

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.