

getting back on its feet, blaming tax cuts for all the red ink when we know because of two wars, when we know because of the gut-punch of 9-11, when we know because of the bail-out of the economic crisis that occurred after the terrorists attacks, that we know because of huge increases for defense and homeland security, appropriately so, to protect the country, we have had to borrow money. We borrowed money deliberately, at a time with interest rates being very low, to do two important things: make sure that our country was protected and make sure that our economy could get back on its feet and start growing again.

Well, our country is protected and continues to be protected; and we will all do whatever it takes to make sure it continues to be protected. But we also have to make sure that it continues to grow, because while we can be secure in our border, we also have to be secure around the kitchen tables of North Dakota and Iowa and the rest of the country. We want to make sure those families who are faced with sometimes much more perplexing issues than what we face here in Congress, like how am I going to pay for college; and how am I going to pay for the health care bills; and how am I going to deal with clothing my kids when I have been out of work for a little while, those are important issues that they face, and we want to make sure they have all of the resources necessary in order to make those important decisions around their kitchen tables with their families.

The only way to do that is to continue the policy which has worked, which has gotten our economy back on its feet, and will continue to work if we allow it to do so, without being hamstrung by a special Senate rule that only stands in the way of making sure that those tax cuts can be predictable, that they can be permanent, and they can continue the job of making sure the economy grows.

Let us vote down this special rule that will only cause tax increases in the future, and let us support the underlying budget which controls spending, which grows the economy, and which makes sure our country is protected. That is the budget we need to pass. We do not need to have a Senate rule, a rule from the other body to tie our hands for tax reform, tax relief, tax simplification in the future. That is what the gentleman, unfortunately, and probably inadvertently, would accomplish if, in fact, this plan passed. He wants to continue to support tax cuts; so do we. We want the economy to continue to grow, and the only way to do that is to vote down this motion to instruct.

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

□ 1915

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as required to close and I will speak from the other podium.

I thank my friend from Iowa, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for joining in this spirited debate, but to any one of our colleagues watching, there is something that we know for sure and that is that bluster does not cover facts. Energetic presentation of lots and lots of stuff does not mask an economic record reflected in these charts.

This is what has happened to the deficit during the last 2 years, and this is where we are going over the next 10 years.

Now, what we are seeking with this motion is budget enforcement ability to try and level out this deeply alarming trend line on national debt. Pay-as-you-go means that if you spend more, you have got to cut somewhere else; or if you cut taxes, you have got to cut spending and show where you do it; or if you cut taxes, you have got to raise taxes somewhere else. It has all got to work out in a zero-sum game. You cannot continue to make the budget situation worse.

We can get lost in the economics and the numbers, but I think it is helpful to just think of it this way. We pay as you go now, or our kids pay when we go later, because these things are not balancing out. Representations that tax cuts are producing more revenue are not at all borne out. The Federal revenues from individual income taxes in the year 2000 was \$1.4 trillion. The 2004 estimate is \$765 billion, almost down a quarter.

As you have revenues fall so precipitously, you have had the debt line grow so significantly. We have had some job numbers thrown out. The fact is we are down 1.6 million jobs. This administration is the first administration on track to have a net loss of jobs since Herbert Hoover was President, but those are issues for another day.

Let us just understand that if you like the economy of the 1990s better than the economy we have seen this decade, realize that throughout the 1990s we had pay-as-you-go budget enforcement, which meant we were trying to get a handle on national debt. We have absolutely lost our way when it comes to fiscal sanity, and that is why we have had this explosion of debt, a deficit leading to debt, and we have got to get our hands around it.

So I believe that if this House took the step of instructing conferees to go with what the Senate has passed, and that is a bipartisan vote to embrace this pay-as-you-go requirement, we can once again get on track. This has been the very issue that has received bipartisan agreement in the past, 1990, 1995, 1997, and now it is time in 2004 for us to do it once again.

It is time for us to do this for our children. We put pay-as-you-go in the budget or it is you pay when we go to our children. As a father of an 8- and a 10-year old back home in Bismarck, North Dakota, I know we owe them a good deal better than this, a very unstable fiscal situation just when baby

boomers retire and start drawing on Medicare and Social Security. We could turn this around, and passing this motion is the place to do it.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

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

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEFAZIO. 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 the subject of the Special Order of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

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

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOODLATTE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my 5 minute Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

#### WASHINGTON WASTE WATCHERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise again as part of the Washington Waste Watchers, a Republican working group dedicated to rooting out the