGINIA OR THE HON. FRANK R. WOLF TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH APRIL 9, 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 20, 2002.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM DAVIS or, if not available to perform this duty, the Honorable FRANK R. WOLF to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through April 9, 2002.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,

Speaker of the House of Representatives

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF NATIONAL MUSEUM OF AFRICAN AMERICAN HISTORY AND CULTURE PLAN FOR ACTION PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 2(b) of the National Museum of African American History and Culture Plan for Action Presidential Commission Act of 2001 (P.L. 107-106), the Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment of the following members on the part of the House to the National Museum of African American History and Culture Plan for Action Presidential Commission:

As voting members:

Ms. Vicky A. Bailey, Washington, D.C.,

Mr. Earl G. Graves, Sr., New York, New York,

Mr. Michael L. Lomax, New Orleans, Louisiana,

Mr. Robert L. Wright, Alexandria, Virginia,

Mr. Lerone Bennett, Jr., Clarksdale, Mississippi,

Ms. Claudine K. Brown, Brooklyn, New York.

As nonvoting members:

Mr. J.C. WATTS, Jr., Norman, Oklahoma,

Mr. JOHN LEWIS, Atlanta, Georgia.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

WE MUST PASS HATES CRIMES BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the United Nations International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. What better way to honor this day than to act upon legislation that will help law enforcement investigate and prevent crimes based on discrimination?

That is why I ask my colleagues to join me to encourage the Republican leadership to bring the gentleman from Michigan's (Mr. CONYERS) bill, H.R. 1343, the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act, to the House floor.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), and others that will be here this evening for their commitment to this issue and their time to speak about it.

Hate crimes have been a persistent problem in the United States. The FBI recently released its hate crimes statistics of 2000. Sadly the report indicated that bias-motivated crimes continue to increase. During the year 2000, law enforcement reported 8,063 bias-motivated criminal incidents, indicating a 3.5 percent increase since 1999. In this report, crimes based on race ranked number one, while crimes based on religion and sexual orientation ranked second and third.

The most disturbing part of this report is what it does not show. The official numbers barely scratch the surface of the hate crime problem across the country. The true number of hate crimes actually committed last year could top 50,000 according to the Southern Poverty Law Center. Yet hate crimes continue to go unreported because of victims' fear and lack of law enforcement resources.

Mr. Speaker, hate crimes continue to occur every day in our cities and small town. What is extremely disturbing is that some of these crimes are committed by children who have learned a pattern to hate. Such an incident occurred in my home State of California

on March 11 in Huntington Beach, California. Three teenagers confronted a Filipino-American in the rear parking lot of his place of employment.

The teens began shouting racial slurs and "white power" before beating him with metal pipes. After the attack, the victim was even more frightened when he received a call from a person identifying himself as a parent of one of the attackers. This parent proceeded to threaten the victim using racial slurs.

This pattern of violence, Mr. Speaker, cannot continue. Our children are learning to hate from their parents and from their peers. We must set an example in Congress by passing legislation that will help to prevent hate. That is why I am a proud co-sponsor of the gentleman from Michigan's (Mr. CONYERS) bipartisan bill, H.R. 1343, the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act. And Mr. Speaker, I am joined as a co-sponsor by 203 of my colleagues and a growing chorus that wants the Republican leadership to bring H.R. 1343 to the House floor. This bill would offer a real solution by strengthening existing Federal hate crimes laws. H.R. 1343 allows the United States Department of Justice to assist in local prosecutions as well as investigate and prosecute cases in which violence occurs because of the victim's sexual orientation, disability, or gender. It would also eliminate obstacles to Federal involvement in many cases of assaults or murder based on race or religion.

This legislation is too important to ignore, especially during a week the United Nations is reminding the world to end racial discrimination.

The Republican leadership must bring this bill before the House to show our Nation and the world that hate will not be tolerated in the United States. This Congress has a responsibility to fight against hate. And the Conyers bill will prove that commitment.

DO NOT INITIATE WAR ON IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I was recently asked why I thought it was a bad idea for the President to initiate a war against Iraq. I responded by saying that I could easily give a half a dozen reasons why; and if I took a minute, I could give a full dozen. For starters, here is a half a dozen.

Number one, Congress has not given the President the legal authority to wage war against Iraq as directed by the Constitution, nor does he have U.N. authority to do so. Even if he did, it would not satisfy the rule of law laid down by the Framers of the Constitution.

Number two, Iraq has not initiated aggression against the United States. Invading Iraq and deposing Saddam Hussein, no matter how evil a dictator

he may be, has nothing to do with our national security. Iraq does not have a single airplane in its air force and is a poverty-ridden Third World nation, hardly a threat to U.S. security. Stirring up a major conflict in this region will actually jeopardize our security.

Number three, a war against Iraq initiated by the United States cannot be morally justified. Arguing that someday in the future Saddam Hussein might pose a threat to us means that any nation any place in the world is subject to an American invasion without cause. This would be comparable to the impossibility of proving a negative.

Number four, initiating a war against Iraq will surely antagonize all neighboring Arab and Muslim nations as well as the Russians, the Chinese and the European Union, if not the whole world. Even the English people are reluctant to support Tony Blair's prodding of our President to invade Iraq. There is no practical benefit for such action. Iraq could end up in even more dangerous hands like Iran.

Number five, an attack on Iraq will not likely be confined to Iraq alone. Spreading the war to Israel and rallying all Arab nations against her may well end up jeopardizing the very existence of Israel. The President has already likened the current international crisis more to that of World War II than the more localized Viet Nam war. The law of unintended consequences applies to international affairs every bit as much as to domestic interventions, yet the consequences of such are much more dangerous.

Number six, the cost of a war against Iraq would be prohibited. We paid a heavy economic price for the Vietnam war in direct cost, debt and inflation. This coming war could be a lot more expensive. Our national debt is growing at a rate greater than \$250 billion per year. This will certainly accelerate. The dollar cost will be the least of our concerns compared to the potential loss of innocent lives, both theirs and ours. The systematic attack on civil liberties that accompanies all wars cannot be ignored. Already we hear cries for resurrecting the authoritarian program of constricting in the name of patriotism, of course.

Could any benefit come from all this war mongering? Possibly. Let us hope and pray so. It should be evident that big government is anathema to individual liberty. In a free society, the role of government is to protect the individual's right to life and liberty. The biggest government of all, the U.N. consistently threatens personal liberties and U.S. sovereignty. But our recent move toward unilateralism hopefully will inadvertently weaken the United Nations. Our participation more often than not lately is conditioned on following the international rules and courts and trade agreements only when they please us, flaunting the consensus without rejecting internationalism on principle, as we should.

The way these international events will eventually play out is unknown,

and in the process we expose ourselves to great danger. Instead of replacing today's international government, the United Nations, the IMF, the World Bank, the WTO, the international criminal court, with free and independent republics, it is more likely that we will see a rise of militant nationalism with a penchant for solving problems with arms and protectionism rather than free trade and peaceful negotiations.

The last thing this world needs is the development of more nuclear weapons, as is now being planned in a pretense for ensuring the peace. We would need more than an office of strategic information to convince the world of that.

What do we need? We need a clear understanding and belief in a free society, a true republic that protects individual liberty, private property, free markets, voluntary exchange and private solutions to social problems, placing strict restraints on government meddling in the internal affairs of others.

□ 2015

Indeed, we live in challenging and dangerous times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HINOJOSA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. KERNS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. RODRIGUEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RECOGNIZING MS. DIANE S. ROARK

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

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, in the past, usually during consideration of the Intelligence budget, I have risen before this body and mentioned the superb and thoroughly knowledgeable staff that resides in the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, of which we are very proud. These individuals are specially selected because of their knowledge and their understanding of the intelligence world, a world that is actually very arcane and confusing to people who do not spend time in it.

We do not talk a lot about these folks and they do not seek recognition. They are not that kind. They understand that much of the work must be done in secret so as not to betray the sensitive information they handle, but let me assure my colleagues and the American people that this group of dedicated people works very hard, and they dig very deeply into the operations of the Intelligence Community in order to ensure that there is oversight of intelligence activity and that our Nation is secure and the Intelligence Community is playing by the rules.

I want to specifically recognize one of these dedicated people who has served the committee and our country diligently for almost 2 decades. Her name is Diane Roark, and I am sorry to say that when this body reconvenes in April Diane will no longer be on our staff. She is retiring from the House and from government service.

Madam Speaker, Diane first joined the committee in April 1985, having previously served in the Department of Energy, the Department of Defense, and just prior to joining us, on the National Security Council, where she was Deputy Director of Intelligence Programs. Since joining the committee, Diane has excelled in the very difficult, technical areas of our oversight. She was the program monitor for the National Reconnaissance Office where she not only challenged the embedded bureaucracy and made it become more innovative in approaches to future election, but she also forced the office to restructure and reform their fiscal accountability system so that oversight was assured.

Most recently, Diane has been our program manager for the National Security Agency, a vital agency for us. This agency has many, severe challenges, Madam Speaker, and if it were not for the efforts of Ms. Roark, I do believe that our committee's efforts to oversee and advocate for NAS would have been much less effective, and for that she has my personal thanks.

Diane is known as a very dedicated, tough-minded program monitor who digs into the issues and forces agencies to see and understand what they sometimes miss themselves. She is also known as a very knowledgeable task master, and her arrival at an agency is often anticipated with apprehension.

Those managing the community know that she is usually on the mark with her assessments and that she takes the public's trust very well to heart. Recently, one of the senior managers within the community commented on her performance by saying that our staff "is very aggressive in their oversight and has a very serious and in-depth knowledge of our programs, sometimes a better understanding than some of the senior managers do."

I think that this is the type of oversight capability that the American people are entitled to and should de-

mand. I cannot think of any greater tribute for Diane than knowing that agency leaders throughout the community recognize that her instincts and assessments are sound.

So, Madam Speaker, it is with some sadness that I rise today to say farewell to a public servant who has dedicated a career to ensuring our security, each and every one of us. Diane's departure is truly our loss, although I know that her younger son, Bryce, will enjoy having Mom around home more. We are going to miss her.

On behalf of the committee I thank Diane for her professionalism, her dedication, her unflinching commitment to our Nation and its security. We wish her well in her future endeavors, whatever they be. Know that she has served her country well and she will be missed. Job well done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMMENDING LOCAL UNITED WAY CHAPTERS FOR CONTINUING SUPPORT OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the 97 percent of all local United Way chapters which continue to support the Boy Scouts of America despite the national campaign to demonize this wonderful organization.

The pressure to abandon the Boy Scouts has been just as intense as the pressure on the scouts themselves to abandon their moral standards and to take God out of the scout oath. Powerful business interests and Hollywood moguls like Steven Spielberg have severed their links with the scouts, and the taxpayer-funded public broadcasting system have attacked them as well. However, an overwhelming majority of the United Way chapters and the American people themselves have not cowered and have stood tall against this disgraceful campaign of intimidation.

In my own constituency, for instance, the Orange County United Way Chapter has given local scout troops and organizations \$1.3 million over the last 3 years and has no sign of letting up. Just recently, the City of Huntington Beach, for example, has named itself the Tree City USA for its greenery. Many of those trees in Huntington Beach were planted by local boy scout troops doing their good deeds and community service.

The United Way chapters that did cave into the pressure were mostly

from liberal university towns where ordinary decency is often treated with scorn and derision, but in the American heartland, in communities where families jealously guard virtues like loyalty and bravery and reverence, the support for the Boy Scouts has remained steadfast, and I would encourage every American to inquire as to what their local United Way is doing in this controversy.

One of the supreme ironies with this campaign against the scouts is that local Americans, ordinary Americans have stepped up and stepped into the breach to support the scouts when the United Way has pulled its support. This overwhelming backing for the scouts has exposed the opposition for what it is, marginal and well financed and vocal but a vitriolic minority nonetheless.

Mainstream America obviously believes that the Boy Scouts have the right to set their own moral standards and to include God in the scout oath. By the way, the Girl Scouts of America, which have many wonderful programs and are celebrating an anniversary this year, gave in to political correctness when it came to God and their scout oath. It is no longer required for Girl Scouts to acknowledge God in the scout oath. This is especially sad when young girls need a spiritual foundation to cope with the challenges and the temptations faced by today's young people.

The argument of those attacking the scouts has been that the scouts are being discriminatory. Well, yes, but they have a right to base their organization on certain beliefs like in God or in certain standards of behavior, sexual or otherwise. It is called freedom of association, and to those who call this discrimination, I ask, is this not what gay groups and even AIDS organizations do, discriminate? Some ask what do I mean?

Well, does anyone doubt that Christian fundamentalists are being excluded from these organizations, from homosexual and AIDS organizations because these religious fundamentalists might want to preach at these people? Is this not a discrimination against those people's religion? Well, of course, it is a discrimination against their religion, but those groups, just like the scouts, have a right to have associations based on shared values.

When gays were targeted by police for personal abuse and victimized by hatemongers, their rights were obviously being violated, and good people stood up. They united to end this injustice.

Today, it is the right of people with more traditional values, like the scouts, who are being under attack simply for trying to live their own lives with their own moral standards. The scouts in Orange County, for example, have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal fees in order to protect their right to have God in the scout oath. This is intolerable and the

scouts are not the only ones facing this stupid political correctness.

Recently the Red Cross in Orange County canceled an appearance of a local school chorus before one of their meetings because the songs that were planned to be sung at that meeting mentioned God, like America the Beautiful. Well, later on the Red Cross apologized but only after a hailstorm of criticism.

What is going on here? Americans have a right not to be forced to participate in what they do not believe, but do not people with religious persuasions have a right to have their own standards? Wake up, America. It can get worse and it will get worse unless we stand tall and we stand together against this kind of nonsense.

NUCLEAR POSTURE REVIEW

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion within the Bush administration about where to take the military campaign against terrorism next. The President has already sent military advisers to the Philippines and the Republic of Georgia. His axis of evil comments lumped Iran, Iraq, and North Korea together as potential targets for future U.S. military action. He also indicated he wants to get the United States more deeply involved in Colombia's civil war by helping the government fight guerrilla armies rather than targeting the drug trafficking done by all parties in the war in Colombia.

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution grants Congress the exclusive authority to declare war. As commander-in-chief, the President conducts or would conduct day-to-day operations of our U.S. military. The Constitution and the War Powers Resolution of 1973 grants Congress the prerogative to decide whether or not to send U.S. troops into hostility.

The use of force resolution approved by Congress specifically safeguarded Congress' war powers by noting nothing in the resolution supersedes any requirement of the War Powers Resolution.

While Congress overwhelmingly authorized the President to use military force to respond to the September 11 terrorist attacks, the Congressional authorization was limited in scope. Specifically, the joint resolution stated the President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed or aided the terrorist attack that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons.

Thus far, the United States intelligence agencies with their secret \$32

billion a year budget could not predict the attacks and cannot uncover any links between Iraq and the attackers. Now, many in the administration are latching on to a magazine article written by Seymour Hirsch in the New Yorker who does not get \$32 billion a year from the taxpayers, who has uncovered purported links between some Kurds and the al Qaeda as a potential excuse to attack Iraq.

In December, I sent a letter along with a number of other Members of Congress to the President pointing out the limitations on the use of force authorization and reminding him that he would have to come, as his father did, to the United States Congress for authorization if he desired and felt there was a case to be made to attack Iraq. I have as yet to have a substantive response to that letter.

We at this point, I believe, have sort of a budding imperial presidency, the likes of which we have not seen since Richard Nixon.

There are other areas that are very troubling with this presidency. The nuclear posture review. According to a leaked version of the classified nuclear posture review, the Bush administration is contemplating using nuclear weapons as offensive weapons rather than merely to deter an attack against the United States. They now say they would target seven countries, Russia, China, Libya, Syria, Iraq, Iran and North Korea. This, in fact, includes countries who are not known to have nuclear weapons, an extraordinary change in U.S. policy. They want to develop small, more friendly nuclear weapons that could be used, they believe, in limited instances.

Of course, this would blur the line between conventional nuclear arms, would undermine the nonproliferation treaty which 187 countries have signed, including the United States of America, and that is a very disturbing trend. As Ronald Reagan once said, a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.

We have the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, the most successful treaty on arms limitations in the history of the world, which the President wishes to unilaterally abrogate, calling it a relic of the Cold War. The Constitution is more than 200 years old. I would hope that the President would not find that to be a relic. It is still very relevant today, as is the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. If it is scrapped as the President wishes, if he can legally do that, that is in question, it is likely that China, Russia and other countries would engage in a new crash program to expand nuclear weapons against our potential defenses which, of course, as we all know, the Star Wars fantasy does not work in any place, but it is a great place in which to dump two or three or \$400 billion of hard-earned taxpayers' money.

Finally, in the defense budget we have seen an extraordinary proposal that we should have a 1-year increase

that far exceeds any increases at the height of the Cold War, the Vietnam War, anything since World War II, to build Cold War weapons against enemies that no longer exist. Hopefully this Congress will act soon to rein in this administration, reexert its authority and bring some sanity to these policies.

□ 2030

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PLATTS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HATE CRIMES LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), who asked Members to appear in a Special Order in honor of the United Nations' International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, which takes place Thursday, March 21. I also want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), who introduced H.R. 1343, the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2001.

There is no place in our society for racism, whether in the form of religious and ethnic discrimination or otherwise. Throughout history, wars have been fought over these types of differences. Many lives have been lost and many people uprooted. As in the dark past, today we are still witnessing violence being perpetrated against others with perceived differences. This is something that must be not only rooted out abroad, but we must also root out the ethnic and religious intolerance that we witness in our daily lives right here in our own communities.

Hate crimes, those committed against a group because of racial or religion or sexual orientation, is alive and well in America. Matthew Shepard and James Byrd are notable victims of these types of crimes; but there are many, many other victims as well of this type of crime, this cycle of violence. It has been stated that crimes based on race ranked number one of all the U.S. crimes reported in the FBI's "Hate Crimes Statistics of 2000" status report. The total number of all hate crimes across the Nation increased 3.5

percent from 1999 to 2000. These numbers reflect only the reported crimes. Many crimes continue to go unreported; and many States, because of budgetary reasons, do not keep tallies of crimes that would fall under this category.

The bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) would provide Federal assistance to States and local jurisdictions so that they can more readily report and prosecute hate crimes. It must be understood that violence motivated by race, color, gender, sexual orientation, or disability will not be tolerated.

It is important for Congress to show solidarity with those around the world honoring the United Nations' International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination by showing that we are ready, willing and able to address hate-motivated crimes within our own borders, within our own Nation. Our country and the world is very diverse. It is our diversity that should make us stronger as a Nation, stronger as a world community. Until we eliminate racial, gender, religious, and other types of discrimination, our unity as a country and as a world community will be threatened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATSON of California addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

KIDNAPPING OF LUDWIG KOONS

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, I stand here today in utter shock and disbelief and absolute anger.

For 2 years, I have been telling stories about missing children. For 2 years, I have been talking about internationally abducted children. For 2 years, I have been working with Jeff Koons and his attorneys to help bring his son Ludwig home from Italy. For 2 years, I have not seen progress. No change in Italy, and no response from our own government. I cannot express today the outrage that I feel right now about our Justice Department, our State Department, and the government and judicial systems of Italy.

Since 1984, for 8 years, Jeff Koons has been trying to get his son back, a son who he has legal custody of, who has been abused and neglected and forced to live in a pornographic compound in Rome, Italy, by his mother. On March 4 of 2002, this year, the Supreme Court of Cassation confirmed Ilona Staller's conviction for kidnapping Ludwig from his habitual residence in New York. This means Ilona Staller is a convicted kidnapper; yet Italy is still letting her retain Ludwig.

Yesterday, the Minors' Tribunal in Italy held a so-called hearing on the emergency order to keep Ms. Staller from taking Ludwig to another country, Hungary. And it is a so-called hearing because this hearing was nothing more than a dog and pony show. Ms. Staller was questioned for 15 minutes about her lawbreaking, about her intention to once again take Ludwig to another country. The judge questioned Ludwig, a scared, manipulated and abused 9-year-old little boy, about his wishes, alone, in the judge's chambers, with no witnesses, with no attorneys, with no video. And then the judge comes back in and says he is fine with his life as is.

The best psychologists in both countries, Italy and the United States, and doctors, say that Ludwig is on the brink of no return. Unless he is removed now, there is no telling what damage might be done to him physically and mentally. Yet these experts, the top Italian experts, were not allowed to testify at this so-called hearing.

In the end, the emergency request was denied and Mr. Koons was given 30 days to go prepare briefs and another 20 days to respond. Another 2 months of delay. It is contrary to all applicable principles of public international law and procedure to preclude an American citizen minor, who was kidnapped from his habitual residence, any access to his country of birth, even the temporary visits with his father and paternal family in their country of residence.

Ludwig, who is now approaching adolescence, finds himself in a dire situation that places him in imminent danger of grave and irreparable damage. His critical condition is directly related to his mother's continued abuse and neglect of the minor over the years, combined with her willful and systematic breach of Mr. Koons's visitation rights.

I stand here tonight because I am concerned that Mr. Koons may be subjected to further discrimination and inequitable treatment by the Italian judiciary in these impending proceedings. I stand here a part of the United States Government, and I have to say that I am ashamed. Where are our priorities? Where are our values?

I sit and listen to the politicians sound off about family values in this Chamber every day; yet every day our government lets this little boy remain captive against his will. Where is our State Department? Where is our Justice Department advocating for U.S. citizens? Ludwig Koons is a U.S. citizen.

We saw Blackhawk helicopters recently go in to rescue missionaries in Afghanistan, people who had been there of their own will. Yet our government will not send a letter or make a phone call demanding that this kid be sent back to our country. Do we only go to bat for citizens being held by those who are not our allies? Should we not go to bat for everyone?

Eight years ago, Jeff Koons put his faith in the law. He put his faith in the United States of America. We have not returned that faith. I am asking my colleagues if they will please take the time to ask every constituent of theirs in this country, and that they do the same, and write the President of the United States, write the Attorney General of this country, write the Secretary of State of this country and plead for the return of this child to the United States of America now.

Bring our children home.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, before I take my 5 minutes, I just want to commend my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON), for the leadership he has provided on behalf of missing children in our country and the focus that he has given the United States Congress on this very important issue. I know, from observing him work and the passion he brings to the subject, that there would not be half the focus that there is in the United States Congress if it were not for him and the hard work that he is doing in elevating this issue and educating the rest of us, as well as our administration and the rest of the country, with what a serious problem it is. So I thank the gentleman and ask him to continue the good work. I want him to know that there are many of us who are with him every step of the way.

Madam Speaker, tonight I rise in honor of Women's History Month. In 1987, Congress passed a resolution designating the month of March as Women's History Month, and a time to honor, and I quote, "American women of every race, class and ethnic background who have made historic contributions to the growth and strength of our Nation in countless recorded and unrecorded ways."

For 2002, the theme of Women's History Month has been "Women Sustaining the American Spirit." To celebrate this month, I would like to honor four of the numerous women from Wisconsin's history that have sustained the American spirit.

First, I would like to recognize Ada Deer. Ms. Deer, a Native American activist, was born in Keshena, Wisconsin. Nationally known as a social worker, scholar, teacher, and political leader, Ms. Deer was the first female Chair of the Menominee Nation and the first woman to serve as head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. She continues her work today as a professor at the University of Wisconsin at Madison.

Next, I honor a woman if not well-known to my colleagues is certainly well-known to a lot of our children, Laura Ingalls Wilder. Ms. Wilder was born in a small town on the banks of the Mississippi, Pepin, Wisconsin,

which is in my congressional district. Her early years in this area became the basis for her first book, "Little House in the Big Woods," written when she was 65 years old. This was the first of many successful books that comprised the "Little House" series, which is still read by many children today.

Belle Case LaFollette is another woman whose contributions to Wisconsin's history cannot be overstated. Though it was her husband, Fighting Bob LaFollette, who held office, Belle was a political force in her own right. Born in Juneau County, Wisconsin, she was the first female graduate of the University of Wisconsin Law School. Throughout her life she was a tireless advocate on behalf of women's rights and human rights in general.

Finally, I would like to highlight the work of Georgia O'Keefe, born in Sun Prairie, Wisconsin. Ms. O'Keefe was one of the first nationally recognized female American artists. After attending high school in Edgewood, Wisconsin, she studied in New York City, then left the city to become supervisor of art in the Amarillo, Texas, school system. It was in the natural floral landscapes of the Southwest that she discovered the subjects of her most famous paintings.

Each of these women has had an impact not only on Wisconsin's history, but also on the history of our Nation as a whole. Whether in art or literature, activism or teaching, they deserve our remembrance not only during the month of March but throughout the rest of the year as well.

THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Madam Speaker, tonight several of us are gathered to talk about the budget resolution we passed today, how we got to where we are, and where we need to go in order to protect our Nation's priorities.

I will start by yielding to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), as soon as he is set up; but we also have joining us tonight the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on the Budget, to talk both about how we got to where we are, exactly what we believe the facts to be, because at a minimum the American public deserves to at least have the facts before we debate our different opinions about how we achieve the Nation's priorities; and then to talk a little bit at the conclusion about some of the solutions we have proposed that were rejected.

These solutions were not even allowed to be debated today on the floor of the House of Representatives. But we are confident they will be brought up in the Senate and, hopefully, will be part of a bipartisan solution, because

we cannot achieve a solution in this body, working with the President and the Senate, unless it is truly bipartisan.

So at this time I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me, and I want to thank him for his leadership on the Committee on the Budget. He has been actively involved in trying to shape bipartisan budget agreements, and his knowledge and insight on the subject is invaluable to the institution, and his leadership is appreciated; and I thank him for all his hard work.

Today, anyone tuning into the deliberations on the House floor probably witnessed one of the most important debates we could have in this session of Congress. It sets the terms of the budget for the rest of the year. And not just for this year, but for many years to come. The budget resolution, although nonbinding, establishes the parameters of where spending is going to occur and how we are going to pay for these budget priorities.

That is why the debate we had, I felt, was very important and very constructive, because it not only affects the Nation in the coming fiscal year, but it will affect our seniors who are currently in the Social Security and Medicare programs, the baby boomers, 77 million of whom are rapidly approaching that retirement age in just a few short years and will start entering some of these very important programs, and also the younger generation, our children and grandchildren, who will be asked to clean up, so to speak, the various mistakes that I feel we are making as a Nation and as a body in the budgets and the economic policies that are then pursued over the next couple of years.

□ 2045

Unfortunately, the budget resolution that was before us today was a budget resolution that only Enron could love. It was full of smoke and mirrors, gimmicks, sleight of hand, and deceit, not in the parameters of the budget resolution, but in how we were going to pay for it and what was going to be sacrificed in the course of the coming year and years based on the decisions that we will be making in the months to come.

Even though we have been debating 10-year budget plans with 10-year forecasts, the majority party decided to go with the 5-year. Perhaps they realized with the \$2 trillion tax cut passed last year the effect of the explosion of tax cuts in the second 5 years of this decade and the tremendous impact it is going to have in creating annual structural deficits again.

They also used budget calculations from the OMB within the Bush administration, rather than the established CBO numbers that we have reached bipartisan agreement in using before in scoring all pieces of legislation, not just budget resolutions, but for obvious

reasons, because the OMB numbers coming out of the administration are much more rosy and optimistic than what the CBO numbers show. The Director of the CBO is appointed by the majority party. Why they would reject their CBO numbers can only be explained from the fact that the numbers are based on more realistic economic growth scenarios and the impact of the policy decisions contained in the budget resolution.

Interesting enough, it was in 1995 when the Republicans came into the majority for the first time in a while that they shut the country down by demanding that the Clinton administration use Congressional Budget Office numbers rather than their own OMB numbers. A few years later, they flipped on that issue out of political expedience. Medicare spending in the next decade, they are underestimating the true impact of Medicare costs.

Yogi Berra was fond of saying this is *deja vu* all over again. The budget resolution that we just debated is really a throwback to the economic policies and the budgets that were passed back in the 1980s and the first part of the 1990s. My constituents are surprised to learn when I tell them that the \$7.5 trillion national debt that we now hold as a Nation, that 86 percent of that national debt was accumulated during the 1980s and early 1990s. So this large debt that we have outstanding already is a relatively recent phenomenon attributed to the policies that were pursued in the 1980s and the first part of the 1990s which led the country down the road of annual structural deficits, and using the money that is contained in the Social Security and Medicare trust fund for other measures.

Unfortunately, the budget that passed today, even after 1 year when virtually every Member of the House of Representatives is on record as saying we will not touch those trust fund monies, in fact, dips into those trust funds for other government expenditures.

Just to remind Members who voted for that budget resolution today what they said as recently as last year in regards to the sanctity of the trust fund, which I happen to agree with, and as a member of the New Democratic Coalition, we have been working hard to establish fiscal responsibility and keeping hands off these trust funds, realizing this demographic retirement boom is around the corner.

Last June the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTER) was on the floor stating, "I was very pleased today that the House passed the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act. This important legislation will protect every penny of the Social Security and Medicare surpluses. American workers deserve to know that these important programs will be there for them when they retire."

The budget resolution passed by the Speaker and his party pillages and raids the lockbox proposal that passed last year.

House majority whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), again during last year's debate, "Trust must be put back into the Social Security Trust Fund. The Republican lockbox legislation locks away the entire Social Security surplus and prevents the funds from being spent on other government programs."

House majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), during last year's debate, "I think it is very important for us to remember that the first thing this Congress did was to continue to keep a firewall between our Social Security and our Medicare Trust Funds and the rest of the American budget so no dime's worth of Social Security or Medicare money will be spent on anything other than Social Security and Medicare."

Here we are today dipping heavily into those trust funds.

Finally, the House Committee on the Budget chairman, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), again last year, "This Congress will protect 100 percent of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, period. No speculation, no supposition, no projections."

That is why many of us during the course of the debate were raising alarms in regard to the path which we are embarking upon with the budget resolution. But we were reminded by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, that we also need to maintain some fiscal discipline and not think about the next election or the next election cycle 3 years from now, but start thinking about the next generation. Our own ranking member, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), is quoted as saying during the context of last year's budget debate that set us on the course of these annual structure deficits, "Today I have one priority, one overriding objective, and it is simply this: To make sure that we do not backslide into the hole we just dug ourselves out of. That is my overriding objective, and that is why I have a problem with the Republican resolution, because it leaves so little room for error."

Madam Speaker, 1 year later we have seen how wrong that budget resolution was. There was no built in flexibility for a September 11, for an economic slowdown, and some of these other national emergencies that we must deal with, and hopefully deal with in the short term and get back on fiscal footing again.

What is different today that did not exist in the 1980s and 1990s is we no longer have the luxury of time. We could run some structural deficits during the 1980s and 1990s contributing to the \$5.7 in national debt because we had the rest of the 1990s to recover from that. Through the budgets that were passed in 1993 and 1997, it put us back onto a road of fiscal sanity. We were actually able to run budget surpluses in the last 4 years, wall off the

Social Security and Medicare trust fund, use the surplus to download our national debt and put us on a firmer financial position to deal with the impending baby boom generation's retirement. We do not have that luxury today.

If we continued down that road that existed in the 1980s and first part of the 1990s, we will not have time to recover. This is not a debate about the baby boom retirement, this is a debate fundamentally about the future of my two little boys, Johnny and Matthew, who are 5 and 3. It is their generation that is going to be asked to clean up the fiscal mess that is being created in today's Congress, by postponing these long-term decisions, by dipping into these trust funds, placing IOUs that will have to be paid back virtually simultaneously when the IOUs with the rest of the national debt have to be paid back.

Madam Speaker, I do not think there is any fiscal possibility or way for them to do it when it is time for them to assume the reins of leadership in this country, for their generation to deal with the aging population, and this massive population that will be existing there drawing from the Social Security and Medicare programs for many years to come. This is really a generational argument that we are having.

Whether we are going to be thinking long term, thinking about the future of our children and grandchildren, helping them to be able to assume the leadership and make the policy decisions that they will be asked to make in the years to come, rather than continuing this black hole of fiscal irresponsibility and adding to their obligations and their burdens when they reach the age of responsibility.

Those are just a couple of issues that I wanted to raise here tonight with my colleagues. I think they are important for us to emphasize and talk about. I think it is important for the American people to tune in for this debate and weigh in to this debate. This is not about whether Democrats support the war against terrorism. We are united on that front. This is about how we can still do that and maintain fiscal discipline and the promises for our aging population, but also the promises we should be making to our children and to future generations.

On that front we are failing them miserably unless we can engage the administration on a budget summit which has been proposed by the leadership of our party, getting the President to the table in order to negotiate a bipartisan agreement of how we can turn this down and get back onto the road to fiscal solvency, walling off the trust fund monies, and downloading the national debt, because we still have time before this massive retirement boom begins to hit our country, which is the greatest fiscal challenge which the country will face for many years to come.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), a leader of the Blue Dogs, a paragon of fiscal responsibility among Democrats and Republicans, and a leader on budget issues since he arrived in Congress in 1997.

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. It is a pleasure to join my colleagues tonight on the House floor to talk about the debate that has been ongoing all day in this House regarding the budget resolution for the upcoming fiscal year.

For many of us it was a very difficult and disappointing day in this House, a day when 435 Members debated the future budget of our Nation, and by a margin of just 6 votes chose to abandon fiscal discipline to raid the Social Security Trust Fund and to cease the efforts that we have made for the last 4 years to balance the budget and pay down our debt.

The choice that we had before us on the floor today was very clear. We can go back to deficit spending, raid Social Security, increase our debt; or we could have chosen to continue down the path of fiscal responsibility, balancing our budget, saving Social Security, paying down debt.

The Republicans on the floor of this House today suggested that we are in war and that their budget was justified because we are in war. All of us in this House, every Member agrees completely that we must dedicate whatever funds are necessary to win the war against terrorism. No dollar should be spared in this effort.

But is it right to ask the young men and women in uniform who are fighting this war to also pay for it? That is the effect of what happened here on this floor today. Does the majority party believe that it is right to commit to spend whatever is necessary to fund this war without an equal commitment to pay for it? Does the majority party in this House really believe that calling on young men and women in uniform who are today, tonight, sacrificing for our Nation, risking their very lives, to also be the ones that will have to pay the debts that are created by this budget?

□ 2100

Does the majority party in this House really believe it is right to spend whatever is necessary to win the war on terrorism while at the same time telling those 18- and 19- and 20-year-old soldiers that they will be called on to pay for this war when they are in their prime income-earning years? In my humble judgment, that is not the true spirit of American patriotism.

Deficit spending, borrowing money from the Social Security trust fund to fight this war is not only fiscally irresponsible but it is morally reprehensible. It is an injustice to pass the cost of today's war on to the very generation that is tonight fighting this war. What father in any American family would choose to leave an inheritance to

his children consisting of a pile of debts, a pile of bills? That is the choice the majority party made in this House today.

After 3 years of budget surpluses achieved by courageous votes of Members of previous Congresses, the majority today refused to face up to the fiscal realities of today. Just 1 year ago, the Congressional Budget Office projected that we would have 10 years of surpluses. This year, the Congressional Budget Office projected that we would show deficits for the next 10 years. At your house or mine, in your business or mine, that would prompt us to change course. But not in this House today. Instead, this House chose to go down the path of fiscal irresponsibility. Yes, it was a sad day for the American people in this House and on this floor this afternoon, because the majority decided it was okay to raid the Social Security trust fund to fund their budget.

On at least four occasions on the floor of this House since 1999, this body has voted overwhelmingly to protect the Social Security trust fund, to put it in what we call the lockbox, pledging never again to spend Social Security funds, the retirement fund of every American, to cover debts incurred in the rest of the budget. If any corporate officer in America raided the employees' retirement fund, they would be guilty of a felony and they would be locked up for a very long time. But here in Washington, after promising never to do it again, the Republican leadership has presented a budget that, without apology and without remedy, raids the Social Security trust fund and returns us to deficit spending and fiscal irresponsibility. This was the wrong choice for the future of America. I am pleased to be on this floor tonight with my colleagues who believe in fiscal responsibility, to stand up for balancing the budget, paying down the debt and protecting Social Security.

Mr. KIND. If the gentleman will yield, I just picked up on a very important issue that the gentleman raised this evening and, that is, who is ultimately paying for the increase in spending or for the tax relief that just passed last year. The gentleman talks about the young men and women who are serving our country now in harm's way overseas and we are blessed that we have such gifted and talented and dedicated individuals looking out after our liberties and our freedoms across the globe in this battle against terrorism. But someone ultimately pays. Unfortunately, while at the same time the majority party delivered tax relief for the most wealthy last year, they are asking to pay for that along with the spending increases in defense and in homeland security through FICA taxes, which we all know is the most regressive form of tax in the Nation, because it is working families, it is low-income working families who have to pay 100 percent of their obligation in FICA taxes to the treasury every year. Those FICA taxes are what goes into

the Social Security and Medicare trust funds. So by raiding those trust funds, we are basically saying that we are going to be delivering tax relief to the Bill Gates and the Warren Buffets of this country while at the same time we are going to continue collecting these FICA taxes from hard-working families who, by the way, are the ones offering their young sons and daughters to fight this battle overseas and they are also being asked to shoulder a disproportionate burden, financial burden, in paying for all this stuff. I could not think of anything more inequitable, anything more unfair that we can do to these working families today than the type of economic policies that have been pursued. I thought that that was an important point that the gentleman raised this evening.

Mr. TURNER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is certainly accurate in his assessment, and I think what it comes down to is that in this Nation, at this time of war, all Americans need to recognize that it is not just those young men and women in uniform that are sacrificing for our Nation but all of us must be willing to do so, because our failure to do so does mean, as the gentleman suggests, that the very generation that is fighting this war will later be the generation that is called upon to pay for it.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), a senior member of the House Budget Committee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for taking out this special order tonight to let us continue the budget debate that has gone on today and that is of such importance to the future of the American people.

Madam Speaker, it was only 10 months ago that we were hearing projections of \$5.5 trillion worth of surpluses over the next 10 years in this country. What has happened since then is a fiscal reversal that I believe historians will tell us is unmatched in our history, where we have gone from a \$5.5 trillion projected surplus to a projected surplus of essentially half a trillion dollars, and even that is probably an overestimate, because the budget numbers that our Republican friends are working with do not include lots of things that we know are probably going to have to be changed and that they are already advocating themselves. It is a sobering reality that we are dealing with. But instead of dealing with that reality and putting us on a path to improving our situation, the budget our Republican friends have put out here today and that the House has approved is, I am afraid, not only going to ratify the situation but actually deepen our difficulty.

The Social Security surplus is estimated to be about \$1.2 trillion over the next 6 years. That was a surplus that we had hoped to not spend on other things but instead to apply to buying

down the national debt and therefore preparing ourselves to meet Social Security's obligation in the next decade. But now that Social Security surplus is going to be spent under this Republican budget. Over 86 percent of that surplus is going to be spent.

This chart will illustrate the reality. Last year we were projecting a surplus in the non-Social Security portion of the budget of \$100 billion in the near term and then well up into several hundred billion dollars later in the decade. Now, a year later, the Bush budget, passed by this House today, put forward by the Republican leadership, now shows that there not only is no non-Social Security surplus but that we are actually in deficit in the non-Social Security portion of the budget, and that means we will be borrowing from Social Security in order to meet our obligations.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. It seems to me that it is important to understand how we got to where we are to avoid repeating history and going deeper into this hole. I know the Congressional Budget Office which is widely regarded as a nonpartisan, apolitical office analyzed what caused the reversal you have just referred to, how we went from surplus into deficit. Many people believe it is entirely based on the events of September 11 and the money that we understandably have spent and will continue to spend to deal with security at home and abroad.

But could the gentleman elaborate a little bit on what the Congressional Budget Office has explained is the cause of this sudden change from surplus to deficit?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that actually less than 10 percent of this reversal, less than 10 percent of the disappeared surplus, is related to the war on terrorism. Forty-three percent of it has to do with the President's tax cut, which our Republican friends shouted through last year with assurances that there was plenty of slack, plenty of running room, that we could do this safely and have a trillion left over. But 43 percent of that fiscal reversal has to do with that tax cut and less than 10 percent with the war on terrorism.

This chart will illustrate the situation. All legislation, including the war on terrorism, accounts for 17 percent and the war on terrorism is about half of that. These technical changes and economic changes have to do with the economic downturn and some of the additional costs in Medicare and Medicaid. It is not all any one factor. But the predominant factor is indeed last year's tax cut.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. If the gentleman will further yield, as I recall there was a Democratic tax cut proposal last year that differed in the size

from what was ultimately passed as the Republican tax cut and one of the reasons for that was the Democratic tax proposal also included a plan to more aggressively pay down the massive Federal debt and also built in a cushion to be more conservative, is that correct?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Absolutely. The gentleman is correct. A year ago we were debating Republican and Democratic budget alternatives. The Republican alternative left no margin for error. It basically said let us take the surplus and spend it on a tax cut and let us risk going into the Social Security surplus. The Democratic plan was far more balanced. We also proposed a tax cut, a tax cut that was aimed at estate tax relief, aimed at putting money in families' pockets who most needed it. That was a proposal that I think could have gotten widespread support. But our Republican friends insisted on going way beyond that. We also had built in a disciplined, systematic program of debt reduction, of buying down the national debt. We also provided for some needed investments in defense, in prescription drug coverage under Medicare, and other pressing national priorities. Most of the American people, I think, agreed that this was a more balanced approach and one that left a greater margin for error in case the economy did not perform as we hoped. Now we know in retrospect that our plan would have been far superior and would have avoided this fiscal turnaround that we have now seen.

Mr. KIND. The gentleman has talked about debt reduction, our plan for debt reduction. Obviously during the course of the debate today and also last year, the Republican majority talked about the merits of tax relief and how it could theoretically stimulate the economy, generate more revenues and encourage more growth. They truly believe that. I understand their argument. Could the gentleman explain to us a little bit about the merits of debt reduction and the fiscal reasons for that and the type of economic benefit that that could bring for the Nation.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman. That is an extremely important point. It is very disappointing to realize that now for 3 years we have been actually buying down the national debt. We have reduced the publicly held debt by something like \$400 billion. That has strengthened our country, strengthened our economy, and made us pay less interest each year on that debt service. Why do we want to reduce the debt? Because it is a huge drag on this economy to owe \$3.5 trillion in externally held debt. The debt service alone on that burden is \$200 billion a year. Any one of our constituents could think of more productive public and private investments. That is simply money down the rathole; \$200 billion a year in interest payments. I think the greatest problem is the burden this

represents for future generations, particularly at precisely the time when the baby boomers are going to be retiring. These surpluses we are running in Social Security are not going to last forever. Baby boomers are going to start retiring in about 6 or 8 more years and then around 2015 or 2016, all of a sudden we are going to be putting out more money in Social Security benefits than we are taking in in Social Security revenues. What do we have to do at that point? We have to start cashing out those bonds that the Social Security trust fund has been holding all these years. The best single way we could prepare for that obligation is to reduce that publicly held debt, so that we are no longer laboring under that burden, no longer putting out \$200 billion worth of interest each year. But I am afraid the situation has precisely been reversed and this budget today that we have been discussing foresees and, in fact, facilitates a huge turnaround in our debt situation.

Mr. KIND. If the gentleman will yield further, I am always interested in listening to Chairman Greenspan when he testifies before our various committees, in the Committee on the Budget, for instance. He is always explaining to us such inherent positive features of debt reduction, not the least of which is the impact on long-term interest rates which can be a hidden tax relief. By keeping debt reduction in check and reducing it will have the beneficial effect of reducing long-term interest rates, making it cheaper for businesses to borrow money, to invest in capital, to create jobs and to hire more people working, making it cheaper for people to afford car payments and home payments and student loan payments and credit card payments. To them, at the Federal Reserve, whether it is Chairman Greenspan, Chairman Volcker before him, the real key to a lot of economic stimulation and growth in the country is what happens with long-term rates.

□ 2115

Through increase in debt and deficits, we have raised those long-term rates because of the reaction from the bond market and financial markets. By maintaining fiscal discipline and reducing our debt burden, it enables those financial markets to reduce the long-term interest rate burden that all working families and all businesses have to confront with.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I think the gentleman is absolutely right. Even before the tragic events of September 11, it was clear that the fiscal policies of our Republican friends and of the Bush Administration were being read by the markets in ways that simply were keeping those long-term interest rates up and were showing that the fiscal projections did not have much credibility. Of course, with this budget we passed today, that problem has been compounded.

A year ago we were looking at essentially paying off the publicly held debt

by around 2008 and being in a far stronger position in this country to do what we need to do, most particularly to meet our obligation to Medicare and to Social Security. Now, unfortunately, we are looking at \$3 trillion debt levels, an accumulation of \$4 trillion more in debt, for as far as the eye can see. This is an enormous fiscal turn around, and if you doubt it has some effect on our yearly bottom line, this chart should illuminate that impact.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would like to further elaborate that just a couple of years ago that interest payment figure the gentleman cited was closer to \$225 billion, and, just to put that in context for the folks at home, that was almost as much as we spent on Medicare for the entire country for that year.

The good news was we were starting to reduce that interest payment, but now, as I think your chart points out, we are going to actually start borrowing more money again, driving up that interest payment, wasting money and potentially jeopardizing these historically low interest rates that consumers have been enjoying, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) has said.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) is absolutely right about the threat to the long-term interest situation, and the gentleman from Florida is right about the implication of this kind of debt service, burdening us down each year.

I think the year the gentleman is referring to, the interest payments were actually more than Medicare. As I recall, interest payments were the third largest item in the whole Federal budget, surpassed only by Social Security and by the defense budget.

Mr. SPRATT. If the gentleman will yield, last year, as you well know, we were literally having a debate about how fast we could pay off the Treasury debt held by the public, which is a little less than \$3.5 trillion. Republicans were trying to tell us we were providing too much, more than could actually be purchased and bought back.

Now what we see from CBO, this is the Congressional Budget Office's analysis of the President's budget dated March 6, the debt held by the public not only has not gone down, it is actually going up. In 2001, at year's end, the total debt outstanding owed to the public was \$3.3 trillion. In 2006, 5 years from then, the debt held by the public will be \$3.6 trillion. It will actually go up \$300 billion.

Our Republican friends took to the well today and touted the fact that some \$300 billion or \$400 billion in national debt had been paid off. It was. It was paid off during the Clinton administration, as we got rid of the deficit and put the budget in surplus. But our objective last year was nothing less than to get that debt paid to a very, very low level, a negligible level, so when the baby-boomers retired Treas-

ury would not be burdened with this external debt owed to the public and they could meet the obligations owed to the Social Security trust fund.

Instead we see, looking at these numbers that CBO gave us just a week or two ago, in 2008, when the baby-boomers begin to retire, we will have outstanding debt owed to the public by the Treasury \$3.479 trillion, which is about \$150 billion more than at the end of 2001. We will not have made any progress at all on the problem. That is such a radical reversal from where we were last year.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman. In the meantime, of course, we will have sunk hundreds of billions of dollars into interest payments, which could have financed, for example, prescription drug coverage under Medicare about three times over, could have rebuilt our crumbling schools, shored up our infrastructure, could have done so many things for our country.

Sometimes these numbers just seem beyond comprehension, but these national debt numbers are not just abstract numbers. They are a yearly drain on this country's resources which, unfortunately, this budget approved here today will only increase the problem.

Mr. SPRATT. If I could go back to what we were discussing a minute ago, Chairman Greenspan, about 2 or 3 years ago when we first began to see daylight, we began to see the budget pull completely out of deficit and into surplus without counting the surplus in Social Security and Medicare, we were able to discern that on the horizon, Chairman Greenspan came to our Democratic Committee on the Budget caucus over in the Library of Congress and spoke to us behind closed doors, off the record.

He said, look, the Fed can get short-term interest rates down, but only you, with fiscal policy, can really bring long-term rates down, and the way you do it is exactly the way what is unfolding right now. If you can convince the financial markets that you are going to retire \$3.5 trillion of Treasury debt, then that will mean the Federal Government will not be in the markets crowding out private borrowers, driving up interest rates. Instead, for every dollar you pay off, it will be a dollar added to net national saving, and over time it will drive down interest rates, boost the economy and bring that long-term rate down.

That in itself, if we could have accomplished it, would have been a long step towards ensuring the solvency of Social Security. That was why it was so critically important. This is not some obtuse debate of whether or not it is better to have less or more debt. It is an absolutely essential element towards making Social Security solvent for the long run.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We need to be systematically and in a dis-

ciplined way paying down that debt, and in these fortunate years where the Social Security trust fund is running a surplus, that is exactly the way that surplus should be applied; not for tax cuts, not for new spending, but for debt reduction and for the strengthening of the future of Social Security. That is the path we were on, that is the path we have been now knocked off of.

We all know that we have to do some extraordinary things at this time of national crisis, and you will find no disagreement here today about that, about the need to prosecute this anti-terrorism offensive, about the need to shore up our homeland defenses. But the entire fiscal solvency of the country cannot be wrapped up in the anti-terrorism offensive. We need to do this and to do it well and to do it right, but we need not to do it at the expense of our country's long-term fiscal strength and fiscal solvency. And that is the debate I am afraid our Republican friends have failed today, as they have projected actually a 5 year budget. They have gone from 10 to 5 year numbers to make it look better, but the fact is our long-term budget prospects are being sacrificed.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. If I could inquire further of the ranking Democrat on the Committee on the Budget, the biggest fear I have with what happened today is that we have failed to adopt a credible blueprint.

The budget resolution is supposed to be our blueprint. For those of us elected to Congress because we extolled the virtues of the balanced budget and paying down the debt because it was the right thing to do for our children and grandchildren and contributed to lower interest rates and helped preserve Medicare and Social Security, we measure every act we take here, whether it is a tax cut or spending proposal, by how it affects our ability to have a balanced budget and pay down the debt.

Having adopted a budget resolution today which I think clearly fails the test of being an honest yardstick as we go forward, I would say to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), I am terribly concerned as we start to debate spending proposals and tax cut proposals over here, we are not going to know where we are in relation to whether it is driving us further into deficit and how we are going to get into it.

Does the gentleman have that fear?

Mr. SPRATT. I will show the gentleman the disparity between the budget on the floor today and the President's budget, and the reason we said this budget we are voting on today is not a real budget.

When the President sent up his budget, he asked for \$675 billion in additional tax cuts, on top of the \$1.35 trillion cut last year; another \$675 billion. Some of it is for things that are going to come up, extenders, that are expiring tax provisions that are very popular and we will all vote for them. The

research and experimentation tax credit is a good example. When it expires we will renew it. This budget today provided only \$28.8 billion, an allowance of just under \$30 billion, versus the President's request for \$675 billion. What is the right number?

One of the biggest issues of all is what happens to last year's tax cuts. Passed last June, by agreement with the Senators who voted for it that made up the majority, the amount of revenue reduction was limited to \$1.35 trillion. To shoe horn that into the budget, it was phased in over time, and then in the year 2010 everything that was phased in would suddenly become a pumpkin, it would expire, we know that is not going to happen.

Nevertheless, when we got this 5 year budget, they limited it to 5 years because that precluded them from having to deal with the decision, what happens if you make this tax cut permanent? It has a huge effect on revenues and a backwash effect at the present time.

CBO says the impact on revenues from making that permanent is an additional \$659 billion, that much less revenue, \$659 billion. Our Republican colleagues on the committee, when asked, said no, we have not made a decision about that. This budget makes no implication.

The next day the Speaker said, absolutely, the repealer, sunseting that tax bill, will be rescinded. It will not stand. Reporters put the same question to Ari Fleischer at the White House. He said unequivocally, it will be repealed.

That is a \$659 billion item. You should reduce your revenues in this budget by that amount and ought to have an honest budget. Not a single penny of that tax policy is reflected anywhere in this 5 year budget. That is why we said this is not a real budget. This is the tip of an iceberg. We are not dealing with reality here.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. If I could inquire further of our ranking member, is there any provision in this budget for emergency spending?

Mr. SPRATT. None at all, even though we know from historic experience it averages about \$6 billion a year. Let me give credit to our chairman, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE). Last year he wanted to baseline that amount of money. He wanted to take the historic average and put it in the budget every year so we would not have a supplemental that would add it in later. The appropriators and some others did not like that idea, and he ultimately lost and he simply dropped it this year. But you may as well get ready, it will be there. We will have to spend that amount of money. You will have to add it to the bottom line.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Is there any provision for the supplemental appropriations bill that we know will be before us in a few weeks?

Mr. SPRATT. None at all.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Is there any provision for altering the Alternative Minimum Tax so millions of Americans don't bump up against that?

Mr. SPRATT. We know that 1.7 million taxpayers last year had to deal with the AMT, the Alternative Minimum Tax. We know from the Treasury Department over the next 10 years that number will grow to 39 million taxpayers, mostly middle income Americans. The gentleman was here when that bill passed. I was here. It was not intended for middle income Americans. It was intended for upper bracket taxpayers.

Consequently, when they find out that deductions and credits and preferences that we promised them in the Tax Code are not fully available because of this thing called the AMT, they are not going to like it. They will be numerous, rising to 39 million taxpayers.

I am sure we will eventually relent and have to modify that and should modify the AMT. But every time we bring it up and say you have to factor this in to the future planning for revenues, sooner or later we have to do something about the AMT, it gets shoved forward, gets ignored.

That is another element that was simply omitted in the consideration of this budget and a reason we said this is not a real budget. This is not everything that has to be captured and taken into account.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. So as bad as these figures look, about the disappeared surplus from \$5.5 trillion to \$0.5 trillion, that is actually an optimistic view.

Mr. SPRATT. It could very well be worse. There are several things to bear in mind: The surpluses come from a projected, estimated \$5.6 trillion. That includes Social Security, all the way to \$0.6 trillion. From \$5.6 trillion to \$0.5 trillion; \$661 billion if we implement the President's budget as he sent it up. That is his number. That is their estimate.

However, the President assumes that Medicare will grow at a rate of growth that is \$225 billion less than CBO assumes. The President assumes that revenues will be \$110 billion higher than CBO assumes. The President assumes that discretionary spending can be held to about \$200 billion non-defense discretionary spending, held about 10 percent below the rate of inflation over the next 10 years.

□ 2130

That is probably doable, but it has not been done before, and it is doubtful.

Add all those things together, and that .6 is gone, too. If they are wrong about those three assumptions, we wipe out what is left of any kind of surplus, which means we have fully consumed the Social Security surplus, because that is what it is, the Social Security.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I think the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has referred to probably one of the most devastating aspects of the budget resolution, and that is the Medicare feature.

As the gentleman has mentioned, if we were to have used the true set of numbers that have been relied upon for years, roughly the amount of money available to spend on Medicare would be about \$100 billion less than is projected today in the Republican budget resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Two hundred twenty-five billion dollars less. That is the difference between CBO and OMB. CBO says it will be \$225 billion higher than OMB estimates. OMB is estimating a very low percentage rate of growth, 4.5 percent in the next couple of years, which is a dramatic departure with the last several years.

Let us hope it happens, but I doubt that it will.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask the gentleman, where does that leave us on two critical challenges we face: first, assuring there is a reasonable and fair rate of reimbursement to doctors and hospitals in rural areas and overcrowded other hospitals; and how do we begin to credibly fund a Medicare prescription drug benefit, given those numbers?

Mr. SPRATT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, what the Republicans have done in this budget is set up a reserve account. In that reserve account, they have put \$89 billion to take care of provider payment adjustments, hospitals, doctors, home health care.

We have an agency called MEDPAC which advises Congress on the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and in particular, on reimbursement rates that are paid providers. They have recommended in all cases increases, and in some cases they have indicated that, for example, the physician reimbursement formula is flawed and needs to be adjusted upward because it has understated what they are entitled to.

In any event, the total of their recommendations over 10 years comes to \$174 billion. That is half the amount of money that the Republicans have put in this reserve fund over 10 years.

That has to come out of the provision for Medicare prescription drugs, because what they have done is put in one pot the sum of money that will pay for Medicare prescription drugs and provider payment adjustments, and the provider payment adjustments could eat up half the amount of money and leave very little left over for Medicare prescription drugs.

But then what happens if CBO is right and OMB is wrong? Then we have to take \$225 billion from \$150 billion and we only have the remainder, \$125 billion to pay the providers, who are seeking \$175 billion, and to pay for Medicare prescription drugs. It is obviously ludicrously inadequate.

Yet, they touted the prescription drug program repeatedly here on the floor, without telling everybody who is going to be a prescription drug beneficiary, or hopes to be, they are going to be in competition for the providers for the little bit of money that is left in that account.

Over 5 years, if CBO's Medicare estimate is right, there is less than \$40 billion over 5 years, spread over 5 years, 40 million people, to pay for prescription drugs. We cannot do it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) again for taking out these special orders and allowing us to explore these issues in more depth in a way that the 1-minute sound bites on the House floor do not permit.

It is a real service, and I am grateful for being able to participate in it.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. I would just like to close by saying we have attempted tonight to identify in what we believe to be a credible way the problems facing this Congress, Madam Speaker.

Earlier today we had the debate on beginning to talk about the solutions. One of the solutions that were proposed by a number of us that we hope the Senate will take up on a bipartisan basis is a trigger which would force the Congress to confront the painful fact that we are going deeper into deficit spending, and that once we do manage to get control of this war on terrorism and we pull out of the recession, that the Congress would be forced to develop a 5-year plan to balance the budget, to begin to use an honest set of numbers so we can again begin to prepare for the Social Security and Medicare, for the retirement of the baby boomers, to credibly talk about how we fund a prescription drug benefit for Medicare, and to get back to paying down the debt, reducing our interest payments as a Federal Government, and contributing to lower interest rates for consumers at home.

Madam Speaker, that concludes our presentation tonight.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SHADEGG (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today until 1:00 p.m. on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KIND) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINOJOSA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAMPSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIND, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOSS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KERNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PLATTS, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1499. An act to amend the District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999 to permit individuals who enroll in an institution of higher education more than 3 years after graduating from a secondary school and individuals who attend private historically black colleges and universities nationwide to participate in the tuition assistance programs under such Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2739. An act to amend Public Law 107-10 to authorize a United States plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the annual summit of the World Health Assembly in May 2002 in Geneva, Switzerland, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2019. An act to extend the authority of the Export-Import Bank until April 30, 2002.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 360, 107th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Accordingly, pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Friday, March 22, 2002, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 360, in which case the House shall stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, April 9, 2002, pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, April 9, 2002, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 360, or under the previous order of the House if not sooner in receipt of a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 360.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5973. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Isoxadifen-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-301224; FRL-6628-5] (RIN:

2070-AB78) received March 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5974. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the retirement of Lieutenant General Thomas J. Keck, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5975. A letter from the Director, FinCEN, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; Special Information Sharing Procedures to Deter Money Laundering and Terrorist Activity (RIN: 1506-AA26) received March 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5976. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting a draft bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to assess certain annual lease fees; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5977. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting a draft bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and the Miscellaneous Appropriations Act, 2000, to provide certainty regarding the availability of spectrum for use by new licensees in upcoming auctions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5978. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule—Medicaid Program; Modification of the Medicaid Upper Payment Limit for Non-State Government-Owned or Operated Hospitals: Delay of Effective Date [CMS-2134-N] (RIN: 0938-AL05) received March 18, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5979. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Finding of Failure to submit a Required State Implementation Plan for Particulate Matter, California—San Joaquin Valley [CA073-FON; FRL-7157-9] received March 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5980. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Perfluoroalkyl Sulfonates; Significant New Use Rule [OPPTS-50639D; FRL-6823-6] (RIN: 2070-AD43) received March 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5981. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Removal of Restrictions on Certain Fire Suppression Substitutes for Ozone-Depleting Substances; and Listing of Substitutes; Correction [FRL-7160-3] received March 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5982. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for Alaska [Alaska 001; FRL-7158-2] received March 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5983. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Modification of Significant New Uses of Certain Chemical Substances [OPPTS-50642A; FRL-6819-5] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received March 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5984. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Modification of Significant New Uses of Certain Chemical Substances [OPPTS-50644A; FRL-6817-8] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received March 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5985. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Designations of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of Nevada; Technical Correction [NV 074-CORR; FRL-7159-6] received March 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5986. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval of Operating Permit Program; State of Iowa [IA 150-1150; FRL-7158-6] received March 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5987. A letter from the Chairman (FCC) and Assistant Secretary (NTIA), Federal Communications Commission and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration transmitting a report entitled, "Alternative Frequencies For Use By Public Safety Systems" submitted in accordance with Section 1705 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act For FY 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5988. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: Standardized NUHOMS-24P, -52B, and -61BT Revision (RIN: 3150-AG88) received March 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5989. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Spain for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 02-14), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

5990. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Germany [Transmittal No. DTC 159-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5991. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles to India [Transmittal No. DTC 166-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5992. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Saudi Arabia [Transmittal No. DTC 118-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5993. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles to India [Transmittal No. DTC 165-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5994. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles to

India [Transmittal No. DTC 175-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5995. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles to India [Transmittal No. DTC 169-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5996. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles to India [Transmittal No. DTC 176-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5997. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles to India [Transmittal No. DTC 177-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5998. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certifications and waivers and their justification under section 565(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 of the prohibition against contracting with firms that comply with the Arab League Boycott of the State of Israel and of the prohibition against contracting with firms that discriminate in the award of subcontracts on the basis of religion, pursuant to Public Law 103-236, section 565(b) (108 Stat. 845); to the Committee on International Relations.

5999. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

6000. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Surplus Military Curio or Relic Firearms—received March 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

6001. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting a report on actions to establish a council to promote greater investment in sub-Saharan Africa; to the Committee on International Relations.

6002. A letter from the Executive Director, Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting the semiannual report of the Office of Inspector General covering the period April 1 through September 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6003. A letter from the Director, Office of White House Liaison, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6004. A letter from the Director, Office of White House Liaison, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6005. A letter from the Director, Office of White House Liaison, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6006. A letter from the Special Assistant, White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6007. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Re-

form Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6008. A letter from the Acting Inspector General, Selective Service System, transmitting a report in accordance with the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6009. A letter from the Acting Associate Deputy Administrator for Management and Administration, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6010. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Independent Expenditure Reporting [Notice 2002-3] received March 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

6011. A letter from the Assistant Director/General Counsel, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Inmate Financial Responsibility Program: Spending Limitations [BOP-1050-F] (RIN: 1120-AA49) received March 14, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6012. A letter from the Executive Officer, Civil Division, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule—September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 (RIN: 1105-AA79) received March 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6013. A letter from the Assistant Director, General Counsel, Federal Bureau of Prisons, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Inmate Personal Property [BOP-1051-F] (RIN: 1120-AA46) received March 14, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6014. A letter from the Staff Director, United States Commission On Civil Rights, transmitting the list of state advisory committees recently rechartered by the Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6015. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Payment of Federal Taxes and the Treasury Tax and Loan Program (RIN: 1510-AA79) received March 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6016. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Division, ATF, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Addition of New Grape Variety Names for American Wines (2000R-370P) [T.D. ATF-466; Re: Notice No. 915] (RIN: 1512-AC26) received March 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6017. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Division Bureau, ATF, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Implementation of Public Law 106-544 for Certain Amendments Related to Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (2001R-90T) [T.D. ATF-467] (RIN: 1512-AC55) received March 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6018. A letter from the Secretary (DOT) and Chairmans, Federal Reserve System, Department of Treasury, Commodity Futures Trading Comm., Securities and Exchange Comm., transmitting a report entitled, "Joint Report on Retail Swaps" as required by Section 105(c) of the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3669. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to empower employees to control their retirement savings accounts through new diversification rights, new disclosure requirements, and new tax incentives for retirement education; with an amendment (Rept. 107-382 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 3669. Referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce extended for a period ending not later than April 9, 2002.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. KELLER, Ms. HART, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. FLAKE):

H.R. 4009. A bill to increase the authority of the Attorney General to remove, suspend, and impose other disciplinary actions on, employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELDON of Florida:

H.R. 4010. A bill to provide for a temporary moratorium on visas for certain aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 4011. A bill to establish the Stem Cell Research Board to conduct research on the effects of the President's August 9, 2001, stem cell research directive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CUBIN:

H.R. 4012. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to foster the deployment of wireless telecommunications services to consumers in rural areas; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KING, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 4013. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an Office of Rare Diseases at the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KING, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 4014. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect

to the development of products for rare diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. REYES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. EVANS, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. SHOWS):

H.R. 4015. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise and improve employment, training, and placement services furnished to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MICA (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 4016. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend the time during which air carrier liability for third party damages as a result of a terrorist attack may be limited, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. REYES, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. COSTELLO, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 4017. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to treat as military service under that Act certain National Guard duty under a call to active service for a period of 30 consecutive days or more; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. REYES, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. PASCARELL, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 4018. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make improvements in judicial review of administrative decisions of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. BARCIA, Ms. DUNN, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KERNS, and Mr. GEKAS):

H.R. 4019. A bill to provide that the marriage penalty relief provisions of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 shall be permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 4020. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the bonus depreciation available under the Job Creation and Worker Assistance Act of 2002; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. BARRETT, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FROST, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. SHOWS):

H.R. 4021. A bill to provide incentives to States to apply for section 1115 waivers to use Federal funds to provide for affordable employer-based health insurance coverage for the uninsured workers of small businesses in the State; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 4022. A bill to enact into law Reform Model 1 as set forth in the report of the President's Commission to Strengthen Social Security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 4023. A bill to enact into law Reform Model 2 as set forth in the report of the President's Commission to Strengthen Social Security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 4024. A bill to enact into law Reform Model 3 as set forth in the report of the President's Commission to Strengthen Social Security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELDON of Florida (for himself, Mr. JOHN, and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 4025. A bill to establish a Federal program to provide reinsurance to improve the availability of homeowners' insurance; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 4026. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act with respect to penalties for powder cocaine and crack cocaine offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Ms. DUNN, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. OSE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico):

H.R. 4027. A bill to provide grants for law enforcement training and equipment to combat methamphetamine labs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. ROSS):

H.R. 4028. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 600 West Capitol Avenue in Little Rock, Arkansas, as the "Richard S. Arnold United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 4029. A bill to direct the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to establish and operate a university-affiliated national integrative center that brings together a broad range of expertise to address the needs of homeland security; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 4030. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act with respect to reform of Federal survey and certification process of nursing facilities under the Medicare and Medicaid Programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CANNON (for himself, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 4031. A bill to amend the Central Utah Project Completion Act to clarify the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the Central Utah Project, to redirect unexpended budget authority for the Central Utah Project for wastewater treatment and reuse and other purposes, to provide for prepayment of repayment contracts for municipal and industrial water delivery facilities, and to eliminate a deadline for such prepayment; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. GREENWOOD):

H.R. 4032. A bill to amend titles V and XIX of the Social Security Act and chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to provide coverage for domestic violence screening and treatment under the maternal and child health block grant program, the Medicaid Program, and the Federal employees health benefits program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 4033. A bill to provide affordable housing opportunities for families that are headed by grandparents and other relatives of children; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. WATERS, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. LEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 4034. A bill to extend Brady background checks to gun shows, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. DELAHUNT):

H.R. 4035. A bill to authorize the President to establish military tribunals to try the terrorists responsible for the September 11, 2001 attacks against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. REYES, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 4036. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow the payment of veterans' benefits in all hospitalization and convalescent claims to begin effective the first day of the month in which hospitalization or treatment begins; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 4037. A bill to amend the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act to identify and register certain Central Americans residing in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 4038. A bill to establish a Securities and Derivatives Oversight Commission in order to combine the functions of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission in a single independent regulatory commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr.

CAPUANO, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STARK, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WEXLER, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 4039. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to ensure that all dogs and cats used by research facilities are obtained legally; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 4040. A bill to provide for the conveyance of land at Fort Hood, Texas, to facilitate the establishment of a State-run cemetery for veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE:

H.R. 4041. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on glufosinate-ammonium; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 4042. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit additional daily interest charges following prepayment in full of housing loans guaranteed by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 4043. A bill to bar Federal agencies from accepting for any identification-related purpose and State-issued driver's license, or other comparable identification document, unless the State requires licenses or comparable documents issued to nonimmigrant aliens to expire upon the expiration of the aliens' nonimmigrant visas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, the Judiciary, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GILCHREST:

H.R. 4044. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance to the State of Maryland for implementation of a program to eradicate nutria and restore marshland damaged my nutria; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 4045. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to carry out a pilot program to promote the preservation of historic school structures; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HOFFFEL (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 4046. A bill to provide for congressional review of regulations relating to military tribunals; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOUGHTON:

H.R. 4047. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify certain rules relating to the taxation of United States businesses operating abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 4048. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on (1R,3R)-3(2,2-dibromovinyl)-2,2-dimethylcyclopropanecarboxylic acid (S)-cyano-3-phenoxybenzyl ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 4049. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on methyl sulfanylcarbamate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 4050. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 3-(3-5, dichlorophenyl)-N-(1-methylethyl)-2,4-dioxo-1-imidazolidine carboxamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 4051. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on (1R,3S)3(1'RS)(1',2',2',2',-Tetrabromoethyl)]-2,2-dimethylcyclopropanecarboxylic acid,(S)-alpha-cyano-3-phenoxybenzyl ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 4052. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on N-phenyl-N'-(1,2,3-thiadiazol-5-yl)urea; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. NORWOOD):

H.R. 4053. A bill to assure more equitable results in union elections; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. NORWOOD):

H.R. 4054. A bill to provide for civil monetary penalties in certain cases; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. NORWOOD):

H.R. 4055. A bill to enhance notification to union members of their rights under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 4056. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on a certain chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 4057. A bill to replace the caseload reduction credit with an employment credit under the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. WU, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PASTOR, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 4058. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to require the Immigration and Naturalization Service to verify whether an alien has an immigration status rendering the alien eligible for service in the Armed Forces of the United States and to achieve parity between the immigration status required for employment as an airport security screener and the immigration status required for service in the Armed Forces, and to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit naturalization through active-duty military service during specified military operations; to the Committee on

the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McNULTY:

H.R. 4059. A bill to provide for homeland security block grants; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FROST, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 4060. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate the taxes funding the Hazardous Substance Superfund and the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and to extend the taxes funding the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KING, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FROST, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. STARK, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. BALDWIN):

H.R. 4061. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a Nationwide Health Tracking Network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 4062. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain land for the benefit of the Crow Tribe of Montana; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. REYES (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ):

H.R. 4063. A bill to improve the health of residents of, and the environment in, the United States-Mexico border area; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Agriculture, Financial Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, International Relations, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROTHMAN:

H.R. 4064. A bill to enable America's schools to use their computer hardware to increase student achievement and prepare students for the 21st century workplace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROTHMAN:

H.R. 4065. A bill to prohibit the use of vending machines to sell tobacco products in all locations other than in locations in which the presence of minors is not permitted; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. GEORGE

MILLER of California, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 4066. A bill to provide for equal coverage of mental health benefits with respect to health insurance coverage unless comparable limitations are imposed on medical and surgical benefits; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 4067. A bill to reinstitute the moratorium on foreclosure on FHA single family mortgage loans of borrowers affected by the events of September 11, 2001, and to expand such moratorium to employees of air carriers and aircraft manufacturers who are involuntarily separated after such date; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GOUDLATTE, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. GOODE):

H.R. 4068. A bill to convert a temporary judgeship for the eastern district of Virginia to a permanent judgeship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. DUNN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 4069. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act provide for miscellaneous enhancements in Social Security benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 4070. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional safeguards for Social Security and Supplemental Security Income beneficiaries with representative payees, to enhance program protections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 4071. A bill to extend the registration and reporting requirements of the Federal securities laws to certain housing-related Government-sponsored enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 4072. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a commemorative trail in connection with the Women's Rights National Historical Park to link properties that are historically and thematically associated with the struggle for women's suffrage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 4073. A bill to amend the Microenterprise for Self-Reliance Act of 2000 and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to increase assistance for the poorest people in developing countries under microenterprise assistance programs under those Acts, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. DELAHUNT):

H.R. 4074. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reaffirm the United States historic commitment to protecting refugees who are fleeing persecution or torture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. FRANK, and Ms. RIVERS):

H.R. 4075. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that corporate tax benefits from stock option compensation expenses are allowed only to the extent such expenses are included in a corporation's financial statements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUMP:

H.R. 4076. A bill to modify the boundaries of the Agua Fria National Monument in the State of Arizona to clarify Bureau of Land Management administrative responsibilities regarding the Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 4077. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide an apportionment to a primary airport that falls below 10,000 passenger boardings in a calendar year as a result of the discontinuance of air carrier service at the airport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 4078. A bill to provide for the reclamation of abandoned hardrock mines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

H.R. 4079. A bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1995 to make available additional funds to increase access to the arts through the support of education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

H.R. 4080. A bill to improve mathematics and science instruction in elementary and secondary schools by authorizing the Secretary of Education to make grants for regional workshops designed to permit educators to share successful strategies for such instruction; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 4081. A bill to require contractors with the Federal Government to possess a satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOSS:

H. Con. Res. 360. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. NEY:

H. Con. Res. 361. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make corrections in the enrollment of the bill H. R. 2356; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. DEMINT):

H. Con. Res. 362. Concurrent resolution encouraging employers who employ members

of the National Guard and Reserve components of the Armed Forces to provide a pay differential benefit and an extension of employee benefits to such members while they serve on active duty, and commending employers who already provide such benefits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. HYDE):

H. Con. Res. 363. Concurrent resolution extending birthday greetings and best wishes to Lionel Hampton on the occasion of his 94th birthday; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. COX:

H. Con. Res. 364. Concurrent resolution recognizing the historic significance of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the United States Army Special Forces and honoring the "Father of the Special Forces", Colonel Aaron Bank (United States Army, retired) of Mission Viejo, California, for his role in establishing the Army Special Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. DUNN (for herself, Mr. CRANE, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. NETHERCUTT):

H. Con. Res. 365. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 30th anniversary of the historic visit of President Richard Nixon to China, and commending President George W. Bush for his effort to continue to advance a political, cultural, and economic relationship between the United States and China; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. LEACH:

H. Con. Res. 366. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress to welcome the Prime Minister of New Zealand, the Right Honorable Helen Clark, on the occasion of her visit to the United States, to express gratitude to the Government of New Zealand for its cooperation with the United States in the campaign against terrorism; and to reaffirm commitment to the continuing expansion of friendship and cooperation between the United States and New Zealand; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. MYRICK (for herself, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia):

H. Con. Res. 367. Concurrent resolution honoring the life and work of Susan B. Anthony; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. STARK):

H. Con. Res. 368. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that reinstating the military draft or implementing any other form of compulsory military service in the United States would be detrimental to the long-term military interests of the United States, violative of individual liberties protected by the Constitution, and inconsistent with the values underlying a free society as expressed in the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H. Con. Res. 369. Concurrent resolution calling upon Yasser Arafat and the leaders of other countries in the Middle East to accept the existence of Israel; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself and Mr. DINGELL):

H. Res. 374. A resolution calling for an immediate cessation of the violence in the Middle East and a resumption of negotiations to end the conflict in the region; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GOSS:

H. Res. 375. Resolution designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

H. Res. 376. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to apply the layover requirements for conference reports during the last six days of a session of Congress, to require that certain matter be included in joint explanatory statements accompanying conference reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, Mr. WYNN introduced a bill (H.R. 4082) for the relief of Germalyn Selga Salto and Carl Gino Selga Salto; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. MCNULTY.
 H.R. 175: Mr. CANTOR.
 H.R. 257: Mr. EHLERS.
 H.R. 267: Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 299: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 425: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 510: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 536: Mr. VITTER.
 H.R. 600: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BERRY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BONILLA, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 648: Mr. WICKER.
 H.R. 701: Mr. BARRETT.
 H.R. 709: Mr. KLECZKA.
 H.R. 755: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 778: Mr. CHAMBLISS.
 H.R. 781: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 1017: Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 1030: Mr. EHLERS.
 H.R. 1089: Mr. MATSUI and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 1090: Mr. BARR of Georgia.
 H.R. 1109: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
 H.R. 1191: Mr. SHAYS.
 H.R. 1296: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1305: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 1341: Mr. LAMPSON.
 H.R. 1343: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 1360: Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 1400: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FORD, and Mr. MATSUI.
 H.R. 1462: Mr. INSLEE.
 H.R. 1475: Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CLAYTON Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. SUNUNU.
 H.R. 1489: Mr. BARRETT.
 H.R. 1520: Mr. LAHOOD.
 H.R. 1535: Mr. KINGSTON.
 H.R. 1543: Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 1556: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 1598: Mr. GUTKNECHT.
 H.R. 1613: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois and Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 1683: Mr. BONIOR and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1701: Mr. PORTMAN.
 H.R. 1723: Mr. OSBORNE.
 H.R. 1724: Mr. STENHOLM and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 1795: Mr. MOORE and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 1822: Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts,

Mr. HOLT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. OTTER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 1887: Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 1903: Mr. FILNER, Mr. WYNN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1904: Mr. FROST and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 1984: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 2009: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TANNER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. LAMPSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. STARK, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. WU, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BOYD, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2102: Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 2125: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 2219: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 2354: Mr. POMBO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. OSE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 2426: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 2484: Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 2583: Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 2605: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 2618: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 2638: Mr. WALSH, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GEKAS, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 2654: Mr. KANJORSKI and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2712: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 2787: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 2874: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 2931: Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 2941: Mr. LEACH, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. QUINN Mr. BARR of Georgia, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 3058: Ms. SANCHEZ, Mrs. NORTHUP, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 3068: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 3113: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BACA, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. REYES, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 3183: Mr. FORBES, Ms. HART, Mr. KERNS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 3231: Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 3236: Mr. BISHOP, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 3238: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 3244: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. KIND, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SABO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STENHOLM, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TURNER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, Mr. JOHN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LUTHER, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 3267: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 3320: Mr. FROST and Mr. EHRLICH.

H.R. 3321: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 3332: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 3333: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 3375: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. CANTOR.

H.R. 3388: Mr. RUSH and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 3389: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BALDACCIO, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 3414: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 3424: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. EVANS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 3430: Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 3436: Mr. GRAVES.

H.R. 3450: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SUNUNU, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FORBES, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RILEY, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 3473: Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 3479: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 3521: Mr. OWENS and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 3524: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 3569: Mr. BERRY and Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 3586: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 3609: Mr. BAKER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 3612: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 3625: Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 3644: Mr. CLAY, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 3661: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. CANTOR.

H.R. 3670: Mr. LYNCH and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 3675: Mr. PASTOR, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 3681: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. JOHN, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 3686: Mr. BRYANT and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 3694: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 3695: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 3701: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 3704: Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 3710: Mr. WOLF and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 3713: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 3714: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FILNER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FARR of California, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3733: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3747: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 3771: Mr. EVANS and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3794: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 3795: Mr. LIPINSKI and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 3807: Mr. PAYNE and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 3808: Ms. HART and Mr. GRAVES.

H.R. 3818: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 3833: Mr. GREENWOOD and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 3834: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 3836: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HOEFFEL, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3889: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. BALDACCIO.

H.R. 3890: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 3897: Mr. PAUL, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 3898: Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 3899: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3900: Mr. REYES, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 3915: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3947: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DICKS, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.

H.R. 3951: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 3957: Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 3961: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 3968: Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. BISHOP, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

H.R. 3970: Mr. SAWYER.

H.R. 3973: Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 3989: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. KING, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FROST, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 4000: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 4003: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.J. Res. 23: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.J. Res. 83: Mr. KILDEE.

H. Con. Res. 164: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H. Con. Res. 169: Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. BERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 195: Mr. FRANK.

H. Con. Res. 238: Mr. POMEROY.

H. Con. Res. 290: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. LEE, Mrs. CAPPS, and Ms. WATSON.

H. Con. Res. 291: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HORN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H. Con. Res. 301: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. OTTER, and Mr. GILCHREST.

H. Con. Res. 321: Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. LEE.

H. Con. Res. 341: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.

H. Con. Res. 346: Mr. WU.

H. Con. Res. 350: Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. GRAVES.

H. Con. Res. 351: Ms. LEE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. CLAY.

H. Res. 225: Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 295: Mr. FOLEY.

H. Res. 361: Mr. KILDEE.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3694: Ms. DELAURO.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 6, by Mr. STEVE ISRAEL, on House Resolution 352: Gerald D. Kleczka, Thomas M. Barrett, Robert C. Scott, Earl Pomeroy, Nick J. Rahall II, Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr., Edolphus Towns, Marion Berry, Ruben Hinojosa, Michael F. Doyle, William J. Jefferson, Ken Bentsen, Danny K. Davis, Charles W. Stenholm, Allen Boyd, Baron P. Hill, Jim Davis, and Anna G. Eshoo.