



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 29, 2004

No. 41

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. HARRIS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 29, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KATHERINE HARRIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

OTHER PEOPLE'S ELECTIONS

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, today I reflect on some of the recent elections held in other countries. While citizens of other countries may have different values about the level of government intervention in areas, let us say in economics or labor rights, overwhelmingly, most citizens of the world would prefer to live in a democracy than a totalitarian-run system. This was presented last summer by the Pew Research Center for the People in the Press. Pew Research Center inter-

viewed over 66,000 people in 44 countries over 2 years. The majority demonstrated strong preferences in democratic governments, even in Muslim countries.

Over the past 3 weeks, other people have elected leaders, sometimes new, sometimes the incumbent. I wish for all, of course, to live under the same sunshine of freedom that we in the United States have here.

In Taiwan Saturday, March 20, incumbent President Chen, Taiwan's pro-independence leader, was declared to have won by a slim margin, just a hair over 50 percent. This election was preceded by threats from mainland China and Chen's international detractors, and jittery nerves by many who urged "don't rock the boat." On election eve, President Chen and his Vice President were shot in a craven attack.

The aftermath of the election is a little calmer: there are street protests and a recount is imminent. Also, in a win for China, though, election authorities nullified the results of a controversial referendum championed by the President because too few voters took part in it.

However, I still see some optimism. The apparent reelection of Chen is sending a message both to Beijing and Washington: while not outright declaring independence, China's people are standing up for their status as a sovereign body; they are not completely buying into Beijing's domineering "One China" policy. Further, I find it telling that while an insufficient number voted in the referendum, of those who did, 90 percent pulled the yes lever to the two questions: one, whether to try to set up a framework for direct talks with China; and, two, whether to buy more advanced weapons if China refuses to move missiles aimed at their island. I wish President Chen every success in my support of his leading his people to a democracy.

Now, let us look at Spain. I understand the emotional and political tu-

mult in which Spain found themselves on March 11 and after. However, I am discouraged that circumstances influenced the election the way they did, for the singular reason that the Spaniards appear to think that the Socialist Party will bring them relief from the retributions of extreme Islamic fundamentalists. I sadly believe they are wrong. Gustavo de Aristegui wrote in *The Washington Post* on Sunday, March 21: "In 1984, I had a long talk with a high-ranking Sunni cleric in a mosque in Damascus. He was very friendly when he learned that I was a Spaniard. After 2 hours of conversation about politics and theology, which are very much intertwined in that part of the world, he said to me: 'Don't worry, we will liberate Spain from Western corruption.'"

The writer emphasized that this was a moderate, respected clergyman. Now, that is a chilling, foreshadowing, looking into the minds of those who would destroy that way of life in Spain.

Yet, what did Spaniards sacrifice in their election of the Socialist Party candidate? Since 1986, the Partido Popular turned from 21 percent unemployment down to 9 percent, foreign debt from 80 percent to less than 50 percent GDP, a deficit of 6.7 percent of GDP in 1996 to a 0.5 percent surplus in 2002, and a growing economy while much of the world experienced a downturn. This is the stuff that democracies are made of: living economically securely, planning futures, and thriving.

Like President Chen, I support our ally Spain and the new leadership that they have openly and fairly chosen. I only ponder that democracies also value economic prosperity, and capitulation to bullies may compromise that for which they have worked.

Heading east, President Putin won reelection in Russia this month. He has promised to translate his landslide reelection into concrete reforms: modernizing the economy, the bureaucracy,

□ 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.

H1595

the banking system, utilities, health and social services. Last Monday President Bush called him to congratulate him and urge him to follow through on his reforms, to move forward towards his promises of market-based and democratic reform.

Madam Speaker, let us hope so. Like the leader of Taiwan, the leader of Spain, I wish the leader of Russia, President Putin, success; but I will define success as: how free are your people?

HOW FAST WILL THEY RUN?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, this week we are going to see just how committed our Republican friends are to the irresponsible budget that they passed 4 days ago.

Tomorrow, Democrats will offer a motion to instruct House conferees on the fiscal 2005 budget resolution to accept the Senate's bipartisan pay-as-you-go budget enforcement rules. Those rules would require us to find offsets for both new spending as well as tax cuts. As a matter of fact, one of the real authors of pay-as-you-go, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), in the 1990s is here, which led to the most fiscally responsible administration's performance, frankly, in history, under Bill Clinton. And with a projected budget deficit of more than a half a trillion dollars this year, it is fair to ask, What could be more reasonable than that?

After all, our bipartisan agreement to pay-as-you-go rules in 1990 led to the steady decrease of our deficits throughout that decade and 4 consecutive years of budget surpluses between fiscal 1998 and 2001, the first time that has happened in 80 years.

But in their budget resolution, our Republican friends pretend that we can get our fiscal house back in order by applying so-called pay-as-you-go rules to spending only. Tax cuts, they believe, are a freebie, even though the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that 40 percent of our deficit is attributable to revenue reductions. Who is going to pay that bill? Our children will pay that bill. Our grandchildren will pay that bill.

And even the respected chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), said in February, "No one should expect significant deficit reduction as a result of austere, nondefense discretionary spending limits. The numbers simply do not add up." So said the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), conservative Republican.

So I urge my Republican friends: join us. Join us in this effort to restore fiscal sanity to our Nation's budget. Vote for this important Democratic motion to instruct. That is not so hard. And remember, you have done it before.

Last year, a mere 96 hours after you passed your fist 2004 budget resolution, you turned right around, 180 degrees, and voted for the Democratic motion to instruct conferees to reject the deep cuts called for in your budget for education, for veterans, Medicare, Medicaid, and other areas. The chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), even stood on this floor and railed against our motion for half an hour. For half an hour he railed against our motion, before he and most of the Republican leadership flip-flopped and helped pass it by a vote of, listen to this, Madam Speaker, 399 to 22. That was the Democratic motion passing. Why? Because Republicans wanted to pretend that they were actually for the motion to instruct's priorities when their budget clearly denied that, contradicted it, did not provide for those priorities.

So I urge my Republican friends to support the adoption of pay-as-you-go rules which helped Democrats produce a budget for fiscal year 2005 that was both fair and responsible.

Our Democratic substitute would balance the budget within 8 years. The Republican resolution would actually increase our deficits. Our Democratic budget would protect Social Security. Our democratic budget would match the Republican budget on defense spending to ensure our national security and provide nearly \$6 billion more over 5 years for homeland security to ensure that our people here at home are safer. Our Democratic budget would provide tax relief for hard-working families; and our budget, the Democratic budget, even as it reins in deficits caused by the Republican Party's failed policies, would provide more resources than the Republican budget for education, veterans, job training, public health, and infrastructure, the last, of course, being extraordinarily effective jobs-producing.

Finally, Madam Speaker, we also will consider this week, as I have said, the transportation reauthorization bill, which will pass, I predict, with wide bipartisan support, but leave both Democrats and some Republicans shaking their heads.

This is not only a bill about infrastructure, critically important to our economy, critically important to the safety of this Nation, critically important to every American; it is also a jobs bill. Democrats and some Republicans, including the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), himself supported a spending level of \$375 billion, which would have created 1.7 million new jobs.

Why is that important? Because for the first time in 75 years since Herbert Hoover, the first time, this is the first administration in three-quarters of a century that will end its 4-year term having lost jobs net in this economy. That is why we have over 8 million people unemployed and 2.5 million jobs

lost. Yet, the President, who has the worst record of job creation since Herbert Hoover threatened a veto of that jobs-creating bill, demanding a funding level that would create 1.1 million fewer new jobs.

□ 1245

I urge my Republican friends to stop ignoring the plight of the unemployed who have suffered under your failed policies.

Since December, more than 1 million jobless workers have exhausted their regular State unemployment benefits without receiving temporary Federal assistance. Why? Because Republicans allowed the Federal program to expire. Democrats have been asking for the last 6 months to extend that program, as we did under the Reagan administration, as we did under Bush 1. They have refused to do so.

Before we leave Washington this week for a 2-week recess, we should pass an immediate extension of temporary Federal jobless benefits. It is the right thing to do, it is the moral thing to do, and I would suggest to you it is the right thing to do for our economy as well. There is no excuse for failing to act.

Madam Speaker, I hope that when the motion to instruct on the budget resolution is made to have a responsible, effective, historically effective pay-as-you-go process, to discipline our budget so that America's children and America's grandchildren and America's economy will not be put deeper into debt and that we will have an effective enforcement process, which will, like America's families, make tough decisions so that we will have a better future for our country.

VOTE FOR THE MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HARRIS). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STENHOLM. Madam Speaker, let me follow in the same footsteps of my colleague from Maryland.

Last week, the House passed a budget, a very bitterly debated and very close decision on the final outcome as to which budget we should pass. A lot of speeches were made, a lot of promises were made, but one of the things that was not a part of the budget resolution last week was pay-as-you-go.

Now, our friends on the other side of the Capitol, the other body, in passing their budget they suggested that pay-as-you-go would be a good policy; and they included everything. In my opinion, unless we have everything on the table, spending and revenue, pay-as-you-go will not work as well in 2004 as it did in the 1990s.

There are those that believe there should be a difference. They are the