



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2004

No. 133

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
November 18, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL K. SIMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Blessed be the God and Father of us all, for he has chosen you to be representatives of his people.

Lord God, what a blessing it is to realize one has a calling at a particular time for a specific service to accomplish Your holy will. It is then we truly have purpose.

Both in great and small things, we become neither overwhelmed nor disdainful. Every task can be embraced. Every duty fulfilled. Every burden can be lightened by the knowledge that You, O Lord, are accomplishing great things in and through us, both now and always. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

### NOTICE

If the 108th Congress, 1st Session, adjourns sine die on or before November 21, 2003, a final issue of the Congressional Record for the 108th Congress, 1st Session, will be published on Monday, December 15, 2003, in order to permit Members to revise and extend their remarks.

All material for insertion must be signed by the Member and delivered to the respective offices of the Official Reporters of Debates (Room HT-60 or S-410A of the Capitol), Monday through Friday, between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. through Friday, December 12, 2003. The final issue will be dated Monday, December 15, 2003, and will be delivered on Tuesday, December 16, 2003.

None of the material printed in the final issue of the Congressional Record may contain subject matter, or relate to any event that occurred after the sine die date.

Senators' statements should also be submitted electronically, either on a disk to accompany the signed statement, or by e-mail to the Official Reporters of Debates at "Record@Sec.Senate.gov".

Members of the House of Representatives' statements may also be submitted electronically by e-mail, to accompany the signed statement, and formatted according to the instructions for the Extensions of Remarks template at <http://clerkhouse.house.gov/forms>. The Official Reporters will transmit to GPO the template formatted electronic file only after receipt of, and authentication with, the hard copy, and signed manuscript. Deliver statements to the Official Reporters in Room HT-60 of the Capitol.

Members of Congress desiring to purchase reprints of material submitted for inclusion in the Congressional Record may do so by contacting the Office of Congressional Publishing Services, at the Government Printing Office, on 512-0224, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. daily.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

ROBERT W. NEY, *Chairman.*

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.

H9965

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin 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.

#### MEDIA THREATENS DEMOCRACY

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, most Americans now realize that Big Media, network TV news programs and the largest newspapers and news magazines, tried to determine the outcome of the Presidential election.

A study by the Project for Excellence in Journalism confirms what Americans already suspected: George Bush received more than twice as much negative coverage as JOHN KERRY. Think what President Bush's margin of victory would have been without the media bias.

But the danger is the media bias will continue. That is a real threat to democracy.

When the American people do not have the facts, the unvarnished truth, they cannot make the best decisions and we do not have good government.

Big Media needs to reassure the American people that they will strive for objectivity and seek to restore their reputation as the protector of democracy, rather than remaining a threat to it.

#### AMERICA NEEDS THE BOY SCOUTS

(Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, this body pledged its allegiance to our flag and to our Republic, under God. Just so, at every meeting, the Boy Scouts of America give their oath to our Republic and to God. There it is, that name again: God. It is good enough for our pledge, it is good enough for our currency, it is even good enough to be in the phrase above the Speaker's podium behind me.

But the ACLU has sued the Department of Defense because the Boy Scouts of America use that phrase and DOD sponsors Boy Scout troops. This is not just the usual left-wing, anti-American foolishness.

Boy Scouts of America is a voluntary organization. It teaches American values like self-reliance and civic duty, values that are at the heart of our military, values that have created so many great leaders, even former presidents. Like never before, America needs leaders, America needs role models and positive, values-based programs. America needs our Boy and Girl Scouts.

The Department of Defense should not back down and, surely, the ACLU has better things to do.

#### REWARDING AMERICANS FOR THEIR TRUST

(Ms. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the American people voted for much more than candidates or parties this election year. They embraced our bold vision, and they expect us to deliver results.

They elected us with a mandate to keep our Nation on its path of economic growth and job creation, to continue tax relief for working families, and to pare back an inefficient, bloated bureaucracy that kills dreams.

One of our first priorities must be to reform our wasteful and oppressive Tax Code. Year after year, working Americans pay accountants and tax lawyers to help them understand this confusing labyrinth of laws and regulations. Just think about what this energy and capital could accomplish if directed towards truly creative purposes. Just imagine what a fair and simpler Tax Code could do to help us build a 21st century economy.

So let us engage in a vigorous debate. Let us begin rewarding the trust that the American people have placed in us, beginning today.

#### PAYING TRIBUTE TO AND HONORING PHIL CRANE AND BILL LIPINSKI

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute and honor to two of our retiring colleagues, Congressman PHIL CRANE and Congressman BILL LIPINSKI, two of the finest men I have ever known.

I first met PHIL CRANE in 1966 when he spoke to a conservative student group at the University of Tennessee and a few years later invited him to speak to my law school class at George Washington University. PHIL CRANE was one of the early national leaders of the modern-day conservative movement, a highly-respected professor, author and legislator. His life has been a true inspiration to countless numbers of young people all across this Nation.

BILL LIPINSKI served as my Ranking Member for the entire 6 years I chaired the Subcommittee on Aviation. I said then that I do not believe any Chairman and Ranking Member got along or worked together better than BILL LIPINSKI and I did. BILL LIPINSKI never forgot where he came from. I have always considered him to be a master politician in the very best sense of the word and the epitome of what a Congressman who truly serves his constituents should be.

I will miss seeing these two men on such a regular basis, but this Nation is a better place today because of the service of two gentlemen from Illinois, PHIL CRANE and BILL LIPINSKI.

#### PAYING TRIBUTE TO MARINE CORPORAL SHANE KIELION

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

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of gratitude and profound sense of sadness that I rise to pay tribute to the life of a brave young man who grew up in my hometown of Omaha, Nebraska, Marine Corporal Shane Kielion who died Monday in combat in Iraq, in Fallujah. On the same day, he became a father.

With his entire life in front of him, Shane chose to risk everything to fight for the values Americans hold close to our hearts in a land halfway around the world. This was his second tour of duty.

My heart goes out to his wife April and his brand-new son Shane and his parents, Roger and Patricia. As a father myself, I cannot imagine being unable to see my sons grow up, and it breaks my heart that Shane will not have the same experience. But I know that Shane will be watching over his young son, and I hope the boy will grow up knowing that his father loved him and his mother very much.

Shane was known as a dedicated person to his wife and he would be to his son and to his country, and all Nebraskans will remember him as a true American. We can take pride in the example he set, bravely fighting to make the world a better place. My thoughts and prayers go out to Shane's family and friends during this difficult time. May God grant them strength, peace, and comfort.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 2986, INCREASING THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 856 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 856

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (S. 2986) to amend title 31 of the United States Code to increase the public debt limit. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. 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.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 856 is a closed rule that provides for consideration of S. 2986, a bill to increase the public debt limit. The rule provides one hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. Finally, the rule provides 1 motion to commit.

Mr. Speaker, the debt limit increase bill that will come before this body is a necessary step in order to avoid a shutdown of our government. The Federal Government has never before defaulted on our obligations, but without our immediate action today we will simply be unable to pay our bills.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill increases the statutory debt limit in order to protect the full faith and credit of the United States. It is necessary and not an unusual step to ensure that the Federal Government is able to pay its bills.

It is important to note that the level of debt subject to limit is a function of past decisions made by decades of administrations and Congresses. It is equally important to note that increasing the debt limit does not increase the deficit.

As Robert Rubin, President Clinton's Treasury Secretary noted, "Passage of the debt ceiling is totally unrelated to deficit reduction." And in testimony before the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services, he further noted that "The debt limit is about meeting obligations already incurred, while future deficits can only be reduced so actions taken in the budget process itself."

While the publicly-held debt has increased more rapidly in recent years, it is a result of the ongoing war against terrorism, an effort that began after the horrific attacks on our Nation on September 11, 2001.

Without passage of the underlying bill today, vital programs such as Social Security, medicare, unemployment insurance benefits, veterans' care, and military retirement are all put in jeopardy.

We risk not providing food, clothing, ammunition, and other necessary resources to our brave men and women engaged in the war on terror. Highway funding, disaster assistance, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, all will be at risk.

In addition, if we do not act today, taxpayers will be further burdened with higher interest rates, and we risk the disruption of financial markets at a time when our national economy continues to grow at a strong pace.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and this underlying legislation is necessary to keep the government operating, ensure

the continued delivery of vital services for our citizens, and provide the equipment, supplies, and munitions our troops need to continue our fight in the war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

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

□ 1015

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, as of yesterday, the national debt hit \$7,444,423,020,967.95. It translates to over \$25,000 owed by each and every one of us. The national debt is growing so fast, \$1.6 billion every single day, that the last seven digits on the national debt clock in New York City are flipping faster than can be seen by the human eye.

No one is spared this heavy economic burden, not even America's children. In fact, today every child born in America comes into this world owing a birth tax of \$25,255 which is their share of payment on a national debt that they had no part in creating.

To my friends on the other side of the aisle that fought with such fervor and passion against the so-called death tax, I ask, where is the moral indignation when it comes to the birth tax which is levied on this Nation's most innocent Americans, its children?

This is a moral issue. The Federal Government cannot continue to borrow 20 cents of every dollar it spends, run up historic deficits, and add to the Federal debt without seriously harming the economy for generations yet unborn.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a measure to raise the debt ceiling for the third time in 3 years. The debt ceiling is a statutory limit, imposed by law on the total amount of debt that the United States of America can incur. It currently stands at \$7.384 trillion. At the beginning of President Bush's first term, Congress was told that the debt ceiling would not need to be raised until the year 2008 at the earliest. However, if we count the \$800 billion increase provided for under S. 2986, the bill to be considered later today, the debt limit will have been raised by more than \$2 trillion since President Bush took office.

On this day, with Americans coming together in Little Rock, Arkansas, to open the Bill Clinton Presidential Library, I find myself waxing nostalgic for the budget policies of the 1990s: the PAYGO rules, the spending caps and other critical budget policies that set our Nation's budget on a path to historic surpluses and allowed us to pay down the national debt for 7 straight years. It was not easy but it was the right thing to do.

Last night in the Committee on Rules, my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), offered an amendment to S. 2986 to help us get on the path of fiscal discipline. The Thompson amendment, co-authored with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), one of this body's most thoughtful Members on budget issues, would have allowed this body to restore the PAYGO rules and spending caps that were allowed to lapse in 2002. Regrettably, the Thompson amendment was rejected and my colleagues are being denied the opportunity to restore some budget discipline.

Mr. Speaker, our national deficit keeps hitting historic highs, \$413 billion by the end of September, and no end in sight, particularly as we are spending \$5 billion a month on the war. At this rate, deficits will continue for years to come, adding several trillion at a minimum to the colossal debt we have already incurred. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office analysis indicates that at the current rate of deficit spending, by the year 2014 the debt ceiling will have to be raised to \$14.5 trillion.

Chronic budget deficits also undermine the economic security of Americans. As the government's appetite for money increases and it consumes more and more of the capital available in credit markets, more Americans will face higher interest rates and find it harder to finance their homes, their education, and their businesses.

Moreover, there is cause for alarm when we look at how this debt is being financed. I have serious concerns about how this Nation will maintain its sovereignty as foreign governments and nationals continue to bankroll us.

Today, the Japanese hold over \$600 billion in U.S. debt paper and the Chinese hold between \$225 and \$275 billion. When 90 percent of new debt is purchased by the likes of the Bank of China and Japanese interests, how can we be sure that we have the resources to provide for the national defense? How do we ensure our independence when foreign governments who do not share our Nation's values or views on foreign policy issues buy up our bonds?

I strongly believe that the level of foreign holdings is a grave and gathering threat to our Nation's sovereignty.

Mr. Speaker the closed rule before us today only allows an hour to debate the national debt. That is simply not enough time to debate an issue that affects every man, woman and child, living and unborn, in this country. Moreover, the majority's refusal to let the Simpson-Stenholm PAYGO amendment come to the floor for a vote is foolhardy. Without a major change in course, we are on the path to debt for generations to come.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 17, 2004]

#### SOARING CEILINGS

This week the lame-duck Congress will have to raise the federal debt ceiling. For several weeks the Treasury Department has

been doing the governmental equivalent of scrounging for spare change in the couch cushions to pay its obligations. Now, with the election safely past and Treasury at the limits of its ingenuity, lawmakers will do the inevitable and increase the government's borrowing authority by as much as \$800 billion—raising the debt ceiling to more than \$3 trillion.

This will be the third time in three years that the debt limit has been increased, for a grand total of more than \$2 trillion during President Bush's first term. The last hike was nearly \$1 trillion, but it took less than 18 months for the government to hit the newly raised ceiling. By way of comparison, the entire federal debt in 1980 was less than \$1 trillion;

There will be some noisy debate about this, only partly on point. The debt limit, as now defined, both overstates and understates the problem of the national debt. It overstates the problem by including not only what an ordinary person would think of as "real debt"—the \$4.3 trillion the government has borrowed—but also money the government essentially owes itself. These are the "trust funds" to finance future obligations, such as Social Security and Medicare, that the government "borrows" from to pay its current bills. To the extent this reflects a debt, it's of a different sort from a Treasury bond. But if this is a debt, the ceiling understates the problem because the trust fund IOUs the government issues to itself don't come close to reflecting the full cost of its future commitments to those programs.

This much is beyond question: The government is living far beyond its means. The deficits it racks up year after year impede economic growth, burden future generations and force the United States to rely on foreign governments and investors. Since Mr. Bush took office, foreign holdings of U.S. debt have grown from 30 percent to 43 percent of the total, and 90 percent of the new debt has been purchased by foreigners. Meanwhile, as the government has to pay more interest on its debt, it has less for health care, education and other programs. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the government's interest payments are expected to more than double between 2003 (\$153 billion) and 2010 (\$319 billion); interest costs will account for almost 10 percent of federal spending in the next decade.

"We owe it to our children and grandchildren to act now," Mr. Bush said in his first State of the Union address. He was speaking about his plan to pay off over the next decade the entire \$2 trillion in government debt held by the public. Now, instead of being eliminated, debt held by the public—real debt—is on track to reach \$6.5 trillion by 2011. How do Mr. Bush and all the lawmakers who have enabled his irresponsibility plan to explain that to the grandchildren?

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to just clarify the record that while public debt is held by foreign interests, foreigners invest in the United States because we have a sound economy and we provide a safe place for them due to our low risk of default.

The market for U.S. Treasury securities is the largest, most liquid and transparent financial market in the world.

It is also important for our colleagues to know that our debt limit increase is not an unusual function if we

just look at the 21st century, but I think we kind of have to look at the last half of the 20th century.

The level of outstanding debt is subject to a limit and a function that is past decisions made by previous administrations and Congresses over decades, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, as well as current and past levels of economic activity and should not be subject to political gamesmanship.

As we look at the debt limit increase measures, there have been 83 since 1940, Mr. Speaker, seven during the 1940s, six during the 1950s, 13 during the 1960s, 18 during the 1970s, 24 during the 1980s, 13 during the 1990s and two far this decade. So it is not an unusual function or an unprecedented function or a Republican function or a Democratic function. It is a function of keeping the government running.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I want to begin by saying that I suspect that this may be the last rule that will be managed by our good friend from Buffalo, New York (Mr. REYNOLDS), as he is going to be taking the position that the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) is giving up as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means representing the State of New York on the Committee on Ways and Means. So I want to say that rarely have we seen the kind of passionate eloquence when it has come to management of rules on the House floor that we have from my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS). And I want to congratulate him and thank him for his stellar service to the Committee on Rules and to this institution overall.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. It is the fiscally responsible policy for us to increase by \$800 billion the national debt limit. One might say, how can that be fiscally responsible for us to all of the sudden increase that burden which has the potential to increase interest rates and do all of these other things that obviously we bemoan increases in spending.

Well, the reason it is the fiscally responsible thing for us to do is that if we do not, there are tremendous obligations that the Federal Government has that could potentially be jeopardized. Not that they will be jeopardized or not, but potentially be jeopardized. One of the things that is important for us to realize, Mr. Speaker, is that if we look at the question of the auction of our Treasury bills that is on the horizon, we know one thing full well. If we do not take this action now as expeditiously as possible, get this done, we will increase the already-high interest costs that the American taxpayer will be shouldering.

Now, this issue is a wonderful issue to demagogue, and I will tell you that

I probably in my quarter century here have been guilty of having done it in the past. I will say that clearly increasing the debt ceiling is something that it is easy to cast a "no" vote on it, but it is not the responsible thing to do.

Now, we listen to people decrying a number of things. Obviously, there is talk about how this President inherited a wonderful surplus and today many of our colleagues are in Little Rock, and we congratulate President Clinton on the opening of his library; but let us remember that as we looked at the surplus that was created during the decade of the 1990s, Mr. Speaker, it was done so because of the fact that we Republicans came to majority in 1994. And we came to majority focusing on a couple of things. Yes, trying to restrain the growth of Federal spending, but at the same time we had our attention on the issue of economic growth. And we know that we brought about that economic growth because of the fact that we were able to reduce taxes to stimulate the economy.

Now, one of the things people say when we talk about the problems of increased spending that has taken place over the past 4 years, one of the things we need to recognize is that even if we did not have the horrendous attacks of September 11, 2001, against the United States of America, even if we did not have the war and the costs of that war in Iraq, we still would be dealing with deficit spending. We still would be faced with the challenge of increasing the debt ceiling. Why? Because it was the fact that we saw an economic slow-down that really began as every economist, virtually every economist has recognized, every nonpartisan economist has recognized, began in the waning, waning months of the year 2000, before George Bush was even elected President of the United States. We saw this economic slow-down. And that economic slow-down obviously diminished flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury.

Now, what is it that we have done? Fortunately, with the policies we have put in place, Mr. Speaker, we have actually seen an increase to the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury and the last projection showed actually an unanticipated \$108 billion in revenues have come into the Federal Treasury. Why? Because of the fact that the economy is growing.

So we are on a path toward greater economic growth. And now that this election is behind us, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we also need to realize is that we have the potential to make permanent the tax cuts, to bring about reform of Social Security, which is a very high priority, and a wide range of other things, like market-opening opportunities which will help us.

The other thing that was just raised by my friend from Buffalo that I think is important for us to talk about is this wringing our hands over the fact that

there are nations like the People's Republic of China that might consider investing its dollars in the United States of America. What better signal of the strength and confidence that the world has for our economy than to see them invest in our economy? I see that, Mr. Speaker, as a positive for us as a Nation.

So it is very clear, some people who want to politicize and say, oh, well, let us not increase the debt limit. Well, it is very important that we do this. Increasing this debt ceiling will save U.S. taxpayer dollars because if we do not, we will see an even greater interest burden shouldered on the U.S. taxpayer. So let us vote for this rule. Let us vote for the rule as it is reported out because of the fact that any kind of delay would delay action over in the other body, and we need to move as quickly as we can on this and then let us vote for the package itself.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Committee on Rules.

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

□ 1030

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, that did not take long. On just the third legislative day after the election we are yet again confronting a need to raise the Nation's debt limit. It is interesting that even though this problem has been apparent for months the Republican leadership chose to wait until after the election to bring this issue to the floor, interesting but not at all surprising.

Once again, the historic fiscal mismanagement of this Republican Congress and the Bush administration is on display, and, once again, we are reminded that we are passing on a massive, unpaid credit card bill to our children and our grandchildren, and the numbers are staggering.

In 2002, the Bush administration came to Congress asking for a debt limit increase of \$450 billion. In 2003, they asked for another increase of \$984 billion, an unprecedented increase, and this year's request will increase the debt ceiling by another \$800 billion. Amazingly, this increase is only expected to last the Treasury 1 year, which means that unless this Congress gets its act together we will be back here next year debating yet another multibillion dollar increase in the national debt limit.

In the last 18 months, this Nation's debt has gone up by nearly \$1 trillion, \$1 trillion. Today's debate proves once again that the promises made by the Bush administration when they came into office were nothing more than empty rhetoric.

They promised under their plan the debt ceiling would not be reached until 2008. Instead, because they continue to

insist on massive tax breaks for the wealthy that are not paid for, the debt limit will have to be raised for the third time in 3 years.

On January 29, 2002, George Bush stood in this Chamber and told the Nation our budget will run a deficit that will be small and short term. I guess he misspoke.

But this debate is about more than numbers, Mr. Speaker. It is about priorities. It is about the kind of country we are leaving for future generations. How will our children be able to afford things like education and health care, homeland security and national defense? How will they be able to pay for us when we retire?

These massive deficits, this huge debt will mean higher interest rates, and that means that the American people will have to pay more for a college education or a new car or a new home. Reckless fiscal policy is not a value. It is a vice, and it has to stop.

Mr. Speaker, the fiscal irresponsibility of the majority and the administration is magnified by the Republican leadership's refusal to institute budget reforms requiring Congress to pay for any new spending. PAYGO simply is a responsible plan that says if you want to increase spending or if you want to give tax cuts to your rich friends, you have got to pay for it.

In the Committee on Rules, several members offered, and I supported, an amendment to increase the debt limit and reinstate the pay-as-you-go spending policies, and it was rejected.

Now I know what my friends on the other side of the aisle are thinking, the next election is not for another 2 years. They think the American people will forget about this fiscal irresponsibility that they are pursuing. Well, maybe they might and maybe they will not, but, in the meantime, they are undermining our economy and they are passing on to our kids a big fat credit card bill and it is shameful.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and vote no on the underlying bill so we can have a real debate on the gross fiscal mismanagement of this Congress and this administration and institute real budget reforms that will provide pay-as-you-go for increased spending and these tax cuts.

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

I think it is important, after listening to my colleague and fellow member of the Committee on Rules, that we point out that tax relief did not cause the deficit. We would have triple-digit budget deficits today if taxes remained at the historically high levels of 2000. The tax policies that were put in place helped our economy out of a recession that began in the Clinton administration and was in the early Bush years.

Without our tax policies, the economy would not have recovered as quick and as well as it has. More Americans would have lost their jobs. A less robust recovery from recession would

have had the adverse effects on revenues and the budget deficit, and healthy revenue growth continues even with tax relief. The recent decline in the deficit is largely a result of revenue increasing faster than anticipated because of strong economic growth.

After 3 years of declining revenue in the wake of September 11, revenue is now growing more robustly than expected. Just since July, we have seen the deficit projections for this year drop by \$32 billion. While I cannot predict what the next election will be, I do know the President ran on those tax cuts, as did the majority in this Congress, and both the President will serve another term and in the 109th Congress the Republican majority will continue in being the majority in this body.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I just refer him to CBO's report in which it concludes that the tax cuts are the largest legislative contributor to the negative debt that we have right now. I mean, so it runs contrary to what the gentleman is saying.

All we are suggesting here is that when my colleagues pass these tax cuts for their corporate friends and for wealthy people that they pay for them, pay as you go. That is the responsible thing, so we do not pass this debt on to our kids and our grandkids.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, in the time of the last 2 years of this Congress we have had a great debate. A guy from the left that believes that there should not be tax cuts, or to have some kind of message for middle America to feel that they might get a piece of it.

I am a guy that believes if you pay taxes, you ought to get a tax cut. We took that referendum, I guess, to the public, and they have ratified an opportunity for this majority to remain.

Now, I also understand majority/minority politics, and I guess if I look through the years of 1940, 1950, 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and 2000 when we would find that Republicans controlled the place or Democrats controlled the place, I am sure that there were a few that made the debt reduction or the aspect of all of that debate at the same time they looked at the debt limit.

But also in my opening remarks we heard from Secretary Rubin who said that the aspect of raising the debt limit was not the aspect of addressing the deficit. It was the budget itself. And I will quote him.

As Robert Rubin, then Treasury Secretary under the President said in November of 1995 in that quote, Passage of the debt ceiling is totally unrelated to deficit reduction. The deficit can only be reduced in the budget process.

He reiterated this truth 1 month later in testimony before the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services when he said, The debt limit is about meeting obligations already

incurred, while future deficits can only be reduced through actions taken in the budget process itself.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this is the third time under this administration that we have raised the debt limit, and what we were asking for last night in the Committee on Rules and what we are asking for today is that, before we do this again, that we institute the necessary budget reforms that require pay-as-you-go so that we are not going down this path of fiscal irresponsibility, so we are not passing down to our kids and our grandkids this massive credit card bill.

My colleagues denied us that ability to be able to vote up or down on a pay-as-you-go bill today, and that is what we are urging here today. That is why we are opposing this rule, and that is why I am going to vote against increasing the debt limit. Because there is no reason to believe that my colleagues' bad habits are not going to continue into the next Congress.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, a couple things.

One, in the finger pointing of this 21st century of deficit and debt limit increases, again, I will put on the record, we had seven during the 1940s, six during the 1950s, 13 during the 1960s, 18 during the 1970s, 24 during the 1980s, 13 during the 1990s and two so far this decade. So we are not into a new venture, and we are not into a Republican venture. We are into a congressional decision of whether we keep the government moving or whether we do not, and there were 83 debt limit measures that have been enacted into law.

I believe the gentleman from Texas will come up and talk about the PAYGO amendment that was offered before the Committee on Rules last night, and I think that it will be important for us to listen to him, and I believe that the issue of PAYGO will have bipartisan support if and when it comes to this floor.

But I also want to caution my colleagues that this is a Senate bill that we are taking up, and further delay once again results in this body jeopardizing our trust funds such as Social Security, Medicare, highways, and we further jeopardize veterans' care and military retirement.

So when we put our military at risk, at not having the necessary resources of food and clothing and ammunition, we also endanger unemployment benefits and disaster assistance, low-income home energy assistance programs.

The debate on PAYGO I believe should happen and will happen. It is not necessarily that it has to happen when we are looking at debt limit for a number of reasons, including the quotes of Robert Rubin of 1995.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 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 want to begin by congratulating my Republican colleagues for bringing this bill to the floor today, clean, up and down. There is a certain amount of justice to this because those who have built up these deficits should have the courage to vote to increase the debt ceiling for the policies of which they have been very successful, and that is commendable.

I sincerely say that, even though my opposition to those policies help contributed to my defeat. Because I have stood on this floor many times, Mr. Speaker, asking that PAYGO be reinstated, but it was never the right time, and, according to the Committee on Rules, it is not the right time today to bring up pay-as-you-go.

But we can talk about these deficits and debt and my friends on the majority side can continue to explain them as they really do not matter anymore. It does not matter that we have borrowed \$570 billion in the last 12 months, that we borrowed \$1.5 trillion in the last 3 years, that we are going to borrow who knows how much more, continuing to fund the same policies. Because I assume if one was elected on these policies they will continue them. That means, based on most economists, the deficit is going to explode into the next year, 2, 3, 5, 10 years.

I hope I am wrong. I want to say here today to my friends on this side of the aisle, I sincerely hope they are right because our country will be so much better off if they are right than if they are wrong, because I detect in today's motion a reluctance to change anything.

I have come to the conclusion now that politics are not going to change my colleagues' policies. They have got the majority in the House. They have got the majority in the Senate. They have got the White House. Therefore, they are going to do what they believe is in the best interest of our country.

I just do not share the belief that deficits do not matter. I just do not share the belief, and I never dreamed I would be a member of the party of fiscal responsibility, which my party has become.

Based on historical records, they talk about a trillion and a half is not much money, \$800 billion, not much money. Well, it took our country 204 years to borrow the first \$1 trillion. Today, we are going to make it possible to borrow another \$800 billion, and it probably will occur in the next 12 to 18 months.

It is not politics that is going to ultimately decide this question. It is the market that is going to decide this question, and I would encourage my friends on this side of the aisle to start paying attention to the market.

It was not insignificant that 2 months ago the Japanese, for the first time since 2002, chose not to increase their holdings of United States Treas-

ury notes. It is not of some insignificance that the European community is concerned about the fall of the dollar.

Much of what the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) has said I agree with him on. I agree with Mr. Rubin, Secretary Rubin. I agree with him 100 percent. I am glad the gentleman repeated it twice for the RECORD because more Members of this body need to read that and understand that what he is talking about is exactly as he has restated it.

This is not a budget vote. What we were talking about last night in asking my colleagues to make pay-as-you-go a part of this rule is changing the policy just a little bit in reinstating pay-as-you-go which worked in a bipartisan way in 1993 and 1997. But this bunch, those of my colleagues who control this House today, have said, nope, that is not any good anymore. We have got a new and better policy. Some of us disagree with that, and we just ask respectfully that we be allowed to vote on that today, but my colleagues said no, and this is their prerogative. That is their prerogative.

To those of my colleagues who believe that the amount of deficits this country is running today and will run under the policies they advocate, if they are going to make the tax cuts permanent, if they are going to continue to have the reductions in the amount of revenue, if we are going to continue to fight to a successful culmination, which I hope we do, of the wars, if we are going to do that, I think there may be a little justice in this for the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS), and I hope you will be up to it.

Going to the Committee on Ways and Means means the gentleman is going to be part of the ways and means of solving this problem, sooner or later, but not today, obviously. Sooner or later, the gentleman is going to have to be part of that, I believe.

So, again, I conclude by congratulating my colleagues for bringing this bill up for a clean up and down vote. If they would have allowed pay-as-you-go, I would have been one of those votes, but I am not going to ratify a policy that I believe is going to drive this country to the brink of ruin, and the market will ultimately be the judge of this, not any vote in this body according to the majority today.

□ 1045

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

It is true that in 2004, as we consider whether we increase the debt limit, the government is controlled by Republicans, a Republican President, a Republican Congress in both the other body and in this one. But I am reminded of President Bill Clinton's State of the Union address in 1996, and I quote him: "And on behalf of all Americans, especially those who need their Social Security payments at the beginning of March, I challenge Congress to preserve the full faith and

credit of the United States, to honor the obligations of this great Nation as we have for 220 years, to rise above the partisanship and pass a straight-forward extension of the debt limit. Show them that America keeps its word."

That rang true when a Democratic President spoke to a Republican Congress; it rings true today as we consider the debt limit.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 second just to say that President Bush, in his first State of the Union said, "We owe it to our children and grandchildren to act now," speaking about his plan to pay off in the next decade the entire \$2 trillion in government-debt held by the public.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, we are here because the Secretary of the Treasury has warned us that he has run out of tricks. Five times he has written the leadership of the Congress and told us that he was approaching the legal limit which Congress has imposed by law on how much debt the United States can incur. We call it the debt ceiling. Now he has told us that he is out of tricks and he is having to do things he does not regard as prudent unless we increase the debt ceiling. So it is right that we are here to do just that.

But it is also right that we take an hour or two to ponder what brings us to this juncture, to raise the debt ceiling again by \$800 billion, when we have already raised it twice in the last 3 years.

Let us go back to January 1, 2001. The Bush administration takes office, and the fruits of our labor in the last two administrations of the Clinton years are laid before him. They look out and see surpluses of \$5.6 trillion and decide that this warrants huge tax cuts. We warned them against buying into a blue-sky projection which might not be obtained, and surely enough, that happened.

They told us, nevertheless, that even if we adopted their tax cuts, they would not have to be back to request an increase in the debt ceiling due to the fantastic surpluses they foresaw, until the year 2008. In truth, they were back in 2002 asking for \$450 billion. And then on May 26, 2003, just 18 months ago, the second request from the Bush administration was passed raising the debt ceiling by \$984 billion. And now we have the third debt ceiling increase in 3 years, equal to \$800 billion, before us.

Let me just take a minute to go through some charts which will explain more graphically why it is we are here and what it is we need to do at this point in time.

This was the debt ceiling when Mr. Bush came to office in January 2001,

\$5.950 trillion. This first increase took it to \$6.4 trillion. The next, where we are today, \$7.384 trillion. That was a \$984 billion increase just 18 months ago. Today, they would like to take that up another \$800 billion because they have rung up \$984 billion in debt in the last 18 months.

Just consider that. Every 18 months the government of the United States under the Bush administration is incurring \$1 trillion in additional debt. Every 18 months. That is the rate at which we are running right now. This next increase will take the debt ceiling to \$8.2 trillion, up from \$5.950 trillion. That is quite a statement about the fiscal policies of this administration.

Now, the administration assured us that they would not need to come back until 2008; that we could cut taxes by immense amounts not only in 2001, but 2002 and 2003, because there have been three tax cuts, and even more, and still enjoy an increase in revenues. This was the path they plotted when they sold their tax cuts to the Congress of the United States showing that tax revenues would rise from a little over \$1 trillion to \$1.118 trillion, individual and corporate income taxes.

Instead, the revenues of this country have followed this descending path here, and we can see the gaping hole, the difference of \$300 billion today between what they predicted and where we actually are. This is an underlying cause.

In addition to that, there have been things that have taken their toll on the budget: defense. Much larger than anybody anticipated in 2001. Homeland Security. We did not even have a heading called Homeland Security 3 years ago. And the 9/11 response. But the increases in spending that have affected the bottom line of the budget have all been sought by the Bush administration. Ninety percent of the increases in spending over and above current services have been things they have sought and we have appropriated because they were urgently needed.

So where are we? A \$450 billion increase in the debt ceiling in 2002. In 2003, we had a \$984 billion increase in the debt ceiling. And today, an \$800 billion increase in the debt ceiling. That means this administration has had to come to Congress and ask for the debt ceiling to be raised by \$2.234 trillion. Let me say that again. It is so fantastic: \$2.234 trillion to accommodate its budgets over the last 4 years. That is the bottom line. It is inescapable.

And how much is \$984 billion, the last increase we had 18 months ago? Well, \$984 billion is more than the entire debt of the United States in the year 1980–81 when Ronald Reagan came to Congress. The last increase 18 months ago exceeded it.

Let me just wrap up by saying that this calls for action. Sure, the ceiling has to be increased, but we should not just increase the ceiling and leave the problem unattended. The very least we can do is reinstate the PAYGO rules

which have worked so well and put the budget in surplus for the first time in 30 years in the 1990s. That is what we ask today, an opportunity to put up an amendment that would at least take one solid step towards stopping this head-long descent deeper and deeper into debt.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 9½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) has 12 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy in yielding me this time.

I heard the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules talk about how this is an easy issue to be a demagogue. Well, I would suggest what we heard from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) was the antithesis of demagoguery. It does not require an emotional or irrational appeal to prejudice. They have been direct and straightforward in telling the consequences of the Republican approach to debt management and spending.

I should amend that. It is not the Republican approach, because the gentlemen I just referred to from South Carolina and from Texas represent many Republicans, like I do back in Oregon, that do not subscribe to this; and it insults them to suggest this is the Republican approach to budgeting.

The distinguished Committee on Rules member from New York talked about the mandate. Well, I would think the Republicans and the President would have a mandate if they had ever talked about this. I did not hear a single Republican talk about increasing the debt. I did not hear them talk about reckless spending on programs for special interests, divorcing it from reality. In fact, they employed tactics to disguise the fact that we had exceeded the debt limit. They have been borrowing from retirement and disability funds, for instance, we expired in October.

No, if they had talked about this directly and honestly to the American public, I would accept the notion there is a mandate. And in fact I would suggest if they had done that with their plans, they would not have had a mandate, because they would not have won the election.

The fact is we are incurring more debt than is necessary for weapons that do not add to security, for handouts to special interests that do not need them, and tax cuts for people who need them least, making them permanent regardless of the fiscal consequences.

We are given a program from the majority party and the President that, if we approved it, would almost double this problem over the next 10 years. I, for one, cannot go back home to campuses and look these young men and women in the eye and suggest that I was a part of approving it.

I long for the day when we have a bipartisan effort to reduce the deficit and to deal meaningfully with our spending priorities. But unless and until that happens, I will vote "no" as the one way I have of protesting this bizarre divorce from reality, of the fiscal reality that all of us are going to have to live with.

Mr. Speaker, would that their rosy scenarios come to pass. In some respects, I hope that they will. I do not wish ill on our country. But the fact is, the policies and the practices are leading us down a path that we will regret for years to come.

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

First of all, I want to correct my colleague from Oregon. I do not think I said I had a mandate on anything. I think I outlined the fact we had a great debate before an election and Republicans continue here.

I also wonder if my colleague ever voted for a debt limit increase in his many terms of service, as we demagogue the issue today. As we come to a vote, it is going to get down to whatever excuse you find if you do not vote for it. But if you do not vote for it, you are actually putting the government in harm's way, which means the people are in harm's way. We have said that in repeated messages on the record today, and that still remains a fact as we look at consideration of the debate on the rule and then the underlying legislation following it.

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, last night I had the opportunity to testify before the Committee on Rules on behalf of my Blue Dog colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), who had proposed an amendment to reintroduce PAYGO into the rule. That proposed amendment would have reestablished one of the most basic, most responsible, and most successful principles of budget enforcement, the PAYGO rule.

I am sad to stand on this floor today and say that this amendment was stopped. It was stopped by the majority on that Committee on Rules from being able to be part of this final resolve to this issue today.

PAYGO was a provision in the original Budget Enforcement Act which this House allowed to expire in 2002. Prior to that time, not only were we forced to operate within the caps imposed on our discretionary spending; we had to

offset all legislation that had the effect of increasing spending or reducing revenue. Put plainly, we had to pay for our bills as we passed our bills.

Since the expiration of the Budget Enforcement Act provisions, PAYGO included, this Congress has not been operating with anywhere near the same level of fiscal responsibility.

□ 1100

Deficits are growing. They are growing in size, they are growing as a percentage of our gross domestic product and, most important, they are growing unchecked because we have allowed provisions such as PAYGO to expire.

The Stenholm proposed amendment would have returned us to the rules by which Congress operated during the 1990s, bipartisan rules. This is not a partisan concept. In its original form in 1990, PAYGO was part of a bipartisan budget agreement between the first President Bush and a Democratic Congress. In 1993, it was extended with a Democratic President and Congress, and again in 1997 it was extended with a Democratic President and a Republican Congress. One hundred ninety-three Republicans voted for PAYGO when it was last extended. One hundred twenty-one of them are still serving in this House today.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal budget should emphasize fiscal responsibility, saving the money necessary to keep both Social Security and Medicare solvent, and paying down the national debt, not increasing it.

I do not like voting to increase the debt ceiling any more than anybody else in this body, but I am not opposed to it if it is accompanied by a plan that would put us back on solid fiscal ground. A good way to start is to reinstate the PAYGO rules. It would be irresponsible for this body to raise the debt limit without a plan for controlling this runaway spending.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up for fiscal responsibility, to stand up for fiscal integrity and vote no on this rule and insist that we restore PAYGO.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to a number of my colleagues, and I have been on the record repeated times. First of all, what came before the Committee on Rules last night was a Senate bill. The Committee on Rules made a vote and decision without having any further delay to bring forward the Senate bill for consideration on the rule that we are now in debate on, and later we will have debate on the underlying legislation.

We can demagogue it and put on the record all sorts of messages to feel good or draw political lines or switch from when might have been responsibility for voting for debt limit and now not, and now PAYGO. We have had debate on that. But I want to make sure that we listen to two things when we talk about bipartisanship. Bipartisan-

ship is a two-way street of working together.

I suspect, as I said before my colleague from California entered the Chamber, I expect to see Republican support again for PAYGO. Republicans are looking at it closely. There is certainly support for consideration of that. My colleague from California outlined some of the votes in a bipartisan vote that came for PAYGO, and I addressed that I think, with the gentleman from Texas, that there is support.

The question is, under the terms of the debate, we want it altogether, right now, right here, and that is the position we are carrying. Some of that has been now a Blue Dog position that has been laid out by a number of members of that caucus. But the reality is if we keep screwing around with this thing, we are going to shut the government down. We cannot have it both ways.

Each of us has voted for something that makes the government run and takes credit for it when it is the fall of the election year, making sure that voters knew they were working hard to bring some of that Federal money back home.

Any further delay will result in this body's jeopardizing our trust funds, like Social Security, Medicare and highways. We further jeopardize military care and retirement. We put our military at risk. We endanger unemployment benefits and disaster assistance and low-income home energy assistance programs, programs many of us had in our messages back in our respective States and districts.

We also talk about listening to presentations from 2000. At least twice I put on the record in this hour 83 different times over the last 64 years has the Congress taken upon itself to increase the debt limit.

I also put on the record President Clinton's 1996 State of the Union address where he asked for bipartisan cooperation to ask the Congress to do the right thing and increase the debt limit.

So it is not a new thing, it is not a Republican thing, it is not a Democrat thing, it is a government thing. There will be a consequence if we do not keep the government running because, for the history of our Nation, we have never not made sure that we honored what needed to be done with respect to debt limit.

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York talks about the great mandate the Republicans got in the election. Why did they not have the guts to bring up an increase in the debt limit before the election?

This is no surprise. In fact, we technically reached default over a month ago. They have been borrowing Federal employees' retirement to keep the government floating, but now they say we

have no option but to vote for this today, and they have no plan.

Let us distill it down to something Americans understand. Trillions, billions, they do not get it. This is the third time we are going to ask for an increase in our borrowing on our credit card limit in 3 years under the Republican leadership, \$2,000 per U.S. citizen. That is what they are authorizing today to borrow. Now everybody here is going to have to pay that back with interest. With interest. And they have no plan to stop borrowing into the indefinite future. No plan at all.

They will not allow us to adopt a simple principle: If they want to increase spending, cut something else. If you want to cut income, decrease taxes, either get tax increases elsewhere or cut spending. That is all we are saying. It is a simple principle. It is something every American would have to do before their credit card company would give them an increase for the third time in 3 years. That is what they are doing here.

They say, there is no time to do that. We are powerless in face of the Senate.

Come on. Give me a break. Members want to talk about demagogues. You are a champion demagogue. You really are. We are borrowing \$1 million a minute to run this government. They want to say let us cut spending.

We can eliminate the entire government, the entire government, far beyond libertarians' dreams, and we would still have a deficit this year. Now we would keep half of the Department of Defense, but we would eliminate everything else the government does, and we would still have a deficit this year. That is how serious this problem is.

And they are borrowing money in the name of the American people who are going to have to pay it back with interest. Our kids are going to pay it back with interest. Our grandkids are going to pay it back with interest. In their scenario, our great great grandkids are going to pay it back with interest to the Chinese and others who are now financing our government and our spend-thrift ways.

All we are asking for here is a little bit of fiscal responsibility, a plan, a plan to deal with this mounting debt, a plan that any American would have to have if they asked their credit card company for the third increase in 3 years in their credit card limit, and they were also cutting their income.

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

Mr. Speaker, in 1996, we heard, as I put on the record, President Clinton's appeal to the Congress. I thought I might share a little bit of the appeal of our colleagues. The two I have come from the Democratic side of the aisle at that time who made the appeal for the debt limit to be rising.

Barbara Kennelly of Connecticut stated, "Lifting the debt limit should not be a matter of politics, but of governance. Ensuring that it is done

should not be a question of partisan leverage, but of leadership."

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), "If the debt ceiling is not extended or is sent to the President in a form he cannot sign, the repercussions will be devastating. Already, the leaders of our European allies are warning of an international financial crisis should the United States default on its debt payments. Bond rating agencies are raising alarm that our Nation's triple A bond rating is in jeopardy."

"An actual default would cause interest rates on Treasury bonds to rise, making a balanced budget almost impossible to achieve. Home mortgage and business borrowing rates would increase, slowing economic growth."

"In the past, many clean debt limit extensions have been passed in a bipartisan manner by this House. It was the right thing to do then, and it is the right thing to do now."

I do not always agree with my colleagues on some of their viewpoints of getting government solutions, and I am sure that many do not agree with me on government solutions, but we have certainly had a history of administrations, Democrat and Republican, and 83 times this Congress since 1940 has said let us do it.

Now I understand showmanship. I understand consumption back home. I understand we are still in November, so we have a little election spirit in us. But the reality is if we do not increase this debt limit, we are putting America's people in jeopardy.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I might ask the gentleman how he himself voted.

Mr. Speaker, the full faith and credit of the United States is not seriously at issue here. What is at issue is what we do not hear a lot about anymore. We do not hear the other side saying we can grow our way out of this debt. We do see the danger signs, the decline of the dollar, the rise in debt purchased by foreigners.

How can we plunge ourselves back into debt so quickly? As President Clinton dedicates his library, I cannot help remember the halcyon days of surplus where the President imposed pay-as-you-go discipline. We can do this ourselves.

Postponing a vote on the debt limit to get through an election is pathetically transparent. The moral bankruptcy of that postponement is deepened by the failure to even make a promise on PAYGO during this debate.

Unless we move, this generation will be remembered as the generation that had a party at the expense of their grandchildren, so selfish that they gave themselves a tax cut, robbed their children's Social Security, and then

charged it straight away to them. Let us do better than that. That is the very definition of a national moral issue.

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

I will be calling for a no vote on the previous question so we can change the rule and add the Stenholm amendment to reinstate pay-as-you-can-go programs in our budget process.

This amendment was offered in the Committee on Rules last night and defeated on a straight party-line vote. I want to emphasize that this no vote will not in any way prevent or block the consideration of the underlying bill to increase the debt ceiling, but a yes vote will block us in voting to restore the pay-as-you-go provisions in the budget process. 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 prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this Congress must honor our commitments and America's priorities. We must stand up today in support of our seniors and veterans and military and all citizens who will be harmed by our inaction. I urge my colleagues to do the right thing and support the rule and the underlying bill.

I also look at the 109th Congress as an opportunity for those who want to look at PAYGO, Republican and Democrat, from those from the left to those on the right to come together in a bipartisan fashion and continue working through the will of the House to see those types of considerations debated in committee and debated on the floor of this great House.

Before I yield back, I would like to quickly thank the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) and all of the members of the Committee on Rules and staff as this is most likely the last time I will manage a rule for this industrious panel. I have been honored to serve on the Rules Committee for the past 6 years.

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

PREVIOUS QUESTIONS FOR H. RES. 856: RULE ON S. 2986

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 2986) to amend title 31 of the United States Code to increase the public debt limit. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) the amendment specified in

section 2 of this resolution, if offered by Representative Stenholm of Texas or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for division of the question, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to commit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The amendment referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows:

Redesignate section 1 as section 101 and before such section add the following:

**TITLE I—INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT**

At the end, add the following new title:

**TITLE II—REINSTATING BUDGET ENFORCEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY**

**SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO REQUIREMENT.**

(a) PURPOSE.—Section 252(a) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by striking “2002” and inserting “2009”.

(b) SEQUESTRATION.—Section 252(b)(1) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by striking “2002” and inserting “2009”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 274 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by striking “2006” and inserting “2013”.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and 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 yeas 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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

**RECESS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2035

**AFTER RECESS**

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 8 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 2986, INCREASING THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 856 on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

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 adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 205, nays 191, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 534]

YEAS—205

- Aderholt
- Akin
- Alexander
- Bachus
- Baker
- Ballenger
- Barrett (SC)
- Bartlett (MD)
- Barton (TX)
- Bass
- Beauprez
- Biggart
- Bilirakis
- Bishop (UT)
- Blackburn
- Blunt
- Boehert
- Bonilla
- Bonner
- Bono
- Boozman
- Bradley (NH)
- Brady (TX)
- Brown (SC)
- Brown-Waite,
- Ginny
- Burgess
- Burns
- Burton (IN)
- Buyer
- Calvert
- Camp
- Cantor
- Capito
- Carter
- Castle
- Chabot
- Chocola
- Coble
- Cole
- Collins
- Cox
- Crenshaw
- Cubin
- Culberson
- Cunningham
- Davis, Jo Ann
- Davis, Tom
- Deal (GA)
- DeLay
- DeMint
- Diaz-Balart, L.
- Diaz-Balart, M.
- Doolittle
- Dreier
- Duncan
- Ehlers
- Emerson
- Everett
- Ferguson
- Flake
- Foley
- Forbes
- Fossella
- Franks (AZ)
- Frelinghuysen
- Gallegly
- Garrett (NJ)
- Gerlach
- Gibbons
- Gilchrest
- Gillmor
- Gingrey
- Goode
- Goodlatte
- Granger
- Graves
- Green (WI)
- Gutknecht
- Hall
- Harris
- Hart
- Hastings (WA)
- Hayes
- Hayworth
- Hefley
- Hensarling
- Herger
- Hobson
- Hoekstra
- Hostettler
- Hulshof
- Hunter
- Hyde
- Isakson
- Issa
- Istook
- Jenkins
- Johnson (CT)
- Johnson (IL)
- Johnson, Sam
- Jones (NC)
- Keller
- Kelly
- Kennedy (MN)
- King (IA)
- King (NY)
- Kingston
- Kirk
- Kline
- Knollenberg
- Kolbe
- LaHood
- Latham
- LaTourette
- Leach
- Lewis (CA)
- Lewis (KY)
- Linder
- LoBiondo
- Lucas (OK)
- Manzullo
- McCotter
- McCrery
- McHugh
- McInnis
- McKeon
- Mica
- Miller (FL)
- Miller (MI)
- Miller, Gary
- Moran (KS)
- Murphy
- Myrick
- Neugebauer
- Ney
- Northup
- Nunes
- Gibbons
- Gilchrest
- Gillmor
- Gingrey
- Goode
- Goodlatte
- Granger
- Graves
- Green (WI)
- Gutknecht
- Hall
- Harris
- Hart
- Hastings (WA)
- Hayes
- Hayworth
- Hefley
- Hensarling
- Herger
- Hobson
- Hoekstra
- Hostettler
- Hulshof
- Hunter
- Hyde
- Isakson
- Issa
- Istook
- Jenkins
- Johnson (CT)
- Johnson (IL)
- Johnson, Sam
- Jones (NC)
- Keller
- Kelly
- Kennedy (MN)
- King (IA)
- King (NY)
- Kingston
- Kirk
- Kline
- Knollenberg
- Kolbe
- LaHood
- Latham
- LaTourette
- Leach
- Lewis (CA)
- Lewis (KY)
- Linder
- LoBiondo
- Lucas (OK)
- Manzullo
- McCotter
- McCrery
- McHugh
- McInnis
- McKeon
- Mica
- Miller (FL)
- Miller (MI)
- Miller, Gary
- Moran (KS)
- Murphy
- Myrick
- Neugebauer
- Ney
- Northup
- Nunes
- Nussle
- Osborne
- Ose
- Otter
- Paul
- Pearce
- Pence
- Peterson (PA)
- Petri
- Pickering
- Pitts
- Platts
- Pombo
- Porter
- Portman
- Pryce (OH)
- Putnam
- Ramstad
- Regula
- Rehberg
- Renzi
- Reynolds
- Rogers (AL)
- Rogers (KY)
- Rogers (MI)
- Rohrabacher
- Ros-Lehtinen
- Royce
- Ryan (WI)
- Ryun (KS)
- Saxton
- Sensenbrenner
- Sessions
- Shadegg
- Shaw
- Shays
- Sherwood
- Shimkus
- Shuster
- Simpson
- Smith (MI)
- Smith (NJ)
- Smith (TX)
- Souder
- Sullivan
- Sweeney
- Tauzin
- Taylor (NC)
- Terry
- Thomas
- Thornberry
- Tiahrt
- Tiberi
- Turner (OH)
- Upton
- Vitter
- Walden (OR)
- Walsh
- Wamp
- Weldon (FL)
- Weldon (PA)
- Whitfield
- Wicker
- Wilson (NM)
- Wilson (SC)
- Wolf
- Young (AK)
- Young (FL)

NAYS—191

- Abercrombie
- Allen
- Andrews
- Baird
- Baldwin
- Becerra
- Bell
- Berkley
- Berman
- Brown, Corrine
- Butterfield
- Capps
- Capuano
- Boswell
- Boucher
- Boyd
- Brady (PA)
- Brown (OH)
- Brown, Corrine
- Butterfield
- Capps
- Capuano
- Cardin
- Cardoza
- Carson (IN)
- Case
- Chandler

- Johnson, E. B.
- Jones (OH)
- Kanjorski
- Kaptur
- Kennedy (RI)
- Kildee
- Kilpatrick
- Kind
- Kucinich
- Lampson
- Langevin
- Lantos
- Larsen (WA)
- Larson (CT)
- Lee
- Levin
- Lewis (GA)
- Lofgren
- Lowey
- Lucas (KY)
- Lynch
- Majette
- Maloney
- Markey
- Marshall
- Matheson
- McCarthy (MO)
- McCollum
- McGovern
- McIntyre
- McNulty
- Meehan
- Meek (FL)
- Meeks (NY)
- Menendez
- Michaud
- Miller (NC)
- Miller, George
- Mollohan
- Moore
- Moran (VA)
- Murtha
- Nadler
- Napolitano
- Neal (MA)
- Oberstar
- Holt
- Olver
- Ortiz
- Owens
- Pallone
- Pascarell
- Pastor
- Payne
- Pelosi
- Peterson (MN)
- Pomeroy
- Price (NC)
- Rahall
- Reyes
- Rodriguez
- Ross
- Rothman
- Roybal-Allard
- Ruppersberger
- Rush
- Ryan (OH)
- Sabo
- Sánchez, Linda T.
- Sanchez, Loretta
- Sanders
- Sandlin
- Schakowsky
- Schiff
- Scott (GA)
- Scott (VA)
- Serrano
- Sherman
- Skelton
- Slaughter
- Smith (WA)
- Snyder
- Solis
- Spratt
- Stenholm
- Strickland
- Stupak
- Tanner
- Tauscher
- Taylor (MS)
- Thompson (CA)
- Thompson (MS)
- Tierney
- Towns
- Turner (TX)
- Udall (CO)
- Udall (NM)
- Van Hollen
- Velázquez
- Visclosky
- Waters
- Watson
- Watt
- Waxman
- Weiner
- Wexler
- Woolsey
- Wu
- Wynn

NOT VOTING—36

- Ackerman
- Baca
- Boehner
- Burr
- Cannon
- Carson (OK)
- Crane
- Dooley (CA)
- Dunn
- English
- Feeney
- Gephardt
- Greenwood
- Hoefel
- Houghton
- John
- Kleccka
- Lipinski
- Matsui
- McCarthy (NY)
- McDermott
- Millender
- McDonald
- Musgrave
- Nethercutt
- Norwood
- Oxley
- Quinn
- Radanovich
- Rangel
- Schrock
- Simmons
- Stark
- Stearns
- Tancredo
- Toomey
- Weller

□ 2102

Mr. WEXLER and Mr. BLUMENAUER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. MCINNIS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 2100

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTION IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3204, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 3204, the Clerk be authorized to make the following correction: In section 4(a)(4)(B), strike "2010" and insert "2006".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware? There was no objection.

INCREASING THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 856, I call up the Senate bill (S. 2986) to amend title 31 of the United States Code to increase the public debt limit, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of S. 2986 is as follows:

S. 2986

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

**SECTION 1. INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT.**

Subsection (b) of section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking "\$7,384,000,000,000" and inserting "\$8,184,000,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 856, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The issue before us is really America's responsibility to pay its bills, to meet obligations that America and Congress, as our Members, have already incurred.

Before September 11 and the war on terror, the Republican-led Congress paid down nearly half a trillion dollars in public debt, marking the first time since 1969 that Congress had reduced the national debt. Today, America is fighting an elusive and determined enemy abroad, while working to stimulate the economy and help industry still recovering from the 9/11 attacks.

At this extraordinary time, with our Nation's many obligations, the government is nearing the debt limit. If the Treasury cannot issue the debt, the government may be unable to meet many of its obligations, such as the regular investment into the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund. Republicans want to do the responsible thing. As a result, Congress is increasing the debt limit to \$8.1 trillion.

Holding the line on spending and raising the debt limit are not mutually exclusive, and it is important to re-

member that. Earlier this year, the House approved a lean, responsible budget that would cut the deficit in half within 5 years, hold the line on spending and guard against Democrats' calls for job-killing tax hikes.

Republicans are committed to reducing America's debt through responsible and restrained spending. Congress must meet America's priorities such as Social Security and Medicare. That is why raising the debt limit is so critical. But, in doing so, we can remain steadfast in our quest to eliminate the waste, the fraud and abuse on behalf of all taxpayers and future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I do have a bipartisan request. Tonight's measure is an appropriate time to discuss spending and deficits and solutions, but as we debate this and as we make our final vote, let us not punish our seniors, let us not punish our elderly, let us not punish our military just to score political points. If the debt ceiling is not increased, America cannot pay its bills. We cannot meet existing obligations. We will not ultimately have the cash on hand to pay Social Security benefits, military retirement, Medicare benefits, unemployment benefits and other trust fund obligations.

As raw as this recent election was, as bitterly contested as it was, with hurt feelings all around, we need to work together as Americans to take responsibility for our bills. Let us not default on our obligations. Let us not stop the checks to our needy who are counting on us. Let us not use our elderly as political pawns in trade for a seven second sound byte back home. They deserve better. We have a responsibility to pay our bills.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remaining time.

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

I would like to join in the bipartisan request that we try to work this out. The request sounds like a drunk going to an Alcoholic Anonymous meeting, saying just give me one more drink and I will not do it again. But there has to be a program involved in joining with my colleagues in this bipartisan approach, and we have a program and that is pay-as-you-go.

My colleagues cannot help themselves with spending. They think they have a credit card with no limit on it. They go to the richest of their friends and they tell them, they do not ask for it, that they are going to give them a \$1 trillion tax cut. Then when they ask, well, where are we going to get the money, do not worry about it, we will increase the debt ceiling, we will just borrow some money.

Who are we borrowing the money from? The Japanese and the Chinese. What kind of patriotism is that? What kind of bipartisanship do my colleagues want for that?

The truth is every day for the next 2 years we are going to be dealing with the moral issues that encompass this Congress and this country, and the

quicker my colleagues try to explain how they can take a surplus projected at \$5.6 trillion and then come up and waste it and come up with a deficit of \$3 trillion, the quicker they can see that the interest on this debt is going to be larger than the things that they talk about in the Koran, in the Bible or in the Torah and all of those things. That is, talking about education and health care and help your fellow man and let us not help the high rollers that my colleagues try to do.

So we are prepared to work in a bipartisan way. If a creditor wants to try to help someone that just could not control the spending, the first thing they do is get a plan. We will give my colleagues plenty of opportunity to be bipartisan by saying pay-as-you-go. Do not stop everything. Do not hurt the aged. Do not hurt Social Security. Do not hurt Medicare. We know how compassionate they feel about those issues, but do not get us involved in anymore debt unless you have some kind of a cockamamie plan to get us out of the mess that you put us in.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) for the purposes of control, who has a true understanding of patriotism and compassion and moral values, and take notes because my colleagues are going to be hearing a lot about this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) will control the time.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, why are we here for the third time in 3 years? It is because our country has borrowed over \$1.5 trillion in that time from 2001 until now.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an accident. This is the first administration and the first Congress in the history of this country that has knowingly, willfully, deliberately, and consciously pursued an economic plan that will leave our country weaker in the long run than when they found it. No other people who have occupied these seats have consciously, willfully and deliberately bankrupted our country like what is going on today.

Just in the last 4 years, at a 5 percent interest rate, these people have raised taxes on the American people \$67 billion a year each and every year from now on to the rest of our lives because of this prolific borrowing that is going on.

President Jimmy Carter once said that the highest office in our land is that of citizen, and he is right. Citizens hire us to come here every couple of years in this body to do the public work, to try to run their business like we would run our own.

All we have asked of the majority is before we borrow another \$800 billion in

the name of every citizen in this country, they would at least give us the opportunity to stop and say why do we not pay for what we are spending? Why do we not do the moral value of paying our bills? We are not paying our bills by borrowing another \$800 billion. We are passing our bills on to our children, our grandchildren and anybody else who follows us. That is no moral value.

I tell my colleagues one other thing. We are creating a financial vulnerability in this country that is second only to the threat of terrorism. Since 2001, there has been an \$844 billion increase in foreign-held debt, and do my colleagues know who holds it? Almost every country in the world.

I hold this up from the Treasury Department: Japan, over \$700 billion; mainland China and Hong Kong, over \$230 billion; the Caribbean banking centers, over \$100 billion.

□ 2115

We are literally, you are literally mortgaging our future economy to anybody in the world that will give us money on the cheap today so we do not have to face up and pay our own bills from my generation: pass it on to somebody else. It is nothing less than a national security issue, and we will have more to say about that later.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Some people have a short memory around here. I do believe that reducing the debt, restraining spending is a bipartisan effort. We have to work together. But I recall my friends on the Democratic side, when Republicans proposed a Medicare drug plan of around \$400 billion, our friends on the Democrat side proposed a plan of \$968 billion. We did not spend too little; they wanted to spend more. When we talked about unemployment extensions, they increased it \$30 billion over the Republican plan. It was not that we were spending too little; they wanted to spend more. And when we talked about welfare reform and the need to move people to work, they added \$52 billion, my Democratic colleagues, so concerned about the debt. It was not that we were spending too little; they wanted to spend more.

And when we are talking about moral obligations, I guess I would ask this: Is it a moral obligation when you trumpet that press release for that new fire-fighting equipment, for that new road you got, for that new university research, for that farm bill you championed, when you stand for the ribbon-cutting back home, and when you court public approval for spending tax dollars? Do you also have the moral obligation to pay for it?

Today, the issue is are we going to pay the bills of America, pay for the spending that has been incurred and take responsibility for our own actions?

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say one thing. We are not paying for anything. We are borrowing every dime he is talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) asked us to be bipartisan. Why were the Republicans not bipartisan when you put your budget together? You want us to be bipartisan now. What about the past? You want us to be fiscally responsible for your fiscal irresponsibility. We will not do that.

You mentioned the Medicare bill. We paid for ours. You hid the facts about what you were proposing. You hid them from us, and you continue to do so.

It has been said here let everybody understand the impact on the families of America. The gross interest on the national debt this year: three-quarters of all nondefense discretionary spending. And when projected over 10 years, it is going to be even larger than non-defense discretionary spending.

This action of yours today is the bitter fruit of your fiscal irresponsibility. You give every reason for this problem except your own actions, your own default. It is time that you stood up to the bitter fruits of your policies. Do not stonewall. Do not give us the hollow excuses. This country's families are now being asked by you for a tax increase on every family of America. You can vote for that; I am not going to do so.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Like a mortgage payment, like a credit card payment, we are paying for past decisions by this Congress, some of them decades old. In fact, if we are talking about the past 40 years of control by our Democratic friends, we are talking about raiding the Social Security trust fund, increasing the debt, and in more recent years voting against every bill because we did not spend more. Because we did not spend more.

Republicans are standing up for this responsibility. We understand that America took three big hits to our economy on 9/11: the recession President Bush inherited, the attacks of 9/11 that cost us almost 2 million American jobs, and then the technology bubble burst and the scandals from the false economy of the 1990s.

America fought back. Republicans fought back with the simple principle: if we want to create jobs in America, leave the tax dollars in America, in our hometowns, on Main Street in our small businesses. By fighting back from a hit that would have sent most countries stumbling to their knees, we

are creating jobs, we are increasing revenue to the Federal Government, and the deficit is dropping.

But today, the question is, for all those Members who have been so eager to trumpet that press release, so eager to take credit for that spending that they brought home, the question is: Are you going to step up and pay the bills that America and Congress has incurred, or are you going to vote to stop our Social Security checks, stop the retirement checks to our military, stop the Medicare payments so important for the elderly?

It is bipartisan, whether you agree or disagree with how we got here. And that is a fair argument. Republicans and Democrats have a different view of this, and that is a healthy one. But regardless of that, if you supported the farm bill, if you supported the road bills, if you supported the water projects, if you supported the road projects, then step up and pay the bill tonight.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas described a situation here 3 years ago before we went on this borrowing binge. What he conveniently neglected to point out was that President Bush and the Republican Party inherited the strongest economy in the history of America that was expected to post a \$5.6 trillion, 10-year surplus. And he conveniently neglects to point out that it is the \$2 trillion that they have taken from the budget through tax cuts that have helped to put us in the situation that we are in. Talk about amnesia.

In just 4 years of Republican management, the country's fiscal situation has collapsed to the tune of nearly \$9 trillion, draining the entire Clinton surplus and digging a deficit of \$3 trillion, the largest deficit in the history of the world. And today, for the third time in 4 years, the country's fiscal situation has become so dire that we bumped up against the legal limit on how much we can borrow. So we are going to raise the limit or the government will default. All of this from the party that in American history has preached fiscal responsibility. So we have to come up with enough money now for their tax cuts, the war, and, by the way, just think of this, two wars with four tax cuts. That defies human history.

And the President has very big plans for the next 4 years. He says he is going to spend a lot of capital that he has earned. So we are going to create private accounts for Social Security, which would cost more than \$1 trillion, more than the current system might offer; and we do not even have enough money in the current system so that we are going to borrow this money tonight.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), who is a nice enough fellow, he mentioned a couple of moments ago the situation that we are in. I want to remind this body that 8 years ago the Republican Party was going to impeach Bob Rubin for doing precisely the things their Secretary of the Treasury is doing this evening.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I have 2 minutes and three or four charts that I think I can tell the whole story with.

The year 2001. The President saw, looking out 10 years, surpluses of \$4.6 trillion, and he said we can have it all, tax cuts and surpluses too. So he sent us a budget with enormous tax cuts. We warned against buying into those projections, but it was not heeded. They told us at the time that we could pass these tax cuts and we would not even have to consider an increase in the debt ceiling until the year 2008. That promise lasted 1 year.

The next year, in 2002, there was a \$450 billion request for another hike in the debt ceiling. The following year, 2003, there was a request for an increase in the debt ceiling of \$984 billion, the single largest increase in history, a bigger amount than the entire national debt in 1981 when Ronald Reagan came to office.

Add those three together and they tell you a lot: \$450 billion, plus \$984 billion, plus tonight's request, \$800 billion, comes to \$2.234 trillion. \$2.234 trillion. That is the amount by which we have had to increase the debt ceiling of the United States in order to accommodate the budgets and fiscal policies of the Bush administration: \$2.234 trillion.

Now, that is bad enough, but we asked CBO last September to take its latest economic forecast and to project the Bush budget 10 years, through the year 2014, and tell us how much debt would be accumulated in that period of time if we stayed on this course. This is what is to come. Tonight is only the beginning. This is what is to come if we follow those policies for the next 10 years. We will accumulate a national debt of \$14.545 trillion.

And here, the final chart tells it all. Our debt is increasing twice as fast as our GDP, or income. This cannot be sustained, and that is why we do not believe this bill in its present form should be adopted.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), a long-serving Member with strong leadership on the Select Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Many of our colleagues are just back from the Clinton library. I will never

forget the night on this floor, not so long ago, in 1996, when in this very Chamber President Clinton said right on the heels of his attempt to have the Federal Government take over responsibility for one-sixth of the Nation's economy, "the era of big government is over."

That line recalled similar sentiments by such earlier conservative Presidents as Ronald Reagan, Calvin Coolidge and Abraham Lincoln, with the difference being that the latter three actually meant it.

How many of you remember not just Clinton's favorite line but the entire passage in proper context? It went as follows: "We know big government does not have all the answers. We know there is not a program for every problem. We have worked to give the American people a smaller, less bureaucratic government in Washington, and we have to give the American people one that lives within its means. The era of big government is over."

I remember that moment vividly. I was, of course, sitting in this House Chamber, about 20 feet from the President, in this seat right here when he spoke those words. He was reading from the teleprompter, and his line of sight over the Plexiglas extended directly to my reserved place here at the leadership table.

Because Bill Clinton was very comfortable using the teleprompter, he routinely made eye contact with the Members sitting in the Chamber, and he looked me directly in the eye, and at that moment I could see that he was enormously satisfied with that line in his speech. Yet in retrospect, when Bill Clinton declared "the era of big government is over," he was right, for now we are living in "the era of really big government."

Assuming we keep to our schedule this evening, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government will spend more than \$100 million just in the time we are debating this debt ceiling legislation. The growth of government in modern history has been astounding. In 1952, the year I was born, which we all agree was not very long ago, Federal spending was a quaint \$68 billion compared to over \$2.5 trillion today. And it was just that high because America was at war in Korea at the time.

When my oldest child was born in 1993, Federal spending was \$1.4 trillion. In just one generation, the size of the Federal Government had increased more than 20-fold. We blew by the \$2 trillion mark in 2002, and we have not even taken our foot off the accelerator.

□ 2130

We are past the point where we can make excuses for the big government elephant in the living room. He has taken over our living space, contributing nothing to the family and, as Ronald Reagan knew, posing a threat to our freedoms.

President Reagan, my first boss in Washington, said it best in his 1989

farewell address, "Man is not free unless government is limited. There is a clear cause and effect here that is as neat and predictable as a law of physics: As government expands, liberty contracts."

President Reagan knew this fundamental truth: Big government is incompatible with freedom.

There is a reason that fiscal restraint is a traditionally conservative value. Big government requires big spending and, therefore, a comfort level in taking and using the fruits of other people's labor. It is a comfort level found in socialism, not conservatism.

So it is with great sadness that I come to the floor tonight to recommend a vote on increasing the debt ceiling. But the reason it is necessary is that the money has already been spent. The bills have come due for what this Congress has already voted for.

Three years ago, we endured a vicious attack on our Nation. As horrifying as it was, it was a visible attack, an attack from without. We knew then how to mount a defense against a foreign enemy. We would not give in to terror. At the time, Osama bin Laden boasted, "I tell you, freedom and human rights in America are doomed." He was wrong then, and he is wrong now. We will not cede this Nation to tyranny, but neither should we cede it to the burdens of big government.

We have got to acknowledge that, unlike the hideous face of terrorism, big government is an attractive seductress. It is sometimes enticing to our citizenry and certainly to many of us in this Chamber. But as chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, I know that every tax dollar spent on nonessential functions of government is, in these times, doubly squandered. Monies given to National Public Radio or the National Endowment for the Arts cannot go toward our national defense.

The truth is, rapid, unsustainable increases in nondefense spending threaten our ability to protect American citizens and to respond to future threats. Period. That is precisely what is happening now so long as the liberal big spenders in this Congress will not say no.

This vote on the debt ceiling tonight is nothing but a reminder that it is high time we get back to pruning back the waste of government. It can be done. We did it in 1995, the first year of the Republican House majority, and we can do it now.

The truth is, the biggest spenders in this Congress will be the ones who vote against this resolution. Because, for big spenders, reining in the government is not a serious priority. The majority of us, however, have got to be responsible. We have got to go forward with renewed resolve to be fiscally responsible. We have to keep uppermost in mind that big government does not have all of the answers. It really does not have many answers at all. Not good ones, anyway.

We know there is not a program for every problem. We have discovered, after all these years, that is really a good thing. So as we do the right thing tonight, Mr. Speaker, let us vow to stick with what the Founding Fathers wanted us to do. Not surprisingly, those are the very things we have been good at all along.

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

Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman just told Members is up is down, and down is up. The liberal big spenders have not spent a dime in this place in 10 years. They do not have the votes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee that Lewis Carroll is writing the speeches that are being given on this legislation: Up is down, black is white, good is bad, and bad is good.

Dick Arme said Republicans control this town, and you have for 4 years. Republicans control it. This House, the Senate, and the White House. Not a nickel is spent because Democrats vote on it. It is all your spending that you are talking about. All your spending.

The immoral, intellectually bankrupt fiscal policies that we have been pursuing for the last 4 years resulted in this request for this gargantuan increase on the debt on the head of every American, young and old.

Bill Clinton was President of the United States and, in 1998, no increase in the debt; 1999, no increase in the debt; 2000, no increase in the debt; 2001, no increase in the debt. Not until the Republican fiscal policies were adopted did this country start to sink deeper and deeper and deeper into debt. From less than \$6 trillion, in 42 months you have taken this country another \$2 trillion in debt.

Let us talk of moral values in America. Let us talk of squandering the public resources of a \$5.6 trillion surplus that President George Bush said was available when he spoke to this Congress in February, 2001. We have some fiscal conservatives, they say, on this floor and they say spending is the problem. Why have they not stopped it for 4 years?

They say there has been terrorism. I agree. There has been a war. We had a war under President Clinton, Members recall, one the other side of the aisle was not enthusiastic about, but we lost very few people, and the despot who committed genocide against the Bosnian people is now locked in The Hague.

I tell my friends, this is the right thing to do if we adopt the motion to instruct that will be offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the most fiscally responsible Member of this body. Increase it for a short time. The United States cannot welch

on its debt. We must pay our debt, but fiscal responsibility ought to be adopted by the majority that have control to do so.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

"We did not spend a dime around here for the past 10 years. All the spending is yours"?

That is not what you told your constituents. I have seen your press releases. You said you secured the road project. You said you championed university research. You said you got that road project. Here is my question: Who are you not leveling with, the voters back home or the people listening tonight?

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am prepared to pay for the public works projects that I secure. The public works project that this side secured pales into insignificance beside the public works projects that you get for your Members on your side of the aisle, 17 times as much as we did, and you came here saying we are against pork. Seventeen times, my friend. Seventeen times is the pork in your bills.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. "Mr. Speaker, we did not spend a dime around here for the past 10 years. It is all your spending." That was 2 minutes ago.

Today, it is, yeah, we spent a lot, but you spent more. Well, there is a difference. What we spent our deficit on was tax relief for the American people. I readily admit that. When we look at the deficit today, and we do share this, the fact of the matter is 50 percent of our deficit is caused because of this recession and we have to strengthen this economy. We have to get into a stronger economy. Twenty-five percent of it was new spending, spending that you have claimed credit for, not tonight, but you have claimed credit for years and years throughout the districts, in your speeches and in your campaigns. And the rest of that, that small amount left, is for tax relief to get people back to work, to help small businesses create jobs and get this economy strong again.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans are stepping up tonight to accept that responsibility to get the economy going. We are going to pay our bills. We are not going to claim credit for spending, lay the blame on another party, and then try to stop the checks for our Social Security recipients and our Medicare recipients and our military retirees.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think people realize the situation we are in. We will step up to the plate if the other side will allow us to pay-as-you-go, but they will not do that. They are not

paying anything. They are borrowing another \$800 billion. We are not paying any bills. We are borrowing money right now based on last year of \$1.1 billion a day, \$48 million an hour, \$796,000 a minute. We have already borrowed \$10 million while we have been talking. It is \$13,000 a second, and you will not let us have pay-as-you-go.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of talk about morality on this House floor and about patriotism.

I want someone to explain to me how it can be moral for a father to stick his kids with his bills. How can it be moral for me to stick my three kids and CHARLIE STENHOLM's beautiful grandson here with \$800 billion of new debt? I want to hear how it is patriotic to burden the next generation of Americans with so much debt that they cannot pay for their wars which they will unfortunately have, that they cannot pay for their natural disasters that are going to happen. Please tell me how that is moral or patriotic.

And for God's sake, Mr. BRADY, please do not tell me you are paying the bills tonight when you are borrowing \$800 billion that you are going to stick your kids with. You are not paying the bill. Your kids are going to pay the bill. And until they pay the bill, we are going to continue to squander \$1 billion a day on interest on the national debt.

It gets better, Mr. BRADY, because I bet when you got back to Texas you tell them how much you hate foreign aid, and so I am sure you would love to tell the people of Texas that one-third of that billion dollars a day that we spend on interest on the national debt goes to the Communist Chinese, goes to the Japanese, goes to the other countries that now own one-third of our debt. I am sure you are proud of that.

But let me just remind you, Mr. BRADY, 3 years ago on this floor, on my son's birthday, you all came down and said you can cut taxes, increase spending, and you were going to pay off the debt. Since that time, you have borrowed \$1,786,314,460,700.45. It gets better. Because in that time you have stolen over \$600 billion from the Social Security trust fund. Tell me how it is moral for you to steal from the Social Security trust fund, how it is moral to steal from the Medicaid trust fund, how it is moral to steal from the military retirees.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair reminds Members to address the Chair and not other Members in the second person.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, tell me the moral clarity of going home each week and trumpeting that press release for the firefighter fund or the road project or for

that water project, and then stand up here tonight and tell us we are not going to pay the bill for it. So the seniors who need their Social Security checks, the heck with them. The military retirees who are counting on their retirement, the heck with them. I got my press acclaim, I got my public support, but you, you on the other side of the aisle, you take responsibility for making sure those checks get there. Tell me the moral obligation of that.

□ 2145

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART).

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of this proposal. Some will talk and just say no and just point fingers. Others will stand and take the responsibility for governing. We have absolutely had a very difficult last several years. We came into this, this administration, with a recession, we were attacked, we are dealing with a war on terror, increased costs of homeland security to fight terror, to prevent further attacks on the United States. That costs a lot of money. There is no doubt that dealing with those costs during a recession put us in a difficult situation.

So what are we to do? Simply say, oh my, let's raise taxes on the American people who are in a recession? That is a huge mistake. We are getting out of the recession. We see growth. We see job improvement, all as a result of the President's and our decision to keep taxes low.

The whole point of this tonight is to take responsibility, not cry and whine and say it is not our fault, it is your fault. We are taking responsibility. We are going to raise the debt ceiling. We are continuing with a conservative budget that will cut our deficit in half in 5 years. That is responsible. I urge my colleagues to grow up, take responsibility and support this tonight.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker:

A little patience, and we shall see the reign of witches pass over, their spells dissolve, and the people, recovering their true sight, restore their government to its true principles. It is true that in the meantime we are suffering deeply in spirit, and incurring the horrors of a war and long oppressions of enormous public debt. If the game runs sometimes against us at home we must have patience till luck turns, and then we shall have an opportunity of winning back the principles we have lost, for this is a game where principles are at stake.—Thomas Jefferson, 1798, after the passage of the Sedition Act.

These words of Jefferson ring particularly true at this moment. Principles are indeed at stake—basic principles of standing up for fiscal integrity, keeping our promises to Amer-

ican workers, and leaving the next generation free of crushing deficits. The majority has abandoned these principles, but we will not let them be forgotten. The futures of our children and our grandchildren are at stake.

We are here to vote on the administration's demand for an increase in the debt limit of \$800 billion dollars. This is the third increase in the debt that this administration has demanded in its first term—for a total of \$2.1 trillion, the largest debt increase in our history. This administration has spent recklessly and immorally, driving the deficit each year to a new record.

Democrats know how to reduce the deficit—and so did Republicans, in earlier years. When I came to Congress in 1992 we had a deficit of \$290 billion. Yet, after 8 years of bipartisan policies of fiscal responsibility we ended President Clinton's second term with a projected 10-year surplus of \$5.6 trillion.

After only 4 years of this administration's irresponsible spending, we have a 10-year projected deficit of \$2.3 trillion—a free fall of almost \$8 trillion dollars in only 4 years. How much worse will it get before we can restore the government to its true principles?

Having been chastised by all the financial ministers of Europe this week for allowing the U.S. budget deficit to get to this point, Secretary Snow said today that the budget deficit is the administration's highest economic priority. I challenge the administration to put its money where its mouth is.

If the administration meant what it said, it would urge Republicans to join Democrats in reinstating the pay-go rules that enabled us to reduce the deficit under President Clinton. We had bipartisan support for these rules for 8 years—because they work, and because they represent the necessary and responsible course.

If the administration meant what it said, we would have a strategy to pay down the debt held by China and other Asian countries before they acquire a stranglehold on our economy and can dictate our fiscal choices.

If the administration meant what it said, we would not be here debating a further increase in the debt limit while the Secretary has already raided the Civil Service Retirement Fund.

For the sake of our children and grandchildren, we must bring government back to fiscal responsibility. Any vote on increasing the debt limit must be coupled with a vote to reinstate the pay-go rules.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds. We want to take responsibility. We want to pay as you go instead of borrowing and borrowing and borrowing. That is responsible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. We are all sinners. None of us has clean hands, particularly on spending issues. But there is one among us who over the last 26 years has the cleanest record and the best record of doing the right thing on Federal budget deficits. That man's name is CHARLIE STENHOLM, and he is proudly from Texas. Sadly, tragically, due to the last election and very unfair partisan gerrymandering, he will no longer be with us. But we need to carry CHARLIE STENHOLM's message in our

hearts, in both parties, every day, because this man has lived it for 26 years and in a friendly and bipartisan fashion tried to carry each one of us on his ample shoulders.

It is a tough job, even in the greatest country in the history of the world, to do the right thing when it comes to future generations like his grandson sitting right there. It is a tough job to live within the budget that you set. But CHARLIE has done the best job of any of us. So I hope that in this debate tonight, as we are literally borrowing nearly \$1 million a minute against our children and grandchildren, that we will learn to reform, because this debate is really about whether we reform our ways starting tonight. Not next Congress, not next year. Starting now. Will we adopt pay-as-you-go? Because that is the only thing that has worked around here. CHARLIE STENHOLM has championed that. It has worked. It worked for 12 years magnificently. We all need to get behind CHARLIE STENHOLM and adopt pay-as-you-go as the policy of this House.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), chairman of the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am no longer the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, but I am the chairman of a subcommittee and I do appreciate it. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) might take issue with that.

Let me just say, I looked around this Chamber and I was listening to the debate. I have a lot of friends on the Democrat side, including my good buddy CHARLIE STENHOLM and CHARLIE RANGEL. We have all been here for a long time. All I can say is that it really kind of tickles me because I hear many of my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle talking about spending constraint. For 40 years you guys had control of this place and year after year after year after year the budget deficit went up and up and up and up, and now that we are in the majority and we have got all these problems and granted we do have a lot of problems we have got to get control of spending and I am for all of that.

To hear colleagues of mine like CHARLIE and others come up here and talk about spending constraints tickles me to death, because for 40 years you did not do that. I love you guys. I love working with you. But there is nothing like a reformed lady of the evening, and I love you guys because you are changing.

But where were you for those 40 years? I do believe we have to work together. I do believe we have to work together, but please remember your past when you are admonishing us to change things.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds. The gentleman from Indiana's side of the aisle has borrowed more money in 3½ years than the Democrats borrowed in 40.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to stand in this well as a Democrat, and I hope that the people of this country are taking good notes tonight, because it is the Democrats in this Congress who are standing up for sound fiscal responsibility. I think it is very important for us to realize and never forget that it was President Clinton who left a huge surplus that has been squandered in these last 4 years.

Here are the facts. This is the third time in 3 years that the debt limit has been increased for a grand total of more than \$2 trillion. The last hike was nearly \$1 trillion. But it took less than 18 months for the government to hit the new rate ceiling. By way of comparison, the entire Federal debt in 1980 was just less than \$1 trillion. We are on a runaway train without any brakes. And all we are asking for is pay-as-you-go so that we can be responsible.

I will tell you really just how irresponsible you are being on the other side of the aisle. Do you realize that 90 percent of this new debt that you are creating is being purchased by foreign countries and foreign interests? And just the amount of the interest that we are paying on it, just the cost of borrowing this money from these countries accounts for more than 10 percent of all of Federal spending, which is more than what we are spending on our own homeland security. You talk about irresponsibility. It is truly irresponsible for us to turn over our debt, our fiscal security, to foreign interests, let alone the irresponsibility we are showing for passing on this debt to our children.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Let us do a quick fact check here. Eighty-eight percent of the debt that we are raising today comes from government transfers, or from past debts before President Bush's administration took office. Eighty-eight percent of that. So we are paying for past decisions, including past Democratic administrations and Democratic holds of this Congress.

Second point. Our deficit and our debt is way too high. I think we all agree on that. I do not know anyone here who thinks otherwise. That truly is bipartisan. Let us keep in perspective that publicly held debt today is 37 percent of the economy. It was as high as 49 percent in 1995 during President Clinton's tenure. The fact of the matter is the debt and the deficit is too high at all levels in America's history, and at some point at the end of this debate after this is all done and we get out and get through with all of our purging of our frustrations on how we got here, we are going to have to work together to balance this budget, to start paying down this debt and find some solutions.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 seconds. You have got an op-

portunity to do that tonight by adopting a PAYGO rule. You can start right now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk and discussion in the media recently about our country's morals which played an important role, I think, to many in our recent elections. I personally welcome these discussions, but I am saddened by the fact that there has been little talk about the moral values of the government's borrow-and-spend economic policies.

Tonight we will have a vote to raise the debt ceiling for the third time in the last 3 years. Why? Because Congress has been content to manage the American taxpayers' money in a way that immorally disregards the well-being of our Nation's economic future. I believe it is immoral for this country to keep racking up debt as far as the eye can see and to pass it on to our children and our grandchildren. I think it is immoral to borrow and spend and ask our soldiers to make the ultimate sacrifice while we refuse to make even marginal sacrifices in our fiscal policies.

Mr. Speaker, last week on Thursday, November 11, the 278th Regimental Combat Unit left for Iraq. Many of these brave men and women of this National Guard unit come from Tennessee and from my congressional district. I was able to visit the 278th in Fort Shelby, Mississippi, the day they went off to defend our country. I wish them luck and offer my prayers for their safe return home. Now I wish our soldiers' government would take the steps necessary to curb this deficit spending, to reinstate true budget enforcement measures like PAYGO, and to pay down this Nation's debt, instead of continuing to raise the ceiling, so that our troops when they return home, they are not left with footing the bill for a war they so bravely fought. As we continue to discuss morality in America, I hope we will not continue to ignore the immoralities of our current fiscal policies.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I think it is important to keep focus that 88 percent of this debt occurred through intergovernmental transfers or before the Bush administration. It is a shared debt and a shared responsibility. The way we do not tackle it is to cut off the retirement checks for the military mothers and fathers of those serving today. That is exactly the wrong way to do it, the wrong way to duck responsibility. Together we can agree to pay our bills and then work together to reduce the debt.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there are two reasons why we

should vote against this debt ceiling limit. The first is that there is no plan to pay it off and the second is that what we are really doing is mortgaging our children's future. The reality is that when you talk about social spending, we could eliminate all social spending and we would still have an annual deficit. Tax cuts have equaled 17 times all domestic discretionary spending, and every child born in this country is now going to inherit \$85,000 in interest costs on this debt, and that is what you are passing on to the next generation. That is immoral.

Also, bear in mind that 90 percent of this new debt is being bought by foreign countries. Forty-three percent of it is now owned by foreign countries. Imagine the situation that you are leaving to the next generation. This is the result of a \$10 trillion fiscal reversal. We are going to offer a PAYGO proposal where we would look at revenue as well as spending. That is what you have to do. That is the only thing that has worked, and that is the only responsible thing to do tonight.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds as a reminder that it is the economy that has caused this deficit; it is additional spending both for homeland security, supporting our troops, and for those press releases Members in this Chamber have so proudly touted back home. Today, and in fact we could have taken away all the tax cuts and we would still be running a deficit in America. It is time to pay our bills. Let us not cut off checks to our Social Security people simply for partisan purposes.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

□ 2200

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard some quite interesting statements tonight. One of the previous speakers derided this side of the aisle for the way we handled the national economy for the 40 years we were in control.

Here are the facts: from 1946 until 1979, our national debt as a percentage of total national income declined by almost three-quarters, from 126 percent of our total national income to about 25 percent of our total national income. Then along came Ronald Reagan and his free lunch budgets; and in the years he was President, our national debt, as a percentage of our national income, doubled. Our national debt went from less than \$1 trillion to more than \$3 trillion under Ronald Reagan's stewardship.

Bill Clinton came into the White House, and with the support of the Democratic Party with not a single vote from the Republican side of the aisle, he took the actions that led to a balanced budget and produced the surpluses that were referred to earlier by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr.

HOYER). Mr. Bush then came along and reversed all of that progress.

So I am sorry. We can all have our own spin, but the fact is one cannot change history. One cannot change the record.

I would say only one other thing. All of the talk about the past is beside the point. This debate tonight is about what we are going to do tomorrow, and that is what the Stenholm motion is all about. It says that regardless of what anybody has done in the past, tomorrow we are going to return to the kind of fiscal responsibility we have not seen under the Bush administration by returning to PAYGO. If they believe in being more responsible tomorrow than they have been up until today, they will vote against this resolution and they will vote for the Stenholm motion.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I want to wish everybody aloha here. Can we get a smile on everybody's face? Aloha. I invite everybody all out to Honolulu. As long as we are spending money, why not come out to Honolulu and enjoy it while they have the opportunity?

Let us face it. The only reason that we are not out there right now is that the Democrats did not take over. If I were chairing one of the committees, we would have an excuse to bring everybody along. We could have a discussion out there on the beach.

Somebody asked me today, What are we doing down there during this lame duck session? I said, We are organizing our delusions. That is what we are doing, organizing our delusions.

I just spoke to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and I said, You are engaged in a non sequitur here, the fact that you can point to somebody and say you did something real bad for a long time and so now we have an excuse to keep on doing it.

That is not an answer. If we are going to do right by the American people, starting tonight, as the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) said, it is always time to start doing the right thing. And tonight we ought to start by doing it by passing the Stenholm motion and acting responsible towards the people who sent us here.

Aloha, Mr. Speaker. Have a wonderful holiday.

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

I do not really believe that people of our country realize the shape the financial balance sheet of our country is in. The budget deficit last year, if we stack \$1 bills on top of one another, would be 41,000 miles high. Listen to this: we are paying \$5,100 a second in interest, \$310,000 a minute. The Amer-

ican people will have paid \$19 million in interest while we have been talking about this matter right now, and that is not including what we are borrowing.

I tell my colleagues if we do not adopt pay-as-you-go, which simply says we are going to pay the bills, not borrow the money from our children and grandchildren, from anybody on Earth that will buy our paper at a relatively low rate of interest while we are here in this place, I tell my colleagues, I said at the outset, this is not an accident, Mr. Speaker. This is a willful, knowingly, deliberately conscious act of following an economic plan that puts us further and further into debt, and they will not accept a simple provision that says simply we ought to pay for what we are consuming. They will not accept that. We are going to have a motion to recommit that will ask for it to.

He said we are going to get around it. We can do it tonight. We can start acting responsibly tonight by simply adopting pay-as-you-go. That is what most American families do. That is considered a virtue where I come from. One pays their bills, they try to behave, they go to work, they get up, they go to church. That is responsibility. It is not responsible to say I am going to buy a new house and give the mortgage to my son. That is not responsible.

I tell my colleagues this is very frustrating because it is so abundantly clear we are mortgaging the future of this country. And what makes it worse is that now 43 percent of our paper is being held by foreign governments that do not see the world as we see it. And some day, I sound like a canary in a coal mine, some day, these chickens are going to come home to roost. When they quit buying, we are going to have lost control of this economy and we will have to pay whoever however much in order to refinance this debt. And that market is going to respond to what you people are doing. And it is not going to be too much longer, I am afraid. And when it does, it is going to be something that the American people are going to suffer from for a long time to come.

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

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding me this time, and I commend him for his very excellent work on fiscal soundness for our country and in this Congress. He has so eloquently driven the message home that no country has ever been strong, prosperous, and bankrupt. I thank him for his eloquence and his leadership.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), our distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Ways

and Means, has been a champion for middle-income families in America and understands the importance of the fiscal soundness they have in their homes in paying their mortgages, their credit cards, their car payments, and the impact of a huge budget deficit, a huge national debt has on the lives of working families in America, and I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) as well.

I want to reserve my highest praise for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM). This Congress has been blessed for many years by his distinguished service in the House of Representatives. He has been a champion for the American people, for the American farmer, and a leader for fiscal soundness in our country. He is about accountability, accountability in our service here. No one has been a stronger or more eloquent voice for that message and what it means. He has been a teacher to the Congress. He has changed the thinking of a political party by making Democrats the party of fiscal responsibility for having a pay-as-you-go policy where we say no more budget deficit, no more deficit spending.

It has too high a cost in the personal lives of the American people. It has too high a cost to fiscal soundness of our country, and as others have indicated, there are countries that own our debt that we are at the mercy of should they decide not to play in those markets at any given time.

So this place will simply not be the same without the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), but I hope that as a source of comfort, if that is the word, to him as he goes on to other great things, and I know he will, that he has made a tremendous difference for our country. He has made tremendous progress for our country. I know I speak for every person here when I say it has been an honor to call him colleague. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. Speaker, many of us just came back from the dedication of the Clinton Library, where obviously we were drenched in the rain for several hours. But it was well worth it because we could pay tribute to a President who too was committed to fiscal soundness. Under the economic policy and the plan that was passed in this body by only Democratic votes, our country went on a path of fiscal soundness that had zero deficit in 1999. Zero deficit. Think of it. Compared to this year when the deficit is over \$425 billion just for this year. And President Clinton, when he left office, he put us on a path of fiscal soundness and surplus of \$5.6 trillion, \$5.6 trillion in surplus.

And now we are going on a path of over \$3 trillion in deficit, a huge swing approaching \$10 trillion. It is historic, the swing that has taken place. So no wonder we would endure the driving rain and all that it did to us there to thank President Clinton.

And I might say that in attendance were also present Jimmy Carter, President George Herbert Walker Bush, and President George W. Bush. And both Presidents Bush spoke with great eloquence. They spoke with great unity for our country. It was an honor for all of us to hear their words and to be there with them at the dedication of the Clinton Library. So it was a very wonderful occasion. And I, as Democratic leader, want to thank President George W. Bush for giving us the planes to enable us to go there and to thank our distinguished Speaker for rolling the votes so that the Democrats and I think some of the Republicans could go there. Senator FRIST was there, but some from the House were there as well.

But just to get back to our subject here, here we come back. Is it not ironic that the Republicans in the campaign went out there and talked about their economic policy and the first order of legislative business when we get back here is to increase the debt ceiling? In the course of the President's administration now, this 4 years, it will have been raised \$2 trillion. This is absolutely astounding in terms of these figures. Whatever happened to the deficit hawks? I know they are over there. We heard from them in earlier manifestations of their legislative lives that they really were concerned about the fiscal soundness of our country. Have the deficit hawks become an endangered species?

Be true to yourselves. Face the facts. We have to have pay-as-you-go again. Pay-as-you-go is what brought us into surplus. Pay-as-you-go is the way we have to go now. And we will have that opportunity to do that later.

I am going to submit my fuller statement for the RECORD because the hour is late and because my colleagues have spoken so eloquently to this point. But I just want to close with a point about accountability. This budget that we have is supposed to be a statement of our national values. We have talked about that over and over again. And a value that we have to have is accountability, how we answer to the next generation for the debt that we are piling on them. We want to give our children opportunity. Instead, we are giving them obligations.

□ 2215

It is simply not right.

So I urge all of my colleagues to support our motion to commit which will accommodate, will give the government a chance to go forward, but also to put a limit on this profligate increase in the debt. I hope at the end of the evening, though, that everyone who stands up for fiscal soundness will vote against this irresponsible lifting of the debt ceiling unless there is a responsible discipline thrust upon it of pay-as-you-go or a plan from the President to say how he intends to reduce the deficit.

With that, once again, I want to commend my colleagues, the gentleman

from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for their exceptional leadership on this subject, which is a very, very important one to our children, that we are accountable to them, that what we hand to them is our responsibility and that we will never forget that.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for fiscal soundness, vote for pay-as-you-go, vote for a plan to reduce the deficit, vote for a limitation on the time that the Republicans can continue to pile on and pile on the debt.

At the same time, President Clinton's responsible economic policies eliminated the deficit, and we had three years in a row of budget surpluses.

How ironic—and how sad—that our first item of legislative business upon returning to Washington after election is to raise the debt ceiling to make room for the enormous piles of debt that President Bush, and this Republican Congress have run up.

When President Bush took office, we were on a path to a \$3 trillion surplus. We are now facing a \$5.6 trillion deficit—a fiscal collapse of nearly \$9 trillion. Record surpluses have become record deficits. The deficit for this year alone is \$413 billion.

Now, Republicans want to raise the debt limit for the third time in three years. Including this year's increase, Republicans will have raised the debt limit by more than \$2.2 trillion since President Bush took office.

What happened to the Republican deficit hawks? They have become an endangered species in Washington. The truth is that there really is no limit to the amount of debt Republicans are willing to run up.

Republicans will tell you that these deficits are not their fault; that they were caused by circumstances beyond their control. But it's just not true.

These deficits are the direct result of irresponsible Republican choices—tax cuts for the wealthy and reckless corporate handouts including tax breaks that encourage shipping jobs overseas.

The Republican policy of borrow-and-spend must end. We are running up a bill and handing it to our children.

We should be giving our children opportunity, not obligations, but America's growing debt will ensure that our children and our grandchildren are paying for Republican irresponsibility for the rest of their lives.

Their taxes will pay for the interest on our debt instead of keeping our military the strongest in the world, strengthening Social Security, or improving education.

Higher deficits also have real consequences for American families today. The federal government is by far the largest player in the credit markets, and when federal borrowing increases there is less credit available to everyone else, causing interest rates to rise.

Higher interest rates mean consumers must spend more on their mortgage, credit cards, and student loan payments.

And when it becomes more expensive to borrow money, businesses are less likely to make the investments that generate jobs and opportunities.

Democrats have a better way. We believe in accountability in government. Accountability

was one of the six core values in our New Partnership for America's Future.

Democrats believe we must return to accountability by restoring fiscal discipline and eliminating deficit spending with pay-as-you-go budget rules in which both tax cuts and spending increases must be paid for.

These rules created the surpluses under President Clinton, and can work again.

Democrats tried earlier today to restore the successful pay-as-you-go rules, but Republicans wrongly rejected that effort. Now, because this issue is so critical, we offer the Republicans yet another chance to work together in good faith to reduce the deficit.

CHARLIE STENHOLM has long been one of the most passionate and eloquent advocates for fiscal responsibility in this Congress. And tonight he is giving us another opportunity to meet our moral responsibility to the next generation.

By supporting his motion to instruct, we will agree to increase the debt ceiling until April 15 next year, at which point the President must present a balanced budget. This would keep the government running and give the President and Congress time to put forward the balanced budget the American people need and deserve.

Thank you, CHARLIE, for all of your leadership, and for this motion. I urge my colleagues to support the Stenholm motion to instruct.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Speaker, let me first, on behalf of this side of the aisle, join with the Minority Leader in praising the service of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM). His grandson ought to be proud of his granddad, his service here, both for our country here in Congress and in Texas where, as a fellow Texan, I can tell my colleagues I am very proud of his service and proud to have served with him.

There is something else we share as well. We share a debt in this Nation and we share a responsibility to pay those bills. The debt we face tonight is shared. Eighty-eight percent of this debt occurs from intergovernmental transfers of before the Bush administration. This is debt generated over decades and decades that every Member in this House today had a hand in creating.

The solution in the end, after all of the rhetoric is said and done, is going to be to join together for spending restraint, for abolishing obsolete agencies, to eliminating the billions of dollars of duplication, to getting a backbone to say no to projects. And, in fact, we have the opportunity starting in January, maybe tonight, to have a fresh start about working together, Republicans and Democrats, to again balance this budget and to start paying down that debt.

But, in truth, the question tonight is much simpler than that. The question is, are we going to pay our bills? Are we going to take responsibility for that press release, that project, that water funding, that university research, all of those things that we have championed and ran on back home, are we going to

take responsibility to pay those bills tonight? Or are we going to vote to go into default, to not meet our obligations, to stop our Social Security checks to the elderly or retirement checks and medicare payments?

It is time to gather Republicans and Democrats to pay our bills, to look out for our seniors and to vote yes on this debt ceiling.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today thoroughly discouraged with the current proposal to increase the public debt limit by a staggering \$800 billion. If this proposal is allowed to pass the American people will inherit a budget system that allows the federal deficit to grow to \$8.18 trillion. This kind of economic maneuvering is not only dangerously foolish, it is in fact unethical. There is a reason why we have a federal debt limit, because incurring too much debt ruins our ability for long-term growth, by adding an additional \$800 billion to the debt limit we are only laughing at the idea of fiscal constraint. This proposal being considered by this body only continues the fiscal irresponsibility of the Bush administration and this Republican Congress.

This administration has tried to say that deficits don't matter; we know that that is simply not true. History has proven that chronic deficits threaten our economic strength by crowding out private investment, driving up interest rates, and slowing economic growth. Indeed foreign investment in the United States has dried up because foreign investors have no confidence in the Bush economic agenda. This administration's irresponsible budget policies have turned a surplus into a large deficit that is choking off growth in the American economy.

President Bush likes to say his budget is geared towards tax cuts for all Americans. When in fact the average American won't receive a substantial tax cut, but will instead be hit with a tax hike in the form of an ever-growing deficit. A large deficit means taxpayers have to shoulder the costs of paying the interest on this new national debt. The end result will be a debt tax on the great majority of Americans. This will be a tax on lower and middle class Americans; it will be a tax on the elderly and most unfortunately it will be a tax on our children. The truly sad part of the President's economic policies is that while they are bad for America today they are even worse for future generations of American taxpayers.

Today, we celebrated the opening of the Bill Clinton Presidential Library in Little Rock, Arkansas. One of President Clinton's greatest achievements was the fact that he led his country through one of our most economically prosperous periods and furthermore he took our large public debt built up through 12 years of Republican administrations and actually turned it into a surplus. It saddens me that while that was one of President Clinton's greatest achievements, it will not be one of his most lasting due to the irresponsible and misguided fiscal policies of the Bush administration. Republican mismanagement has turned large projected surpluses of over \$5.6 trillion into huge projected deficits of more than \$3.5 trillion. The difference in only a few years is staggering and ultimately reckless. The large public debt could be significantly reduced by

instituting the pay-as-you-go (PAYGO) system that applies to tax cuts as well as mandatory spending. These PAYGO enforcement rules were so effective in the 1990s at reducing our deficit and making our way towards a surplus. Democrats in Congress have time after time supported the reestablishment of these effective rules, but it seems no one on the other side of the chamber is listening.

These Republican policies will double the current debt in 10 years. The CBO projects that the debt subject to limit will continue to rise, reaching \$13.272 trillion by 2014 if there is no change in current Republican budget policy. Accounting for the implementation of administration policies, such as making permanent the expiring tax cuts, the government will incur about \$6.2 trillion in additional debt between now and 2014, raising the statutory debt to a projected \$14.5 trillion, nearly double the current \$7.384 trillion limit. These figures are astounding in their size, but truly they are saddening in their effect. Our children will bear the burden of this fiscal insanity. We can raise the debt limit today with little effect, but we are only postponing the inevitable. At some point all accounts have to be paid, unfortunately by then it will be our children who will be left with this oversized bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to convene the 109th Congress, one of our top priorities should be getting our fiscal house in order. Unfortunately the Republican leadership is sending us in the wrong direction. The House voted recently to raise the debt limit by a total of \$800 billion. The vote to raise the debt limit for a third time in 3 years is a direct consequence of the reckless fiscal policy pursued by the Republican leadership over the last few years.

A key step to putting America back on the path to financial security would be re-implementing pay-as-you-go policies. The House Republican leadership blocked efforts to restore these rules. Using pay-as-you-go rules, the Clinton administration helped turn a \$290 billion budget deficit in 1992 into budget surpluses in 1998, 1999, and 2000. As a result, the Clinton administration was successful in paying down \$362 billion in publicly held debt. However, in 2002, the Republican leadership let the pay-as-you-go rules expire and once again we are facing endless budget deficits and soaring national debt.

Debt increases have serious consequences for American families. At a time when the House leadership is promoting more and more tax cuts that disproportionately benefit the wealthiest Americans, increased budget deficits create an enormous debt that will mortgage our future. While a few are benefiting disproportionately from certain Bush tax cuts, all Americans will pay the consequences through the rising "debt tax."

Throughout our history, every generation of Americans has worked to leave our children a world that is stronger and more secure than the one that was left to us. That is our legacy and it should also be our commitment. It is simply wrong to run up a debt on our national credit card and leave our children to pay the bill. We must take personal responsibility to return our Nation to fiscal responsibility.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, Congress is once again engaging in fiscal irresponsibility and endangering the American economy by raising the debt ceiling, this time by \$800 billion. One particularly troubling aspect of today's debate

is how many Members who won their seats in part by pledging never to raise taxes will vote for this tax increase on future generations without so much as a second thought.

The term "national debt" really is a misnomer. It is not the Nation's debt. Instead, it is the Federal Government's debt. The American people did not spend the money, but they will have to pay it back.

Most Americans do not spend much time worrying about the national debt, which now totals more than \$8 trillion. The number is so staggering that it hardly seems real, even when economists issue bleak warnings about how much every American owes—currently about \$25,000. Of course, Congress never hands each taxpayer a bill for that amount. Instead, the Federal Government uses the people's hard-earned money to pay interest on this debt, which is like making minimum payments on a credit card. Notice that the principal never goes down. In fact, it is rising steadily.

The problem is very simple: Congress almost always spends more each year than the IRS collects in revenues. Federal spending always goes up, but revenues are not so dependable, especially since raising income taxes to sufficiently fund the government would be highly unpopular. So long as Congress spends more than the government takes via taxes, the Federal Government must raise taxes, print more dollars, or borrow money.

Over the past 3 years, we have witnessed an unprecedented explosion in federal spending. The national debt has actually increased an average of \$160 billion a day since September 30, 2003.

Federal law limits the total amount of debt the Treasury can carry. Despite a historic increase in the debt limit in 2002 and another increase in 2003, the current limit of \$7.38 trillion was reached last month. So Congress must once again vote to raise the limit. Hard as it may be for the American people to believe, many experts expect government spending will exceed this new limit next year.

Increasing the national debt sends a signal to investors that the government is not serious about reining in spending. This increases the risks that investors will be reluctant to buy government debt instruments. The effects on the American economy could be devastating. The only reason why we have been able to endure such large deficits without skyrocketing interest rates is the willingness of foreign nations to buy the Federal Government's debt instruments. However, the recent fall in the value of the dollar and rise in the price of gold indicate that investors may be unwilling to continue to prop up our debt-ridden economy. Furthermore, increasing the national debt will provide more incentive for foreign investors to stop buying federal debt instruments at the current interest rates. Mr. Speaker, what will happen to our already fragile economy if the Federal Reserve must raise interest rates to levels unseen since the seventies to persuade foreigners to buy government debt interests?

The whole point of the debt ceiling law was to limit borrowing by forcing Congress into an open and presumably somewhat shameful vote when it wants to borrow more than a pre-set amount of money. Yet, since there have been no political consequences for Members who vote to raise the debt limit and support the outrageous spending bills in the first place, the debt limit has become merely another technicality on the road to bankruptcy.

The only way to control federal spending is to take away the government's credit card, which will force Congress to control federal spending. Therefore, I call upon my colleagues to reject S. 2986 and, instead, to reduce government spending. It is time Congress forces the Federal Government to live within its constitutional means. Congress should end the immoral practice of excessive spending and passing the bill to the next generation.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no." Congress and this administration simply must end the reckless and irresponsible budget path we are currently on.

Early next year, my wife Faye and I expect to become grandparents for the first time. While this is an exciting time for our family, I shudder to think that our Nation's legacy to that child is going to be the largest national debt ever bequeathed to a generation in this country's history. That is wrong. It is immoral. It violates to the core our most basic values of responsibility to one another.

The current administration and the Republican leadership has run up a massive national debt of \$7.4 trillion and growing with no end in sight. Each newborn child now inherits \$85,000 in debt. This so-called "baby tax" is wrong and is building inflation into our economy that poses catastrophic danger to our Nation's economic prosperity.

America must return to the values of balanced budgets and put our fiscal house in order. As someone who hails from a conservative state, I fail to see what at all is conservative about refusing to pay one's bills.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must reject this legislation and return to policies of budget sanity and economic growth so that every individual willing to work hard can make the most of his or her God-given abilities and live the American dream.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that we need to raise the debt limit this week. I vote against S. 2986 not for the purpose of causing the United States to default, but rather for the purpose of forcing a serious debate on fiscal policy.

I am confident that if this motion were to be defeated, Congress would in effect go into emergency session to deal with the fiscal issues that are before us.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose increasing the debt limit without putting in place any plans or mechanisms to bring our budget into balance.

"Increasing the debt ceiling" is a technical term for what Congress is actually doing today—we've spent another \$800 billion we didn't have, and now we're forced to borrow that amount of money from our children. The national debt, already \$7.4 trillion, will soon rise to more than \$8.1 trillion because of the irresponsible borrowing and spending of the Republican Congress.

Today marks the third time in the last 3 years that the Republican Congress has been forced to raise the debt ceiling. It's the moral equivalent of applying for a credit card in your child's name, running it up all the way, raising the credit limit, charging more money on it, raising the limit again, charging even more money, and raising the limit one more time. Only Congress is doing it on a much larger scale.

It's a fact that the biggest cause of the red ink is tax cuts—tax cuts that went overwhelmingly to the highest income brackets and failed to create jobs. The second biggest cause is the Republican Congress's addiction to unrestrained spending.

Ten years ago, the Republican Party took power in Congress promising to restore fiscal responsibility and balance the budget. I was proud to work with President Clinton and my Republican colleagues to achieve a historic balanced budget agreement in 1997.

In the 1990s, working under PAYGO budget constraints, we balanced the budget, lowered interest rates, grew the economy, and charted a course to a debt-free America. In January 2001, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that we'd be able to pay off the entire debt of the United States by 2011.

But over the last 4 years, Congress has veered onto a different course; \$5.6 trillion in projected surpluses have turned into \$5 trillion in projected deficits. The dream of a debt-free America has vanished—today, about 40 percent of our mounting debt is in foreign hands. That is the legacy of this Republican Congress—giveaways to special interests, tax cuts for the very wealthy, historic levels of borrowing, all leading to a diminished future for our children.

I urge my colleagues to support the Stenholm amendment to restore fiscal and moral responsibility to Congress and oppose another yet increase the debt limit.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S. 2986, a bill that will increase the debt limit of the U.S. Federal Budget from \$7.4 trillion to \$8.2 trillion.

Why am I voting against this bill? I am following a basic rule that families in my district, and throughout the country follow—don't spend money you don't have.

When my constituents sit down and look at their credit card bills, they don't say, "Oh look, I'm in debt. I guess I better spend more." No, they think about where they can save money, in big and small ways. And they prioritize. And maybe, if there is something that they really need, they decide to work a little overtime next to add some more money to the balance.

That is exactly how government needs to function. Government needs to exercise fiscal responsibility. Government needs to spend within its means, or raise more money to finance unmet needs.

The Republican majority, unfortunately, does not seem to understand this basic principle. It increases federal spending—more than any other government in recent history—and it simultaneously cuts taxes. They want to have their cake and eat it too.

It is the time for the majority to start practicing what they preach about fiscal discipline. It needs to keep an eye on both the spending and revenue columns in the ledger. It needs to prioritize and economize, particularly in the areas where we are spending the most.

Let's be realistic. Families can't balance their budgets by spending dollars and saving pennies, they need to make real economies.

Similarly, we can't balance the budget on the back of domestic spending. Comparatively speaking, domestic spending makes up an insignificant part of our budget. If Congress really wants to balance the budget, it is going to have to look at entitlements, interest on debt, defense spending, and we're going to have to think twice about projected tax reductions.

The future fiscal health of the United States is in our hands. I urge my colleagues to be more responsible with the money of the taxpayers of this country. There are no more excuses.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the third time since President Bush took office, Republicans will increase the federal debt limit. This year, Republicans will increase the debt limit by \$800 billion. This would allow borrowing to reach \$8.2 trillion—\$8.2 trillion. Where has the fiscal responsibility gone?

This year the deficit will hit a record \$412 billion. Over the last 4 years the federal debt has ballooned by \$1.4 trillion. Because there appears to be no end in sight to the annual budget deficits, the new debt ceiling will probably have to be raised again next year.

One would think that faced with this huge debt problem our friends on the other side of the aisle would want to reinstate "pay-as-you-go" rules as we, Democrats, have been advocating. But, unbeknownst to me and the American public—who are paying attention because they are the ones carrying this heavy debt burden—Republicans refuse to adopt "pay-go" rules.

These are the same "pay-go" rules that played a key role in balancing the budget in the 1990s under the Clinton administration. The Republicans' refusal to adopt "pay-go" does not make any sense.

If we have to increase the debt limit, then we should do so along with fiscally responsible "pay-go" rules that would stop Republicans from putting Americans deeper and deeper into debt. It is hard-working American people that are the victims of this growing, out of control debt. An average American family of four bears a debt burden of about \$100,000—\$100,000.

Something has to be done. At some point we will have to stop these massive increases in the federal debt. At some point we will have to make room to adequately fund our children's education, our brave troops, Social Security.

Republicans do not seem to understand that the larger our federal debt becomes, the less room there is to fund these important programs. This body should bear that in mind as we vote tonight.

The American people are watching.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S. 2986, a bill that increases the federal debt limit by \$814 billion while doing nothing to ensure a return to fiscally responsible economic policy. If we continue to spend at the current rate while giving tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans, our national debt will top \$8 trillion in the very near future.

Just weeks ago, President Bush and many Republican candidates across the country were campaigning on a platform of fiscal responsibility and cutting the deficit in half during the next 4 years. Now that they've won the campaign, that rhetoric is gone and their actions today—increasing the debt limit for the third time in 4 years—certainly don't meet their election promises.

We could have had a real debate today about re-implementing the pay-as-you-go rules that led to historic surpluses at the end of the Clinton administration. That would be a real move toward fiscal responsibility. Instead, Republicans are giving themselves the freedom to further reduce tax revenue while funding an ill-conceived war in Iraq, and claiming they just

can't afford to pay for the government programs vital to this country's health and well-being.

Republicans will, however, continue to run up huge deficits while lowering taxes, especially for corporations and individuals making over \$200,000 a year. Unfortunately, they don't want to pay for the loss of revenue caused by these tax-cutting measures. That means less money to spend on everything from education to Medicare.

Increasing the debt limit is a statutory necessity to keep the government running, but it is also a sad commentary on the fiscal stewardship shown to the American people by this administration and the Republican leadership in Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 856, the bill is considered read for amendment, and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO COMMIT OFFERED BY MR. STENHOLM

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. STENHOLM. I most certainly am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Stenholm moves to commit the bill S. 2986 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions that the Committee report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of section 1 of the bill the following new sentence: "The amendment made by this section shall not apply after April 15, 2005."

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking our leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) for their kind remarks about me.

I want to say it is with a little bit of mixed emotion tonight that I address this body for the last time. I guess it kind of came to me in a real way just a moment ago when my grandson, who is sitting beside me, asked me a moment ago, "What are you going to be doing?" I said, "I am going to offer a motion." "Are you going to win this one?" I said "No, we are not." And he said, "Why?"

Well, that is a question that a 9-year-old would ask. It is also a question a lot of 50- and 60-year-olds ought to be asking. Why is it those of us on this side who used to vote with my colleagues on that side on fiscal restraint have been losing every single vote for the last 4 years? What is it that has changed?

I listened to some of the rhetoric tonight, and I want to say with great re-

spect tonight I recognize the right to have disagreements on this floor. It is so important that we do and that we do it without being disagreeable. But for the life of me I cannot understand how the majority can march in lockstep on this side and build up the largest fiscal deficits in the history of our country and explain it away in saying deficits really do not matter anymore.

Now, I know so many of my colleagues so well, and I appreciate everyone in this body. But when you come up to me privately and say, Charlie, you are right, but I cannot vote with you, I ask the simple question, why?

Now, I understand there has been an election and I understand you won, and I commend you for winning. But that also means you now have the responsibility of your actions.

It was amazing to me that some tonight tried to continue to blame it on Democrat spending. They know better than that. The minority cannot spend. Yes, I say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), we can take credit for some things within the budget because we are not for zero spending.

I tried to offer an amendment to this bill to say pay-as-you-go, which worked, bipartisanship. It worked. Why did my colleagues choose to knock it out in 2002 and say we are not going to have pay-as-you-go anymore? Why do you insist on that when you know in your heart that it works? We tried to do this in the rule today, but we lost, because you said, no, we are going to increase the debt ceiling by \$800 billion. So I assume that means you are going to continue with the same policies that you have been carrying for the last 4 years.

Here I will say I hope and I pray you are right. Our country will do better if you are right. But you should be getting a little bit nervous tonight because, ultimately, politics and arguments across this side of the aisle in which you are going to in fact have 100 percent party loyalty is not going to cut it. The market is going to ultimately determine whether our fiscal policies for our Nation are correct or incorrect. You know that and I know that, and you should be getting nervous, as I am getting nervous.

The Japanese, for the first time since 2002, did not buy the amount of debt that they had previously been buying. You should be a little bit worried about the Chinese beginning to become our bankers at the rate that they are becoming our bankers. That should bother you a little, but it does not seem to.

Now, I hope you are right. Because for the good of the country, continuing down the economic path you are insisting on going down, in my judgment, is going to create a major problem. But that helped me lose an election, because the people in my district agree with you and, therefore, I respect the people of my district, and I hope and pray you are right.

But, tonight, let me conclude by saying this: Yes, I have one of Cindy's and

my three grandchildren on the floor. And a lot of people have asked why I have been so involved in Social Security. I wish we had spent a part of the last 4 years dealing with the future of Social Security, because everyone in this room knows that we are 4 years closer to D-Day on Social Security, but we have done nothing on that. We tried. That got me opposition from my opponent in this race. But we are going to have to face up to it. You are.

Well, our grandchildren do not have a vote tonight. And to those of you who believe we can fight two wars, win the war on homeland security and do it with continued borrowed money and believe that our country is going to profit, then vote against the motion to commit. It is pretty simple. All we are saying tonight is, increase the debt ceiling until next April 15 and give the new Congress a chance to go in and re-examine the economic policy that we are following and, as many of you have said, you like pay-as-you-go. All we are saying with this motion to commit is, let us do it in the new Congress. That is all we are saying.

You have already said you did not want pay-as-you-go, but you said you might want it next year. All we are saying is, reduce the amount we can borrow and force bipartisan cooperation. Allow the Democratic Party and those on this side who believe, as many of you say you do, allow us the chance in the next Congress to do it.

That is what this motion to commit is all about tonight. It is increasing the debt ceiling just enough to get to April 15 so the 109th Congress can do everything that both sides are saying need to be done.

Please vote for the motion to commit.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I agree with much of what our distinguished friend from Texas has said; and, again, he has been a long champion of balancing the budget and reducing this deficit. And he is so right, and we all agree: Deficits do matter. They mattered before we got here. They will always matter.

But jobs matter, too. Jobs matter, too. We did not ask for the attacks of 9/11 that not only struck the heart of our Nation, they struck two million American workers from the payroll. We did not ask for the recession. It was inherited. And we did not ask for the Enrons and the WorldComs and the technology bubble that not only cost so many workers their jobs but really damaged, I think, everyone's hopes for retirement in the future.

How we respond to that challenge, there was a difference, a respected difference. My colleagues on the Democratic side felt that if we kept the money here, if we spend and target different ways, that would move us out of the economy, and that is a fair position.

As Republicans, we felt otherwise. We thought if you want to create jobs

in small business, leave the money in small business. If you want to create jobs on Main Street, leave the money on Main Street. If we want families to be able to recover and to make ends meet, let them keep more of the hard-earned money that they in the past have sent to Washington where, unfortunately, we have squandered with so many I think obsolete agencies and duplicative programs we would all agree with.

But the fact of the matter is leaving the money at home worked. We are creating more jobs, and we need to do more. I think, ultimately, after tonight is over, that is the solution we can agree on: continuing to grow this economy so more people work and they pay taxes and Social Security and Medicare, and then together, working together, identifying all of the wasteful spending, getting the backbone on spending, saying no when it would be easier to say yes, maybe doing without, with one less press release on that project back home, all of which, by the way, we have a responsibility today to pay for those bills and these spending projects.

□ 2230

This motion has nothing to do with PAYGO. And I would respectfully say PAYGO as I have seen it really means higher taxes, unfortunately higher spending, and unfortunately fewer jobs. I just respectfully disagree on that. But the fact of the matter is if we keep the economy going, if we will work together on spending restraint, I know that we can balance the budget. I know we can pay down the deficit. But tonight we have a responsibility to pay our bills, to meet our obligations, to keep the checks going to our Social Security recipients, for our military retirees.

I would respectfully urge this Chamber to vote "no" on commit.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to commit.

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

Mr. TANNER. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 194, nays 213, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 535]

YEAS—194

Abercrombie	Gutierrez
Allen	Harman
Andrews	Hastings (FL)
Baca	Hersteth
Baird	Hill
Baldwin	Hinchey
Becerra	Hinojosa
Bell	Holden
Berkley	Holt
Berman	Honda
Berry	Hooley (OR)
Bishop (GA)	Hoyer
Bishop (NY)	Isaacs
Blumenauer	Israel
Boswell	Jackson (IL)
Boucher	Jackson-Lee
Boyd	(TX)
Brady (PA)	Jefferson
Brown (OH)	John
Brown, Corrine	Johnson, E. B.
Butterfield	Jones (OH)
Capps	Jones (OH)
Capuano	Kanjorski
Cardin	Kaptur
Cardoza	Kennedy (RI)
Carson (IN)	Kildee
Case	Kilpatrick
Chandler	Kind
Clay	Kucinich
Clyburn	Lampson
Conyers	Langevin
Cooper	Lantos
Costello	Larsen (WA)
Cramer	Larsen (CT)
Crowley	Lee
Cummings	Levin
Davis (AL)	Lewis (GA)
Davis (CA)	Lofgren
Davis (FL)	Lowe
Davis (IL)	Lucas (KY)
Davis (TN)	Lynch
DeFazio	Majette
DeGette	Maloney
Delahunt	Markey
DeLauro	Marshall
Deutsch	Matheson
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)
Dingell	McCollum
Doggett	McGovern
Doyle	McIntyre
Edwards	McNulty
Emanuel	Meehan
Engel	Meeke (FL)
Eshoo	Meeks (NY)
Etheridge	Menendez
Evans	Michaud
Farr	Miller (NC)
Fattah	Miller, George
Filner	Mollohan
Ford	Moore
Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)
Frost	Murtha
Gonzalez	Nadler
Gordon	Napolitano
Green (TX)	Neal (MA)
Grijalva	Oberstar
	Obey

NAYS—218

Aderholt	Burns	Doolittle
Akin	Burr	Dreier
Alexander	Burton (IN)	Duncan
Bachus	Buyer	Ehlers
Baker	Calvert	Emerson
Ballenger	Camp	English
Barrett (SC)	Cantor	Everett
Bartlett (MD)	Capito	Ferguson
Barton (TX)	Carter	Flake
Bass	Castle	Foley
Beauprez	Chabot	Forbes
Biggert	Chocola	Fossella
Bilirakis	Coble	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Frelinghuysen
Blackburn	Collins	Gallely
Blunt	Cox	Garrett (NJ)
Boehlert	Crane	Gerlach
Boehner	Crenshaw	Gibbons
Bonilla	Cubin	Gilchrest
Bonner	Culberson	Gillmor
Bono	Cunningham	Gingrey
Boozman	Davis, Jo Ann	Goode
Bradley (NH)	Davis, Tom	Goodlatte
Brady (TX)	Deal (GA)	Granger
Brown (SC)	DeLay	Graves
Brown-Waite,	DeMint	Green (WI)
Ginny	Diaz-Balart, L.	Greenwood
Burgess	Diaz-Balart, M.	Gutknecht

Hall	McCotter	Ros-Lehtinen
Harris	McCrary	Royce
Hart	McHugh	Ryan (WI)
Hastert	McInnis	Ryun (KS)
Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Saxton
Hayes	Mica	Schrook
Hayworth	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Hefley	Miller (MI)	Sessions
Hensarling	Miller, Gary	Shadegg
Herger	Moran (KS)	Shaw
Hobson	Murphy	Shays
Hoekstra	Myrick	Sherwood
Hostettler	Nethercutt	Shimkus
Houghton	Neugebauer	Shuster
Hulshof	Ney	Simmons
Hunter	Northup	Simpson
Hyde	Nunes	Smith (MI)
Isakson	Nussle	Smith (NJ)
Issa	Osborne	Smith (TX)
Istook	Ose	Souder
Jenkins	Otter	Stearns
Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Sullivan
Johnson (IL)	Paul	Sweeney
Johnson, Sam	Pearce	Tauzin
Jones (NC)	Pence	Taylor (NC)
Keller	Peterson (PA)	Terry
Kelly	Petri	Thomas
Kennedy (MN)	Pickering	Thornberry
King (IA)	Pitts	Tiahrt
King (NY)	Platts	Tiberi
Kingston	Pombo	Turner (OH)
Kirk	Porter	Upton
Kline	Portman	Vitter
Knollenberg	Pryce (OH)	Walden (OR)
Kolbe	Putnam	Walsh
LaHood	Radanovich	Wamp
Latham	Ramstad	Weldon (FL)
LaTourette	Regula	Weldon (PA)
Leach	Rehberg	Whitfield
Lewis (CA)	Renzi	Wicker
Lewis (KY)	Reynolds	Wilson (NM)
Linder	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (SC)
LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)	Wolf
Lucas (OK)	Rogers (MI)	Young (AK)
Manzullo	Rohrabacher	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Ackerman	Klecza	Norwood
Cannon	Lipinski	Quinn
Carson (OK)	Matsui	Stark
Dooley (CA)	McCarthy (NY)	Tancredto
Dunn	McDermott	Toomey
Feeney	Millender-	Weller
Gephardt	McDonald	
Hoefel	Musgrave	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 2254

Mr. OTTER, Mr. NUNES, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. THOMAS and Mr. CHABOT changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. OWENS, Mr. STRICKLAND and Mrs. LOWEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 208, noes 204, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 536]

AYES—208

Aderholt	Gilchrest	Osborne
Akin	Gillmor	Otter
Alexander	Gingrey	Oxley
Bachus	Goodlatte	Pearce
Baker	Granger	Pence
Balenger	Graves	Peterson (PA)
Barrett (SC)	Green (WI)	Petri
Barton (TX)	Greenwood	Pickering
Bass	Gutknecht	Pitts
Beauprez	Hall	Platts
Biggert	Harris	Pombo
Bilirakis	Hart	Porter
Bishop (UT)	Hastert	Portman
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Blunt	Hayes	Putnam
Boehlert	Hayworth	Radanovich
Boehner	Hensarling	Ramstad
Bonilla	Herger	Regula
Bonner	Hobson	Rehberg
Bono	Hoekstra	Rehberg
Boozman	Hostettler	Renzi
Bradley (NH)	Houghton	Reynolds
Brady (TX)	Hulshof	Rogers (AL)
Brown (SC)	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Brown-Waite,	Hyde	Rogers (MI)
Ginny	Isakson	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Burns	Istook	Royce
Burr	Jenkins	Ryan (WI)
Burton (IN)	Johnson (CT)	Ryun (KS)
Buyer	Johnson (IL)	Saxton
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Schrock
Camp	Keller	Sensenbrenner
Cantor	Kelly	Sessions
Capito	Kennedy (MN)	Shadegg
Carter	King (IA)	Shaw
Castle	King (NY)	Shays
Chabot	Kingston	Sherwood
Chocola	Kirk	Shimkus
Coble	Klione	Shuster
Cole	Knollenberg	Simmons
Collins	Kolbe	Simpson
Cox	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Latham	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	LaTourette	Souder
Cubin	Leach	Stearns
Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Sullivan
Cunningham	Lewis (KY)	Sweeney
Davis, Tom	Linder	Tauzin
Deal (GA)	LoBiondo	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	Lucas (OK)	Terry
DeMint	Manzullo	Thomas
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCotter	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCrery	Tiahrt
Doolittle	McHugh	Tiberi
Dreier	McInnis	Turner (OH)
Ehlers	McKeon	Upton
Emerson	Mica	Vitter
English	Miller (FL)	Walden (OR)
Everett	Miller (MI)	Walsh
Ferguson	Miller, Gary	Wamp
Flake	Moran (KS)	Weldon (FL)
Foley	Murphy	Weldon (PA)
Forbes	Myrick	Whitfield
Fossella	Nethercutt	Wicker
Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer	Wilson (NM)
Frelinghuysen	Ney	Wilson (SC)
Galleghy	Northup	Wolf
Garrett (NJ)	Nunes	Young (AK)
Gerlach	Nussle	Young (FL)

NOES—204

Abercrombie	Cardin	Dicks
Allen	Cardoza	Dingell
Andrews	Carson (IN)	Doggett
Baca	Case	Doyle
Baird	Chandler	Duncan
Baldwin	Clay	Edwards
Bartlett (MD)	Clyburn	Emanuel
Becerra	Conyers	Engel
Bell	Cooper	Eshoo
Berkley	Costello	Etheridge
Berman	Cramer	Evans
Berry	Crowley	Farr
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Fattah
Bishop (NY)	Davis (AL)	Finer
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Ford
Boswell	Davis (FL)	Frank (MA)
Boucher	Davis (IL)	Frost
Boyd	Davis (TN)	Gibbons
Brady (PA)	Davis, Jo Ann	Gonzalez
Brown (OH)	DeFazio	Goode
Brown, Corrine	DeGette	Gordon
Butterfield	Delahunt	Green (TX)
Capps	DeLauro	Grijalva
Capuano	Deutsch	Gutierrez

Harman	Matheson	Sabo
Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (MO)	Sánchez, Linda
Hefley	McCollum	T.
Herseeth	McGovern	Sanchez, Loretta
Hill	McIntyre	Sanders
Hinchesy	McNulty	Sandlin
Hinojosa	Meehan	Schakowsky
Holden	Meek (FL)	Schiff
Holt	Meeks (NY)	Scott (GA)
Honda	Menendez	Scott (VA)
Hoolley (OR)	Michaud	Serrano
Hoyer	Miller (NC)	Sherman
Inslee	Miller, George	Skelton
Israel	Mollohan	Slaughter
Jackson (IL)	Moore	Smith (MI)
Jackson-Lee	Moran (VA)	Smith (WA)
(TX)	Murtha	Snyder
Jefferson	Nadler	Solis
John	Napolitano	Spratt
Johnson, E. B.	Neal (MA)	Stenholm
Jones (NC)	Oberstar	Strickland
Jones (OH)	Obey	Stupak
Kanjorski	Olver	Tanner
Kaptur	Ortiz	Tauscher
Kennedy (RI)	Ose	Taylor (MS)
Kildee	Owens	Thompson (CA)
Kilpatrick	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Kind	Pascrell	Tierney
Kucinich	Pastor	Towns
Lampson	Paul	Turner (TX)
Langevin	Payne	Udall (CO)
Lantos	Pelosi	Udall (NM)
Larsen (WA)	Peterson (MN)	Van Hollen
Larson (CT)	Pomeroy	Velázquez
Lee	Price (NC)	Visclosky
Levin	Rahall	Waters
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Watson
Lofgren	Reyes	Watt
Lowey	Rodriguez	Weiner
Lucas (KY)	Ross	Wexler
Lynch	Rothman	Woolsey
Majette	Roybal-Allard	Wu
Maloney	Ruppersberger	Wynn
Markey	Rush	
Marshall	Ryan (OH)	

NOT VOTING—21

Ackerman	Kleczka	Norwood
Cannon	Lipinski	Quinn
Carson (OK)	Matsui	Stark
Dooley (CA)	McCarthy (NY)	Tancredo
Dunn	McDermott	Toomey
Feeney	Millender-	Weller
Gephardt	McDonald	
Hoefl	Musgrave	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2311

So the Senate bill was passed.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. 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 S. 2986, the Senate bill just passed.  
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?  
 There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1350, INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2004

Mr. SESSIONS (during debate on S. 2986), from the Committee on Rules,

submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-781) on the resolution (H. Res. 858) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1350) to reauthorize the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. SESSIONS (during debate on S. 2986), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-782) on the resolution (H. Res. 859) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. SESSIONS (during debate on S. 2986), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-783) on the resolution (H. Res. 860) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 2310

CONGRATULATING BOSTON RED SOX ON WINNING THE 2004 WORLD SERIES

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 854) congratulating the Boston Red Sox on winning the 2004 World Series, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object because this is a resolution congratulating the greatest team in the history of baseball, the Boston Red Sox, who after 86 years finally relieved all New Englanders, and all wonderful people in America, of the greatest burden in the history of sports, 86 years of drought. No more. No more. The Cubs come next.

Mr. Speaker, down three to nothing against one of the greatest teams in baseball, they staged the greatest comeback in the history of sports, sweeping four games in a row against a fantastic Yankees team and one of the

greatest rivalries in professional sports today, and then sweeping a four-game series against the Cardinals, another fantastic team, that many of us thought would win the World Series this year.

Not only did they do that, when they came home, we were fortunate enough a few years ago to have the Patriots win their championship in football. We had a million people in downtown Boston celebrating that. The Red Sox won, and we had well over 3 million people. That is half the population of the State of Massachusetts. We had people flying in from all over the country to witness a once-in-a-lifetime experience.

I heard that many people went to cemeteries and gave hats and gave baseball cards to their loved ones who were not here to see this. I heard that some people brought the ashes of their loved ones to the parade because there were those of us who just had no understanding of how to win with our beloved Red Sox.

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

Mr. CAPUANO. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, what did they bring to the parade?

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, we will have to get a translator.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution congratulates the men of the Red Sox and the owners of the Red Sox for their dedication and their commitment to the sport and to their fans. They have opened up the park, I will translate that word, too, later on. They have opened up the park to the public. They have had the players out there talking to the people who come to the games. They have closed off a piece of public turf so we can expand the experience of Fenway.

For those fortunate enough to come to the convention this summer in Boston, I am hoping most Members got to go to Fenway Park, still the smallest ballpark in the major league, yet always sold out because the people of New England support their team.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a thank you to the best of our ability to thank the men of the Red Sox and the owners and to the entire Red Sox nation for 86 years of unflinching support and dedication to a team that has so often let us down but every year came back and gave us more to cheer for.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAPUANO. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts knows that I am from New Hampshire. There is a friendly rivalry between our States, as Members know. We have gone back and forth for years and years on a number of things, but the one thing that we have always shared in common with other New England States is our love of the Red Sox.

I, too, like the Members from Massachusetts here tonight, wondered if I would ever live long enough to see the Red Sox win the World Series ever. When Dave Roberts stole that base and changed the tide against Mariano Rivera, the greatest closer ever, and then David Ortiz hit a home run, and then David Ortiz hit a bloop single the next night, Curt Schilling the next day pitched that great game, and then Derrek Lowe on 2 days' rest came back, and we won four games and then did it again against the Cardinals, there was a dream that most of us in New England thought would never happen.

People wondered where we would be on the night that the Red Sox won. I do not know where the gentleman from Massachusetts was, but I was with my sons who are younger, and they had never been through Bill Buckner and through Carlton Fisk or Jim Lamborg, or even Johnny Peske, and all of the memories that those of us who have grown up in New England have known for years and years and years. But, finally, we have done it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and may our States always be friends and always rooting for the Red Sox.

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

Mr. CAPUANO. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I have an offering for the House this evening with apologies to Ernest L. Thayer entitled "The Curse Has Struck Out."

The outlook wasn't guaranteed for the Red Sox nine this year. Since 1918 the boys had left us crying in our beer. And when they lost twice in New York and lost again at home, a pall-like silence fell upon the loyal Red Sox fans.

A straggling few got up to go in deep despair. "Wait 'til next year," they said. Resignation filled the air. The rest clung to that hope that springs eternal in the human breast. "It ain't over 'til its over" they muttered half in jest. They thought, "If only our boys could put some bat on that ball, we'd put Bambino's curse to rest once and for all."

And then Ortiz let fly a homer, to the wonderment of all. And Johnny Damon, bases loaded, tore the cover off the ball. And when the dust had lifted on that memorable night, we had come back from three games down, the Curse was in our sights.

Then from all of Red Sox nation's throats there rose a wild call, it echoed on the Common, it shook Fanueil Hall. It pounded on the River Charles, and splashed upon the Bay, the Yankees were all through, kaput, a World Series we would play.

And they rolled out to St. Louis, jewel of the Midwest. The Cards had won their league with ease, but now they faced a test. Were they ready for

the Boston boys? The town was dressed in red. The fans could not be nicer, the team was so well led.

But the Red Sox took the first three games, competing nobly one and all. They overcame their errors, they answered every call. And as game four proceeded, and a series win now loomed, all New England shivered with the thought we might still be doomed.

□ 2320

What deus ex machina would fall down from the sky?

What Bucky Dent/Bill Buckner ghost might steer things all awry?

Keith Foulke climbed up upon the mound, ball burning in his hand.

The Curse stepped up to face him, to make a final stand.

There was ease in the Curse's manner as he stepped into his place.

There was pride in Bambino's bearing, a smile on the Curse's face.

And when, responding to his fans, he lightly doffed his hat,

No stranger in the crowd could doubt 'twas the Curse at the bat.

A nation's eyes were on him as he rubbed his hands with dirt.

60,000 tongues applauded when he wiped them on his shirt.

Then, while Foulke rubbed the ball into his shifty hip,

Defiance flashed in the Curse's eye, a sneer curled on his lip.

And now the leather-covered sphere came hurtling through the air,

And the Curse stood a-watching it in haughty grandeur there.

Close by the portly batsman the ball unheeded sped—

"I just can't hit that," said the Curse. "Strike one!" the umpire said.

From the canyons of Manhattan, there rose a muffled roar.

New York fans were screaming, "Would the Curse really be no more?"

"Kill him, kill the umpire," they shouted in Yankee land.

The Curse looked smug. In 86 years the Curse had never fanned.

With a smile of overconfidence, the Curse's visage shone.

He stilled the rising tumult, he bade the game go on.

He signaled the Red Sox closer, and once more the dun sphere flew,

But the Curse couldn't hit it, and the umpire said, "Strike two."

"It's over," thought the Cardinals fans, who are brought up so well.

But the Curse gave a scornful look and an eerie silence fell.

They saw his face frown stern and cold, they saw his muscles strain.

And they really thought the Curse wouldn't let that ball go by again.

The sneer has fled from the Curse's lip, the teeth are clenched in hate.

He pounds, with cruel violence, his bat upon the plate.

And now the pitcher holds the ball, and now he lets it go,

And now the air is shattered by the force of the Curse's blow.

Oh, all across this favored land the sun is shining bright.

The band is playing happily and our hearts are oh so light.

And Red Sox Nation smiles and laughs, and little children shout.

And there is pure joy in Beantown—the Curse has struck out.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to also congratulate all of the Red Sox, but I especially would like to congratulate my longtime friend Johnny Pesky. Johnny Pesky, at the age of 85, still dresses out every day with the Red Sox. Nobody loves the Red Sox more than Johnny Pesky, a longtime player, coach, manager, broadcaster, one of the most popular figures in all of New England.

I had the privilege as an 11 and 12-year-old boy of serving as his batboy for the Knoxville Smokies minor league baseball team and got to know him starting in 1959. He has had me right in the dugout at Fenway Park. I know that no one is more excited or happy over these great events of the last few weeks than my friend Johnny Pesky. I would like to offer a special congratulations to a really fine man and great American, Johnny Pesky.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am going to submit this for the RECORD but I would just like to read the first two paragraphs of an article that appeared in the Boston Herald:

“When Margaret ‘Peg’ Coyne lost her desire to eat, when she could no longer rise from her parlor chair, walk to the kitchen and fix herself a cup of tea, there was still the Red Sox.

“When the grand nieces who kept a vigil by Aunt Peg’s hospice bed were sure the pain, the morphine and the Ativan had eased her into a tranquil delirium, Johnny Damon would step into the batter’s box and Peg’s 93-year-old eyes suddenly opened.”

It is a longer article than that that I will submit for the RECORD. But I think those two paragraphs catch the tenor of how the Red Sox Nation feels. This is something we have waited for a long time and many people have come and gone. There have been fantastic players that have been with the team over the years that have given us joy. Johnny Pesky. The right field foul pole is named after Johnny Pesky because he gave us so many thrills while he was playing.

[From the Boston Herald, Nov. 1, 2004]

ANGEL IN THE OUTFIELD SENDS HEAVENLY MIRACLE FROM ABOVE

(By Peter Gelzinis)

When Margaret “Peg” Coyne lost her desire to eat, when she could no longer rise from her parlor chair, walk to the kitchen and fix herself a cup of tea . . . there was still the Red Sox.

When the grand nieces who kept a vigil by “Aunt Peg’s” hospice bed were sure the pain, the morphine and the Ativan had eased her into a tranquil delirium, Johnny Damon would step into the batter’s box and Peg’s 93-year-old eyes suddenly opened.

“Come on, Johnny! Come on, Johnny!” she cried out at the television screen, her voice frail but unbowed.

“We couldn’t understand how she knew the inning, let alone the batter,” Jeannie Boutin recalled. “When we asked her, Peg just said, ‘Because I pay attention, what do you think, Besides,’ she’d say, ‘they run the numbers along the top of the screen.’ And, of course, she always wanted to see her Johnny.”

“Oooh, my sister loved Johnny Damon all right,” Nora Coyne said. “She loved how he managed to get on base. Peg loved Johnny’s heart. But then, of course, she was always saying, ‘I wish Johnny would cut his hair and shave that beard.’”

Nora betrayed the kind of self-conscious blush one might expect from a fan of, say, 19 . . . or maybe 29. She happens to be 89.

Ah, but when you venture this deep into the heart of Red Sox Nation—to the cozy sanctuary of a South Boston parlor where two easy chairs sit side-by-side—age is little more than a state of mind. And baseball is what keeps you forever young.

The Coyne sisters didn’t particularly care for Babe Ruth. Why?

“Because Peg and I were there at Braves Field, when the Babe came to play for the Braves at the end of his career,” Nora explains. “We used to sit in this box right there beside the Braves’ dugout. We knew all the Braves. Really, they were our favorites for a long time. We always like the National League guys, because they were a lot more friendly.

“Oh . . . I’m sorry, back to Babe. Well, you see, all these little kids came down from the grandstands to get his autograph, and the Babe . . . well, he just ignored all the little kids. My sister and I thought that was really awful. We never forgot it. And, of course, don’t get me started on the Southie girl Babe married. Her name was Nora, too. She lived on Fourth Street, just above F (Street), I think. And what did the Babe do but leave her for a New York showgirl.”

In between caring for several generations of family—my wife and our son among them—and stitching curtains in factories throughout Southie, Roxbury and Dorchester, Peg and Nora didn’t just watch baseball . . . they lived it.

There are tales of how the ancient Sox pitcher Boo Ferris charmed Peg and Nora with a “Hello Girls,” on his way into the Harvard Club, or how Ted Williams fired off a string of “bad words” when the sisters stepped in front of his Caddie.

“Dizzy Trout, the Detroit pitcher, was sitting next to him in the front seat,” Nora remembered, “and he just laughed.”

On the final day of this past August, during a Red Sox winning streak, Peg Coyne’s vantage point on this season shifted from a blue parlor to a celestial box seat. My son’s theory was that in return for letting go and coming to heaven, God had surely promised Peg that the Sox would catch the Yankees down the stretch.

When Johnny Damon finally emerged from his playoff slump in truly miraculous fashion, Nora’s phone rang off the hook.

“It’s Peg,” all the nieces screamed, “Peg’s there in the outfield with him.”

“When Keith Foulke made the last out,” Nora said, “I leaned over to say something to Peg. But there was only an empty chair. I wanted her to know what just happened. The Sox finally won it all. They took the Series. But then, of course, my sister already knew. She was watching everything from a much better seat . . . way up there.

And she was smiling.”

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have the wonderful honor of representing the city of Boston with my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO). This is a special moment for us. I want to rise here tonight just to remember a couple of great Red Sox fans from this body, a couple of people who just embodied the spirit of loyalty to the Red Sox and who I wish were here to share in this. Those two gentlemen are Silvio Conte who served in this body for such a long time representing western Mass, and also my predecessor, Congressman Joe Moakley. Two finer Red Sox fans there never were. I think Silvio Conte would have the full Red Sox uniform on tonight making his remarks if he were here.

The hour is late. I do want to before this resolution passes congratulate the Boston Red Sox and their superb management team, Larry Lucchino, John Henry, Tom Werner and also Theo Epstein and Terry Francona for putting together a wonderful team of just extraordinary gentlemen who not only carried out their athletic roles with excellence but also did it in a way that young people from Massachusetts and all through New England and through the country can really look up to. They really handled themselves with extreme class. The players of the 2004 World Series champion Red Sox, I do not have to name them tonight because their names as we all know will be forever written in the hearts of the citizens of Boston and of New England and of Red Sox Nation. I join with my colleagues in the House in congratulating them for their wonderful, wonderful accomplishment.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I was not intending to speak but I am now, because I am not a poet and cannot really compete with my colleague from Alden, but I am now goaded into speaking out of respect for my predecessor Silvio O. Conte who has just been referenced by my esteemed colleague from Boston (Mr. LYNCH).

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am adding my congratulations to the Boston Red Sox for overcoming what many thought was impossible, namely, the toppling of the New York Yankees and ultimately overcoming the Curse of the Bambino. While our Nation is often described as polarized and divided, this Red Sox team managed to bridge these gaps and bring fans from all corners of the country into the Red Sox Nation. All the 2004 Boston Red Sox team will be remembered for their stars, Curt Schilling, Manny Ramirez, Pedro Martinez and David Ortiz, the real underlying message of this team is that the impossible can occur when people come together with the right attitude.

In their march to the world championship, the Red Sox overcame obstacles not through individual triumphs but rather through team effort. Players who had been stars with other

teams selflessly accepted lesser roles in the interest of the team. Such players could have easily sulked and pined for personal glory. Instead, they encouraged those who were participating and did their job when they were called upon. The triumph of the 2004 Boston Red Sox was twofold, physical and mental. While the Red Sox players, coaches and management would tell you they did not believe in curses, the fans and the media were convinced that there were forces at work far greater than those who give the curveball its break or cause a knuckleball to dance. Still, despite 86 years of expectations, capped by disappointments, this self-labored "bunch of idiots" managed to overcome preordained demise and ultimate collapse and they did it all with a goofy smile on their face, goofy styles in their hair and a love for the game that is a breath of fresh air in professional sports.

The 2004 World Series run will always hold a special place in the heart of Red Sox fans in the New England region as a whole.

□ 2330

Gone is the label of lovable loser and all the "what if" speculation in the papers and on the airwaves. For the first time in 86 years, the Red Sox Nation can breathe a deep sigh of relief this off-season and enjoy the fruits of the hometown team's labor. Gone are the columns speculating on the cause of their most recent demise, and in their place are columns about long-suffering fans able to rest knowing that they have seen in their lifetime what others in the past were not so lucky to see.

Mr. Speaker, 2004 will be a year remembered for many reasons; and while some of those reasons may fade with the passing of time, I am sure that the citizens of the Red Sox Nation will keep a not-so-silent vigil to ensure that 2004 is remembered as the year an impossible dream became a reality, the hopes of the faithful and long suffering were met in full, and the season that was always going to be next year was finally this year.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to privately say we finally did it. The Boston Red Sox have won the World Series for the first time in 86 years. Not only did they win, but they made history in the process. Congratulations to the gentlemen. They have done what so many thought was impossible.

As a lifelong Red Sox fan, I can honestly say that this is a dream come true. Like millions of other fans, I had such high hopes year after year only to see the World Series slip through our fingers. We have had so many opportunities during our long drought, but something was always missing. Time

and time again when victory seemed to be within our grasp, fate intervened and the season would end once again with us muttering the line "there is always next year." Next year was finally this year.

Self-confidence is the hallmark of this team embodied by Curt Schilling and is now classic mantra of "why not us?" History is in the past, and we must live and play for today, and that is what the 2004 Red Sox have taught all of us.

We also learned that over the course of this season that redemption cannot come easy. The Red Sox were three outs away from packing their bags for the winter, as they have so many times in the past. But perhaps the first time, these men knew they could not allow their arch rivals to celebrate at Fenway Park. More than that, Terry Francona knew that the Sox were not done and masterfully managed his team with four straight victories with the help of David Ortiz's amazing performances.

Red Sox fans know that the game is never over until the last out, but we have got to believe. We have all finally seen a dream come true. And it said that Red Sox, the Red Sox play 162 home games, the support of their amazing fans follows them everywhere and is a key factor that propelled the team to victory.

Finally, I am happy to be able to say this in my lifetime, that we did it and I look forward to the 2005 season when the Red Sox defend their World Series title.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, just yesterday the gentleman who runs the Democratic cloak room was brought to the hospital for a little problem, and I understand that as he was heading towards the hospital clutching his chest, he was heard to say, "It's okay, I've seen the Red Sox win. It's okay." He will be back soon.

But I will tell my colleagues that though many of the Sunday morning pundits are now thinking that some of us in Boston are scratching our heads wondering what happened on some issues this year, the truth is we are all looking at each other wondering how do we enter next year's baseball season now that we have won. We know what to do when we lose: do not worry, next year is it, we are going to make this trade. We have not got a clue how to deal with a win. So all of us at home are really kind of standing wondering now what do we do. We will figure it out, and we will stumble through. And the only thing I will say for the rest of the night is in 86 years, I will be back again to do this one more time.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 854, congratulating the Boston Red Sox on winning the World Series.

The 2004 Boston Red Sox were no ordinary champion. I would urge my colleagues to remember the scene at Fenway Park as midnight neared on October 17, 2004.

The Sox had dropped the first three games of the American League Championship Se-

ries—a deficit that no team had ever surmounted. The night before, they were drubbed 19–8 before the hometown fans.

The Boston bats were silent. Their arms were spent. Their gloves were shaky. Their ace pitcher's foot was stapled to the rest of his leg.

Now trailing 4–3 in Game Four, they came to bat in the bottom of the ninth just three outs away from another close call, another heart-break for another generation of Sox fans.

In the other dugout was a Yankees team that dashed our hopes last year and won 101 games this year—a team packed with talent and carrying a monster payroll of \$184 million.

On the mound was Mariano Rivera, the best and most reliable closer in the history of the game.

Hovering over all of New England was the ghost of Babe Ruth.

Only a "band of idiots" could have believed that they could come back. And only the 2004 Boston Red Sox could have actually pulled it off.

But the slugger Kevin Millar patiently worked out a walk. The speedy pinch-runner Dave Roberts stole second, leaving third baseman Bill Mueller with the chance to tie it. He promptly did, smacking a single through Rivera's legs, and he—and all of the Red Sox Nation—watched Roberts speed home.

The game was tied. The Sox were alive. The Bambino rolled over in his grave. The Yankees' historic choke had begun.

David Ortiz ended the game with a twelfth-inning homer, and less than 24 hours later, the heroic "Big Papi" won Game Five with a fourteenth-inning single.

Game Six was won by the clutch Mark Bellhorn, the mythical Curt Schilling and the medical miracle workers who put his ankle back together.

In Game Seven, the Yankees succumbed to the biblical slugging of Johnny Damon and the untouchable sinkerballs of Derek Lowe.

The Series wasn't even close. The Cardinals had a great season, but they picked the wrong year to win the National League. 2004 belonged to Red Sox Nation. After the bitter endings of 1948, 1978, 1986 and 2003, we deserved it.

All of New England breathed a collective sigh of relief as the always dependable closer Keith Foulke grabbed the final ground ball of Game Four and tossed it to Gold Glove first baseman Doug Mientkiewicz for the final out.

For the first time in 86 years, the Red Sox are the World Champions of baseball—truly World champions, with a roster assembled from the Dominican Republic, South Korea, Colombia, Red-State and Blue-State America. Congratulations to the brilliant general manager Theo Epstein.

Congratulations to our field general, Terry Francona, and his lieutenants on the coaching staff.

Congratulations to the top brass—John Henry, Tom Werner, and Larry Lucchino.

Congratulations to World Series MVP Manny Ramirez. Congratulations to the dean of the Red Sox, Tim Wakefield. Congratulations to the bullpen saviors Mike Timlin and Alan Embree. Congratulations to the steady veterans Jason Varitek, Trot Nixon, and Doug Mirabelli. Congratulations to recent arrivals Bronson Arroyo, Orlando Cabrera, Gabe Kapler, and Pokey Reese.

Congratulations to the unparalleled Pedro Martinez—Pedro, please don't go!

Congratulations to the entire Red Sox team, who will be remembered forever as the conquering heroes who Reversed the Curse and brought a baseball championship to New England for the first time since the Wilson Administration. (Woodrow Wilson, not Mookie.)

Congratulations also to all the great Red Sox players of the past, including Johnny Pesky, Dom Dimaggio, Carl Yastrzemski, Jim Rice, and Luis Tiant—this victory was as much for them as anyone. The same can be said of Ted Williams and all the other Sox greats who have passed on, but who no doubt watched from the heavens above, smiling.

And most importantly, congratulations to baseball's most loyal and passionate fans: Red Sox Nation.

Mr. Speaker, on April 11, 2005, the Red Sox will raise the 2004 World Championship banner at Fenway Park alongside its counterpart from 1918. In the visiting dugout, watching the Sox try on their rings, will be a team that has suffered without a championship since the year 2000—the New York Yankees.

Don't worry, Yankees fans, there's always next year.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANKS of Arizona). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 854

Whereas on October 27, 2004, the Boston Red Sox won their first World Series title in 86 years in a four-game sweep of the St. Louis Cardinals;

Whereas the Red Sox won their sixth world title in the 104-year history of the storied franchise;

Whereas the 2004 Red Sox World Champion team epitomized sportmanship, selfless play, team spirit, determination, and heart in the course of winning 98 games in the regular season and clinching the American League Wild Card playoff berth;

Whereas the 2004 Red Sox World Champion team honored the careers of all former Red Sox legends, including Joe Cronin, Bobby Doerr, Carlton Fisk, Jimmie Foxx, Carl Yastrzemski, Cy Young, Johnny Pesky, Dom DiMaggio, Jim Rice, and Ted Williams;

Whereas the 2004 postseason produced new Red Sox legends, including Derek Lowe, Pedro Martinez, Curt Schilling, Tim Wakefield, Jason Varitek, Keith Foulke, Manny Ramirez, David Ortiz, Johnny Damon, Trot Nixon, Orlando Cabrera, Kevin Millar, Mike Timlin, Alan Embree, Mark Bellhorn, Bill Mueller, and Dave Roberts;

Whereas Red Sox Manager Terry Francona brought fresh leadership to the clubhouse this year, and brought together a self-proclaimed "band of idiots" and made them into one of the greatest Red Sox teams of all time;

Whereas Red Sox owners John Henry and Tom Werner and Red Sox President and Chief Executive Officer Larry Lucchino never wavered from their goal of bringing a World Series Championship to Boston;

Whereas Red Sox General Manager Theo Epstein assembled a team with strong pitching, a crushing offense, and most important, the heart and soul of a champion;

Whereas the Red Sox never trailed in any of the 36 innings of the World Series;

Whereas the Red Sox set a new major league record by winning eight consecutive games in the postseason;

Whereas Derrek Lowe, Pedro Martinez, and Curt Schilling delivered gutsy pitching performances in the postseason worthy of their status as some of the best pitchers in Red Sox history;

Whereas the Red Sox starting pitching in Games 2, 3, and 4 of the World Series had a combined earned run average of 0.00;

Whereas Manny Ramirez won the 2004 World Series Most Valuable Player award in the World Series after batting 0.350 in the postseason with two home runs and 11 runs batted in;

Whereas the Red Sox staged the greatest comeback in baseball history in the American League Championship Series against their rivals, the New York Yankees, by winning four consecutive games after losing the first three games of the series;

Whereas the Red Sox prevailed in four consecutive American League Championship Series games, while producing some of the most memorable moments in sports history, including Dave Roberts stealing second base in the bottom of the ninth inning of Game 4, David Ortiz securing a walk-off home run in the 12th inning of Game 4, David Ortiz singling in the winning run in the bottom of the 14th inning in Game 5, and Johnny Damon making a grand slam in Game 7;

Whereas the entire Red Sox organization has a strong commitment to charitable causes in New England, demonstrated by the team's 51-year support of the Dana-Farber Cancer Institute's Jimmy Fund in the fight against childhood cancers;

Whereas fans of the Red Sox do not live only in Boston or New England, but all across the country and the world, and a grateful "Red Sox Nation" thanks the team for bringing a World Championship home to Boston;

Whereas the 2004 Boston Red Sox and their loyal fans believed; and

Whereas this IS next year: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates—

(A) the Boston Red Sox for winning the 2004 Major League Baseball World Series and for their incredible performance during the 2004 Major League Baseball season; and

(B) the eight Major League Baseball teams that played in the postseason;

(2) recognizes the achievements of the Boston Red Sox players, manager, coaches, and support staff whose hard work, dedication, and spirit made this all possible;

(3) commends—

(A) the St. Louis Cardinals for a valiant performance during the 2004 season and the World Series;

(B) the fans and management of the St. Louis Cardinals for allowing the Red Sox fans from Boston and around the Nation to celebrate their first title in 86 years at their home field; and

(4) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the 2004 Boston Red Sox team;

(B) Red Sox Manager Terry Francona;

(C) Red Sox General Manager Theo Epstein;

(D) Red Sox President and Chief Executive Officer Larry Lucchino;

(E) Red Sox Principal Owner John Henry; and

(F) Red Sox Chairman Tom Werner.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY  
MR. OSE

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the preamble.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the preamble offered by Mr. OSE:

On page 1 line 10 strike the word "payoff" and insert the word "playoff".

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I do want to speak to the amendment, if I might, because I know the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) comes from district eight in Massachusetts, and clearly there has been an error in the third paragraph of the resolution. We are going to call this E-8 in the gentleman from Massachusetts' (Mr. CAPUANO) memory because I do not believe he meant to put the word "payoff" in there, and we are attempting to correct this. And I just want to assure folks of the district that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) represents that it was an error made in good faith and that it was an error much like many errors in the past like Mr. Buckner has made, and I hope to never see such an error again in the next 86 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the preamble.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. DREIER, (during debate on H. Res. 854) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-784) on the resolution (H. Res. 861) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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 Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

A FISCAL U-TURN: BACK IN THE HOLE AND STILL DIGGING

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I joined many of my colleagues in Little Rock, Arkansas, for the official dedication of the William Jefferson

Clinton Presidential Center, a place where scholars and all Americans can study the many remarkable achievements of 8 years of the Clinton administration.

As I sat through the dedication ceremonies today, I reflected on the unparalleled economic prosperity that America experienced during President Clinton's tenure. I also could not help thinking about the important matter we would be confronted with on the House floor later in the day, a vote to raise the debt limit for the third time since President Clinton's successor took office. With today's vote, the majority of this House has agreed to a whopping \$800 billion increase in the debt ceiling from its present level of \$7.38 trillion to \$8.18 trillion.

The impending breach of the statutory debt ceiling is the latest warning about the Nation's fiscal health. Our debt has been growing faster than our economy's ability to repay it due in large part to a reckless economic policy over the last 4 years. These policies have undone the hard work it took to balance the budget during the 1990s and have left us awash in a sea of red ink.

At the beginning of the Clinton administration in 1992, the Federal budget deficit was at a historic high of \$290 billion, 10 million Americans were out of work, and the Nation's economic growth rate was the lowest in more than half a century. In response, President Clinton and the congressional Democrats worked together to enact the 1993 Deficit Reduction Plan which passed the House and Senate without a single Republican vote. The balanced budget plan demonstrated that guided by common sense and realism, we could slash the deficit in half while also making important investments in our future including education, health care, science, and technology.

The plan included more than \$500 billion in deficit reduction and cut taxes for 15 million of the hardest pressed Americans as well as small businesses.

□ 2340

What followed is unarguable: the creation of more than 22 million new jobs and the Nation's lowest unemployment rate in 30 years. The Nation went from the largest budget deficits in history to the largest budget surpluses in history. Four consecutive years of debt reduction also followed, a total of \$453 billion paid down, bringing the public debt down to \$2.9 trillion lower in 2001 than projected in 1993.

When President Clinton left office, we were on track to eliminate the Nation's public debt by 2012, making America debt-free for the first time since Andrew Jackson was President.

Today, we continue the fiscal U-turn that this Congress and administration have steered us into over the last 4 years. Today's vote to increase the debt limit marks yet another unfortunate milestone in our Nation's history where we have the largest deficits we have ever had, \$413 billion, and abso-

lutely no plan in sight to put our fiscal House in order.

For years, members of the Blue Dog Coalition have warned that we were spending money we did not have, that the administration had no economic plan, and that tax cuts alone were not a substitute for an economic plan for our country's future. This Congress continues to reject efforts to budget in the same way that your family and mine does, by paying as you go.

Even as we sought to stave off the day of reckoning, middle-class Americans are paying for our profligacy in the form of rising interest rates. As a result, American consumers are paying more for their mortgages and on their credit cards.

With the retirement of the baby-boom generation beginning in just 4 years, we must rededicate ourselves to ensuring that our children and future generations are not saddled with the enormous responsibility of paying for our economic health and our safety. We owe it to the American people to stop imperiling the Nation's economic future by borrowing money to pay for irresponsible policies.

We all acknowledge that the September 11 attacks and the resulting war on terrorism as well as the war on Iraq have put an additional stress on our economy. But instead of spending political capital to ask all Americans to share in the Nation's sacrifice, the President and the majority today took the easy way out.

Mr. Speaker, the day of reckoning is at hand, and with today's vote we must all acknowledge we have hit rock bottom.

In his farewell address to the Nation from the Oval Office in February, 2003, President Clinton left the American people with three thoughts about our future. His first admonition was that America must maintain its fiscal responsibility. Pointing to record deficits turned into record surpluses and the paying down of our national debt, he urged us to stay on track. "If we choose wisely," he said, "we can pay down the debt, deal with the retirement of the baby-boomers, invest more in our future, and provide tax relief."

Unfortunately, this Congress and this administration have not chosen wisely. The juxtaposition of today's dedication of the Clinton Library and this evening's vote to increase the national debt is a clarion call to return to the sound fiscal policies that were central to the economic boom of the 1990s. We have a duty to the American people to restore sanity and discipline to our Nation's finances.

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

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

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my special order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

#### PUTTING PEOPLE FIRST

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor and a privilege to join with over 100 of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, and four U.S. presidents to dedicate the William J. Clinton Library in Little Rock, Arkansas. All of the four presidents spoke eloquently. I was especially moved by the words of former President George W. Bush when he said it not a Democrat or Republican day, but it was a great day for all Americans.

I joined President Clinton in the 1992 election here in Washington to represent northern Michigan to do, as President Clinton challenged us then, to put people first. I have learned and tried to do that each day as a Congressman. I learned this not just from President Clinton but from my own father who was a local elected official in Delta County, Michigan.

I come tonight to put people first, to put our children first as I continue to speak out against the acne drug Accutane. As a legislator, I have called for more restrictions on the distribution and use of this drug, which is known to cause severe birth defects and a form of impulsive behavior and depression in young people taking this drug.

This drug has devastated my family with the loss of our son BJ and more than 250 other families who have lost their young son or daughter across this Nation who have lost them while they were taking Accutane.

As we were flying back from Little Rock, Arkansas, CBS news ran a story tonight, and I quote an FDA safety reviewer, Dr. David Graham, when he spoke to the Senate Finance Committee. Dr. Graham said, "I would argue that the FDA as currently configured is incapable of protecting America against another Vioxx." He told the Senate Finance Committee that "there are at least five other drugs on the market today that should be looked at seriously to see whether

they should remain on the market." He cited the acne drug Accutane.

Why Accutane? Because of the horrendous birth defects, but also because of a recent study by Dr. J. Douglas Bremner. He has demonstrated how Accutane mediates depression, causes impulsive behavior due to changes in the orbito frontal cortex in the front part of the brain. That mediates depression. Depression is found in this part of the brain.

Over the course of our investigation of the Committee on Energy and Commerce research, it has indicated that the current formula of Accutane may be about 240 times greater than what is necessary to be effective. Too much Accutane, a synthetic vitamin A, causes cerebri tumor or a pseudo tumor in some patients. This pseudo tumor is a warning that is found on the packaging, but what does it really mean? It means severe headaches. And while it acts like a tumor in the brain, it cannot be discovered. CAT scans will not show it. There is no evidence of a tumor. So what happens?

As Dr. Bremner showed us here in a study of the orbito frontal cortex, there is a decrease in the metabolism of the brain. This is the baseline of a person before they started Accutane. This is post Accutane, or 4 months on Accutane. Notice the red brain activity in the front part of the brain. Notice very little red after 4 months on Accutane. It neutralizes or decreases the metabolism in this part of the brain.

In this one slide that Dr. Bremner has shared with us, there is a 21 percent decrease in brain metabolism with this patient. This only occurred in Accutane patients. Dr. Bremner did the same thing with other patients on oral antibiotics. And it was not all Accutane patients, just those who complained of severe headaches. Is this excessive dosage found in the current formula of Accutane that is being given to patients, is this the cause in the change that we see?

The medical evidence is clear that Accutane causes changes in the brain, which leads some young people to take their own life through impulsive behavior.

Putting people first. Let us put children first. Let us join with the FDA drug safety reviewer and pull this drug from the market or, at a minimum, severely restrict the use and distribution of Accutane until we have all the answers about this powerful, dangerous drug.

Is a decreased metabolism that we see here, is this reversible? Will the brain repair itself? How much Accutane is safe? What should the real dose be so we do not hurt the developing young brains of our children? Has the FDA done enough to protect our children? Has the FDA seriously looked at this study and similar studies in animal testing, which also demonstrate Accutane harms the brain?

It is time to put our children first. It is time to pull this drug off the market

until all of our questions are seriously answered. Put our children first.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit for the RECORD the CBS news report and also a photocopy of the CAT scan from Dr. Bremner.

#### INSIDER: FDA CAN'T PROTECT PUBLIC

The American public is "virtually defenseless" if another medication such as Vioxx proves to be unsafe after it is approved for sale, a government drug safety reviewer told a congressional committee Thursday.

"I would argue that the FDA as currently configured is incapable of protecting America against another Vioxx," said David Graham, who warned that the arthritis drug had been linked to an increased risk of heart attack and stroke.

He told the Senate Finance Committee that there were at least five other drugs on the market today that should be looked at seriously to see whether they should remain there. He cited the acne drug Accutane, the weight loss drug Meridia, the anti-cholesterol drug Crestor, the pain reliever Bextra, and the asthma drug Serevent.

Vioxx's maker, Merck & Co. pulled the drug from the market on Sept. 30 after a study indicated the popular painkiller doubled the risk of heart attacks and stroke when taken for longer than 18 months.

Raymond V. Gilimartin, the company president, said in prepared testimony that Merck acted within four days of learning about the risk.

"Given the availability of alternative therapies and the questions raised by the data withdrawing Vioxx was consistent with an ethic that has driven Merck actions and decisions for more than 100 years," he said.

Gilimartin also said the company was surprised by the cardiovascular risk because it differed from past clinical trials. "My wife was a user of Vioxx until the day we withdrew it from the marketplace," he said.

The Food and Drug Administration has defended its actions regarding Vioxx. In a statement issued late Wednesday, the agency cited its "well-documented and long-standing commitment to openness and transparency in its review of marketed drugs."

"What's come to light about Vioxx since Sept. 30 makes people wonder if the FDA has lost its way when it comes to making sure that drugs are safe," said Senate Finance Committee Chairman Charles Grassley, R-Iowa, as the hearing opened.

Grassley suggested that an independent board of drug safety might be needed to ensure the safety of medications after they're approved for the market.

"Consumers should not have to second-guess the safety of what's in their medicine cabinet," he said.

Graham told the committee that research indicated that Vioxx caused up to 160,000 heart attacks and strokes.

"If we were talking about Florida or Pennsylvania, 1 percent of the entire state population would have been affected," he said. "I'm sorry to say Sen. Grassley, but 67 percent of the citizens of Des Moines would be affected and, what's worse—the entire population of every other city in the state of Iowa."

Graham said his research helped to coax the FDA to withdraw a number of drugs including Fen-phen, a weight loss drug, Lotronex, Baycol and Rezulin. "During my career I have recommended the market withdrawal of 12 drugs," he said. "Only two of these remain on the market today."

At the same time, though, he questioned the agency's commitment to removing unsafe drugs from the market, since it would call into question their earlier approval.

Sen. Jeff Bingman, D-New Mexico, said the problem was within the FDA's own culture.

"The culture within the FDA, being one where the pharmaceutical industry, which the FDA is supposed to regulate, is seen by the FDA as its client instead," he said.

He called on President Bush to appoint a new head for the agency. Lester Crawford has been acting commissioner of the agency.

Lester Crawford's statement, sent by e-mail to reporters about 16 hours before the Senate Finance Committee's scheduled hearing on Vioxx, said the FDA initiated and paid for reviews of Vioxx and antidepressants after those drugs had hit the market. "That is evidence the system is working," Crawford said.

"It's not working good for them to have a drug to be out on the market this long \* \* \* and never really announcing that it was causing strokes and heart attacks," John Byrd of Coats, N.C., told CBS Radio News Thursday morning. He's a 47-year-old who had a heart attack last spring and is now suing the maker of Vioxx.

Critics contend the agency ignored risks in both instances, then intimidated its own reviewers when they pointed to safety concerns.

In October, the FDA ordered that all antidepressants carry warnings that they "increase the risk of suicidal thinking and behavior" in children who take them. Vioxx's maker, Merck & Co. pulled the drug from the market on Sept. 30 after a study indicated the popular painkiller doubled the risk of heart attacks and stroke when taken for longer than 18 months.

"I've never had any knowledge that it could cause a heart attack or blood clots or stroke. That's where I find a little shadiness in this recall," said Byrd, a Goodyear employee, who added the Vioxx paperwork only warned that it could upset his stomach.

The FDA's statement disturbed lawyer Andy Birchfield, who is evaluating thousands of potential cases against Merck on behalf of injured patients.

"How can they see that type of problem and look back and say 'We did everything right?'" Birchfield said. "When they're not willing to recognize mistakes, we have no hope for them voluntarily taking measures to correct the situation."

Crawford's statement did not mention Graham by name, but suggested that the reviewer was a maverick who did not follow agency protocol.

Graham was lead author on a research project that studied the records of almost 1.4 million Kaiser Permanente patients, including 40,405 treated with Pfizer's Celebrex and 26,748 treated with Vioxx. The study found that high doses of Vioxx tripled risks of heart attacks and sudden cardiac death.

Vioxx was responsible for an additional 27,785 deaths from heart ailments from 1999 to 2003, Graham concluded.

He has told congressional investigators that, superiors pressured him to soften his conclusions.

Crawford said in his statement that the reviewer voluntarily chose to revise his conclusions, and he did so, in his own words, "without compromising my deeply held convictions."

**THE SPEAKER pro tempore.** Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER  
TIME

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

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

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION CONCERNS

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Congress Daily published by the National Journal, there was an article stating that some of the Nation's largest high-tech companies are pushing for a big increase in the H-1B visa program. This is the program that grants visas to so-called skilled foreigners such as computer specialists, engineers, and technical medical researchers. This program already allows 65,000 foreigners each year to come in and take some of the best jobs this country has to offer.

Now, these giant corporations are waging what Congress Daily described as an "intense lobbying" campaign to get 30,000 to 40,000 more of these foreign workers, and this goes on every year and has undoubtedly let in hundreds of thousands or even more over the last several years.

□ 2350

This, of course, is on top of the many millions of illegal aliens we already have here, probably at least double or triple the ten million illegals the government estimates are here based on what I have read and heard and seen.

I realize the H-1B program is a way to get here legally, and I do commend those involved for at least going through the proper legal channels. But over the last 16 years since I have been in Congress, I have had many parents and grandparents bring me their college graduate children or grandchildren who cannot find good jobs. And these are good-looking young people with very good grades.

All over this country there are many thousands of college graduates who cannot find good jobs so they work as waiters and waitresses and go to graduate school or more often law school. Sometimes people with masters degrees or even PhDs are having trouble finding good jobs. Our unemployment is low, but our underemployment is terrible. Yet we bring in many thousands more foreign workers each year while we continue to send huge numbers of good jobs to other countries with our astounding \$1 billion-a-minute trade deficit.

Many years ago I read that our government estimated that half the people of the world wanted to come here to live. Consistent with that I read in the last few months that half of the people

in the world have to get by on \$2 or less a day and do not have a second pair of shoes. We simply cannot take 3 billion more people in to this Nation, especially over a short period of time. Already our schools and hospitals are overrun with illegal immigrants in areas near our borders.

God has blessed every nation in this world with either natural beauty and natural resources and usually both that could make those countries rich if they had a free market, free enterprise system. However, all over this world people have fallen for the myth that government can solve all problems, and they have either voted in or had governments forced on them that were liberal, left-wing or socialist. And all over this world all big government has done is to ruin economies and wipe out the middle class.

Big government means a few elite rulers at the top, a huge underclass, usually near starvation, and almost no middle class. Today with many of our trade and immigration policies, our own big government is slowly wiping out our own middle class to try to benefit a small number of huge multi-national companies. The big giants are growing bigger in large part because of government favoritism, government contracts, tax breaks, free land. Big government, though, really only helps extremely big business and the bureaucrats who work for the government. Everyone else gets the crumbs or the shaft.

There really cannot be such a thing as big government conservatism. That is an oxymoron. Only in a very small government, truly free market system does the little man or a person without great capital have a real chance.

Big government liberalism, while always claiming to help the little guy, has actually been the best friend extremely big business has. And this proposed expansion of the H-1B program is just another example of this big government, big business duopoly that is in the long run bringing down American small business and our great middle class.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANKS of Arizona). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER  
TIME

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

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

There was no objection.

ARMS SALES TO PAKISTAN

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to express my deep concern about the proposed Pentagon arms sale to Pakistan.

Reports indicate that the Pentagon has proposed sales of the following weapons to Pakistan: eight P-3C Orion surveillance aircraft valued at up to \$970 million and 2,000 TOW-2A missiles and 14 TOW-2A Fly-to-Buy missiles valued at \$82 million. It is undoubted that Pakistan has been an ally in the war on terror; however, it is necessary to urge President Bush to block these proposed arms sales for several reasons.

A number of my colleagues and I were extremely disappointed to learn of the Major Non-NATO Alliance status that was bestowed upon Pakistan earlier this year because it allowed Pakistan to purchase military equipment that is not normally sanctioned to a country that is not under democratic rule. Pakistan unfortunately continues to remain under military rule and is not taking meaningful steps to return to a democracy; and therefore I support democracy sanctions that will prohibit military assistance to Pakistan entirely. Moreover, I feel that it is unprecedented for the Pentagon to be engaging in weapon sales with Pakistan due to its political instability.

Mr. Speaker, the Bush administration's policies with respect to military assistance and now military sales to Pakistan are contributing to increased security concerns throughout South Asia and particularly to India. Although Pakistan has been an ally in the global war on terror, Pakistan has not taken steps to end terrorism in its own backyard, and foreign military assistance to Pakistan has oftentimes been used against India.

I sent a letter today, Mr. Speaker, to President Bush urging him to reexamine the interests and priorities of the United States and to take a strong position against selling arms to Pakistan both now and in the future. The Pentagon is still in the proposed phase of selling these weapons to Pakistan. I urge my colleagues to block this inappropriate and unnecessary arms sales to Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, the Bush administration and this Congress should be promoting peace in South Asia, not a war between Pakistan and India.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. WELLER (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of his wedding.

## 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. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. DELAURO, 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. 1284. An act to amend the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to increase the Federal share of the costs of the San Gabriel Basin demonstration project.

H.R. 4794. An act to amend the Tijuana River Valley Estuary and Beach Sewage Cleanup Act of 2000 to extend the authorization of appropriations, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5245. An act to extend the liability indemnification regime for the commercial space transportation industry.

H.R. 5213. An act to expand research information regarding multidisciplinary research projects and epidemiological studies.

H.R. 5163. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide the Department of Transportation with a more focused research organization with an emphasis on innovative technology, and for other purposes.

## SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 434. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange all or part of certain parcels of National Forest System land in the State of Idaho and use the proceeds derived from the sale or exchange for National Forest System purposes.

S. 1446. An act to implement the recommendations of the Garrison Unit Joint Tribal Advisory Committee by providing authorization for the construction of a rural health care facility on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, North Dakota.

S. 1241. An act to establish the Kate Mullany National Historic Site in the State of New York, and for other purposes.

S. 1727. An act to authorize additional appropriations for the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act of 1978.

S. 2042. An act for the relief of Rocco A. Trescota of Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

S. 2214. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3150 Great Northern Avenue in Missoula, Montana, as the "Mike Mansfield Post Office".

S. 2302. An act to improve access to physicians in medically underserved areas.

S. 2484. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to simplify and improve pay provisions for physicians and dentists and to authorize alternate work schedules and executive pay for nurses, and for other purposes.

S. 2640. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1050 North Hills Boulevard in Reno, Nevada, as the "Guardians of Freedom Memorial Post Office Building" and to authorize the installation of a plaque at such site, and for other purposes.

S. 2693. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1475 Western Avenue, Suite 45, Albany, New York, as the "Lieutenant John F. Finn Post Office."

S. 2965. An act to amend the Livestock Mandatory Price Reporting Act of 1999 to modify the termination date for mandatory price reporting.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 19, 2004, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

10904. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Glyphosate; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2004-0323; FRL-7683-9] received November 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10905. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Mepanipyrim; Pesticide Tolerances [OPP-2004-0299; FRL-7681-8] received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10906. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Cyprodinil; Pesticide Tolerances [OPP-2004-0327; FRL-7682-1] received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10907. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Edward Soriano, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

10908. A letter from the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower and Personnel), Department of Defense, transmitting notification of a decision to implement performance by the Most Efficient Organization (MEO) for the Physical Distribution in Bremerton, WA (initiative number NC20000784); to the Committee on Armed Services.

10909. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the amount of purchases from foreign entities for Fiscal Year 2003, pursuant to Public Law 107-248, section 8033(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

10910. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Lo-

gistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Strategic Plan for Corrosion Prevention and Mitigation, pursuant to Public Law 107-314, section 1067; to the Committee on Armed Services.

10911. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's quarterly report as of September 30, 2004, entitled, "Acceptance of contributions for defense programs, projects and activities; Defense Cooperation Account," pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2608; to the Committee on Armed Services.

10912. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule—Reinvention of the Sections 514, 515, 516, and 521 Multi-Family Housing Programs (RIN: 0575-AC13) received November 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

10913. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the annual report of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity for Fiscal Year 2004, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1145(e); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

10914. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on the Community Services Block Grant Discretionary Activities: Community Economic Development Program (CEDP) Projects Funded During Fiscal Year 2000; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

10915. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a preliminary report on the Department's Alternative Fuel Vehicle (AFV) program for FY 2004, pursuant to Public Law 105-388 42 U.S.C. 13211-13219; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10916. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District [CA 309-0468a; FRL-7834-3] received November 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10917. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Interim Final Determination to Stay Sanctions, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District [CA 309-0468c; FRL-7834-5] received November 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10918. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Corrections to the California State Implementation Plan [CA120-REC; FRL-7837-9] received November 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10919. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Plan Revisions; Indiana [R05-OAR-2004-IN-0002; FRL-7826-8] received October 28, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10920. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Memorandum of Agreement between Texas Council on Environmental Quality and the North Central Texas Council of Governments Providing Emissions Offsets to Dallas Fort Worth International Airport [R06-OAR-2004-TX-

0002; FRL-7830-8] received October 28, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10921. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State Of Missouri; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes, Iron County; Arcadia and Liberty Townships [R07-OAR-2004-MO-003; FRL-7831-1] received October 28, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10922. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Idaho; Correcting Amendments [ID-02-003; FRL-7825-3] received October 28, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10923. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [CA 307-0464a; FRL-7818-6] received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10924. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Bay Area Air Quality Management District [CA284-0462; FRL-7811-2] received October 21, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10925. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Environmental Performance Track Program; Corrections [OA-2004-0004; FRL-7830-1] (RIN: 2090-AA13) received October 21, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10926. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plan Revision for North Dakota; Revisions to the Air Pollution Control Rules; Delegation of Authority for New Source Performance Standards [ND-0001-0011; FRL-7823-2] received October 21, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10927. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Determination of Attainment and Redesignation of the City of Weirton PM10 Nonattainment Area to Attainment and Approval of the Maintenance Plan [R03-AOR-2004-WV-0001; FRL-7821-4] received October 21, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10928. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> RACT Determinations for National Fuel Gas Supply Corporation [PA208-4231; FRL-7822-5] received October 21, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10929. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland;

Redesignation of Kent and Queen Anne's Counties Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment and Approval of the Area's Maintenance Plan [MD160-3113; FRL-7821-1] received October 21, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10930. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Control of VOC Emissions from Yeast Manufacturing [MD170-3113a; FRL-7819-7] received October 21, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10931. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes, Steamboat Springs [CO-001-0077a; FRL-7815-5] received October 21, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

10932. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Pakistan for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 05-05), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

10933. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to the United Arab Emirates for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 05-09), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

10934. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Pakistan for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 05-06), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

10935. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Pakistan for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 05-07), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

10936. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 13-04 informing of an intent to sign a Memorandum of Understanding Concerning Land Battlespace Systems with the United Kingdom, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

10937. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 14-04 informing of an intent to sign a Memorandum of Understanding Concerning Defense Space Cooperation with Turkey, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

10938. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad with Poland (Transmittal No. DDTC 082-04), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

10939. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the annual report of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States therein during the calendar year 2003, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 287b; to the Committee on International Relations.

10940. 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.

10941. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergency Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Syria that was declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004; to the Committee on International Relations.

10942. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979; to the Committee on International Relations.

10943. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Registration Fee Change (RIN: 1400-AB97) received November 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

10944. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the six-month period ending September 30, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

10945. A letter from the Chairman, Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting in accordance with the requirements of the Accountability of Tax Dollars Act of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-289), the Board's FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10946. A letter from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10947. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, and the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum 04-07, the Department's report on competitive sourcing efforts for FY 2003; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10948. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting an inventory of functions performed by the Department that are not inherently governmental after the inventory has been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10949. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2004; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10950. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's FY 2004 Report on Performance and Accountability; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10951. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10952. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Secretary's Management Report on Management Decisions and Final Action on Office of Inspector General Audit Recommendations for the period ending March 31, 2004, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10953. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10954. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's Fiscal Year 2004 Performance and Accountability Report required under the Accountability for Tax Dollars Act of 2002; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10955. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting pursuant to the "Accountability of Tax Dollars Act of 2002" and related guidance from the Office of Management and Budget, the Endowment's Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2004; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10956. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting the Endowment's inventory of activities as required by OMB Circular A-76 and the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10957. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report, prepared in accordance with the Reports Consolidation Act of 2000 and the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10958. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report entitled "Statistical Programs of the United States Government: Fiscal Year 2005," pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3504(e)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform.

10959. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the Board's Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2004, including the Office of Inspector General's Auditor's Report, Report on Internal Control, and Report on Compliance with Laws and Regulations; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10960. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's Fiscal Year 2004 Performance and Accountability Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

10961. A letter from the Director, Trade and Development Agency, transmitting the Agency's annual financial audit for FY 2004, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2421(e)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform.

10962. A letter from the Executive Director, United States Access Board, transmitting the Board's consolidated report for the Inspector General Act and the Federal Financial Manager's Integrity Act, pursuant to (102 Stat. 2525); to the Committee on Government Reform.

10963. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the study, findings, and report for the Squirrel River in

Alaska, consistent with section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Public Law 90-542, as amended; (H. Doc. No. 108-235); to the Committee on Resources and ordered to be printed.

10964. A letter from the Federal Registrar Liaison Officer, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Coal Production Fees (RIN: 1029-AC46) received October 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10965. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 031126297-3297-01; I.D. 100704A] received October 20, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10966. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 031125292-4061-02; I.D. 092404A] received October 12, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10967. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Amendment 16-3; Corrections [Docket No. 040618188-4265-02; I.D. 061404A] (RIN: 0648-AS26) received October 12, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10968. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Closure [Docket No. 001005281-0369-02; I.D. 101804C] received November 1, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10969. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 031126297-3297-01; I.D. 100604A] received October 20, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10970. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Oregon Sport Fisheries [Docket No. 040209049-4117-02; I.D. 091404G] received October 12, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10971. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fishery; Suspension of Minimum Surfclam Size for 2005 [Docket No. 031015257-3308-02; I.D. 092804B] received October 12, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10972. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, Na-

tional Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 031124287-4060-02; I.D. 101504B] received October 28, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10973. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; "Other Species" in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 031124287-4060-02; I.D. 10504A] received October 28, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10974. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Framework Adjustment 5 [Docket No. 040804226-4278-02; I.D. 071904C] (RIN: 0648-AR50) received November 5, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10975. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Closure of the Recreational Red Snapper Component [I.D. 101904A] received November 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10976. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications [Docket No. 040706201-4279-02; I.D. 060204F] (RIN: 0648-AR97) received November 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10977. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Revisions to the Annual Harvest Specifications Process for the Groundfish Fisheries of the Gulf of Alaska and the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 040713206-4292-02; I.D. 070704F] (RIN: 0648-AR77) received November 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10978. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Inseason Adjustment of the Quater III Fishery of Loligo Squid [Docket No. 031104274-4011-02; I.D. 071604E] received November 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10979. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Tilefish Fishery; Quota Harvested for Part-time Category [Docket No. 040122024-4105-02; I.D. 092104C] received November 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10980. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeastern (NE) Multispecies Fishery; Closure of the Eastern U.S./Canada Area and Prohibition of Harvesting, Processing, or Landing of Yellowtail Flounder from the U.S./Canada Management Area [Docket No. 040112010-414-02; I.D. 093004C] received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10981. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish Fisheries by Vessels Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 031125292-4061-02; I.D. 093004D] received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10982. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 031125292-4061-02; I.D. 093004E] received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10983. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Western Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 031124287-4060-02; I.D. 093004F] received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10984. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 031125292-4061-02; I.D. 100504B] received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10985. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish; Annual Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No. 031216314-3314-01; I.D. 092904C] received October 20, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10986. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the thirty-sixth in a series of reports on refugee resettlement in the United States covering the period October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2002, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1523(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10987. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Documentation of Non-immigrants Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended—Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS)—received November 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10988. A letter from the Chair of the Committee on the Budget and Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmit-

ting a letter asking that the judiciary be specifically exempted from any across-the-board reductions that may be considered during the FY 2005 Appropriations Process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10989. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Hoffman Propeller GmbH & Co KG Models HO-V343 and HO-V343K Propellers [Docket No. FAA-2004-18958; Directorate Identifier 2004-NE-32-AD; Amendment 39-13778; AD 2004-18-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10990. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-350-AD; Amendment 39-13777; AD 2004-17-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10991. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-14, DC-9-15, and DC-9-15F Airplanes; and Model DC-9-20, DC-9-30, DC-9-40, and DC-9-50 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-345-AD; Amendment 39-13789; AD 2004-18-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10992. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airport Noise Compatibility Planning [Docket No. FAA-2004-19158; Amendment 150-14] (RIN: 2120-A137) received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10993. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Picture Identification Requirements [Docket No. FAA-2002-11666; Amendment No. 61-107] (RIN: 2120-AH76) received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10994. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Flight Limitation in the Proximity of Space Flight Operations [Docket No. FAA-2004-19246; Amendment Nos. 91-284] (RIN: 2120-AI40) received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10995. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Prohibition Against Certain Flights Between the United States and Libya [Docket No. FAA-2004-19316; Special Aviation Regulation (SFAR) No. 65-1] (RIN: 2120-AI46) received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10996. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Civil Penalty Assessment Procedures [Docket No. 27854; Amendment No. 13-32] (RIN: 2120-AE84) received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10997. A letter from the Senior Attorney, RSPA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hazardous Materials Regulations; Compatibility with the Regulations of the International Atomic Energy Agency; Correction; Final Rule [Docket No. RSPA-99-6283 (HM-230)]

(RIN: 2137-AD40) received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10998. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-102, -103, -106, -201, -202, -301, -311, and -315 Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-338-AD; Amendment 39-13788; AD 2004-18-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10999. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-311 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2004-18563; Directorate Identifier 2002-NM-98-AD; Amendment 39-13783; AD 2004-18-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11000. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Report to Congress—Part 135 Air Taxi Operators Study," as required by the Aviation Investment and Reform Act of the 21st Century under Section 735; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11001. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-10-10F, MD-10-30F, MD-11, MD-11F, and 717-200 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2004-19017; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-144-AD; Amendment 39-13782; AD 2004-18-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11002. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Water Quality Standards for Coastal and Great Lakes Recreation Waters [OW-2004-0010; FRL-7837-5] (RIN: 2040-AE63) received November 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

11003. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an Agreement between the United States of America and Japan on Social Security, with a principal agreement and an administrative arrangement, both signed at Washington on February 19, 2004, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1); (H. Doc. No. 108-234); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

11004. A letter from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the intent to initiate negotiations for a free trade agreement between the United States and the United Arab Emirates, pursuant to Section 2104(a)(1) of the Trade Act of 2002; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

11005. A letter from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the intent to initiate negotiations for a free trade agreement between the United States and the Sultanate of Oman, pursuant to Section 2104(a)(1) of the Trade Act of 2002; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

11006. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army and Secretary of Agriculture, Departments of the Army and Agriculture, transmitting notice of intention of the Departments of the Army and Agriculture to interchange jurisdiction of Army and National Forest lands at the Joint Readiness Training Center (JRTC) and Fort Polk, Louisiana and the Kisatchie National Forest,

Louisiana, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 505a (70 Stat. 656); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Agriculture.

11007. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report to Congress on Standards for Supervision of Physical Therapist Assistants (PTAs) and the Implications of Eliminating the "Personal" PTA Supervision Requirements on the Financial Caps for Medicare Therapy Services, requested by Congress in Appendix F, Section 421 of Pub. L. 106-554; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

11008. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting three documents in response to requests for reports to Congress on outpatient therapy services mandated or modified in Section 4541(d)(2) of Pub. L. 105-22, Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (BBA), Sections 221(c) and (d) of Pub. L. 106-113, Balanced Budget Refinement Act of 1999 (BBRA), Section 421(b) of Pub. L. 105-551, Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Benefits Improvement and Protection Act (BIPA) of 2000, and Section 624(b) of Pub. L. 108-173, Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (MMA); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

11009. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting a determination that there exists an emergency need for an outlet for Devils Lake, North Dakota, as defined by Section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, Pub. L. 93-288; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Appropriations.

#### 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. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4634. A bill to extend the terrorism insurance program of the Department of the Treasury; with an amendment (Rept. 108-780). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State on the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 858. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1350) to reauthorize the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and for other purposes (Rept. 108-781). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 859. Resolution providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 108-782). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 860. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 108-783). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. MYRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 861. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 108-784). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. GORDON):

H.R. 5382. A bill to promote the development of the emerging commercial human space flight industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 5383. A bill to clarify that certain coal industry health benefits may not be modified or terminated; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BELL, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BOYD, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. FORD, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GORDON, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HALL, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. REYES, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H.R. 5384. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the allowance of the deduction of State and local general sales taxes in lieu of State and local income taxes permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOEHLERT:

H.R. 5385. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Centennial Challenge Prize Program at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 5386. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to reform Federal Prison Industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 5387. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to provide remedial actions and other assistance to affected residents near the Wauconda Sand and Gravel Superfund Site; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. EHLERS:

H.R. 5388. A bill to establish an interagency aerospace revitalization task force to develop a national strategy for aerospace workforce cultivation, training, and recruitment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 5389. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish requirements for the operation of high occupancy vehicle facilities on highways; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 5390. A bill to amend title 3, United States Code, to revise the procedures for Presidential succession in the case of the death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify of the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 5391. A bill to reduce sexual assault and domestic violence involving members of the Armed Forces and their family members

and partners through enhanced programs of prevention and deterrence, enhanced programs of victims services, and strengthened provisions for prosecution of assailants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Veterans' Affairs, 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. STUPAK:

H.R. 5392. A bill to authorize the use of a covered grant to provide a reasonable stipend to paid-on-call or volunteer first responders for travel to or participation in training to prevent, prepare for, respond to, or mitigate terrorist attacks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, 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 Ms. LOFGREN:

H.J. Res. 112. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the Electoral College and to provide for the direct election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.J. Res. 113. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the process by which the House of Representatives chooses the President of the United States in the event no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SHERWOOD, and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H. Con. Res. 522. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Department of Defense should continue to exercise its statutory authority to support the activities of the Boy Scouts of America, in particular the periodic national and world Boy Scout Jamborees; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H. Con. Res. 523. Concurrent resolution strongly denouncing the danger of international terrorism inspired by an apostate vision of Islam, one of the historic religions of the world; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H. Res. 862. A resolution urging the European Council to continue to maintain its embargo on the sales of arms to the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on International Relations.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

459. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 279 memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the Specialty Crop Competitiveness Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

460. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 107 memorializing the Congress of the United States to consign the public policy of the Legislature of Puerto Rico in facing and attending to the urgent need to review the political relations between Puerto Rico and the United States through a Constitutional Convention on Status elected by the people in the exercise of the natural rights to self-determination and sovereignty, and to initiate its organizational process; to the Committee on Resources.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 962: Ms. PELOSI.  
 H.R. 1205: Mr. JEFFERSON.  
 H.R. 1306: Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 1316: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. DICKS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.  
 H.R. 1431: Mr. NADLER.  
 H.R. 1563: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. INSLER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.  
 H.R. 1684: Mr. WATT and Ms. WATERS.  
 H.R. 1783: Mr. BURNS.  
 H.R. 2237: Mr. SWEENEY.  
 H.R. 2379: Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.  
 H.R. 2414: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 2509: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 2560: Mr. BOUCHER.  
 H.R. 2705: Mr. FARR.  
 H.R. 2735: Mr. GIBBONS.  
 H.R. 2823: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. CLAY.  
 H.R. 2824: Mr. MARSHALL.  
 H.R. 3388: Mr. ENGLISH.  
 H.R. 3476: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.  
 H.R. 3484: Mr. NADLER.  
 H.R. 3602: Mr. HONDA.  
 H.R. 3634: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.  
 H.R. 3859: Mr. CLYBURN and Mr. EVANS.  
 H.R. 3880: Mr. WEINER.  
 H.R. 4002: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.  
 H.R. 4116: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H.R. 4343: Mr. FLAKE.  
 H.R. 4391: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
 H.R. 4491: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. SANDERS.  
 H.R. 4732: Ms. GRANGER.  
 H.R. 4888: Mrs. DAVIS of California.  
 H.R. 4900: Mr. SAXTON.  
 H.R. 4940: Mr. GERLACH.  
 H.R. 4957: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.  
 H.R. 5063: Mr. PAYNE.  
 H.R. 5206: Mr. MEEK of Florida.  
 H.R. 5236: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
 H.R. 5244: Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. WAXMAN.  
 H.R. 5252: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ALLEN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
 H.R. 5261: Mr. KIND.  
 H.R. 5292: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. SABO.  
 H.R. 5335: Mr. STARK and Mr. MENENDEZ.  
 H.R. 5274: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. WATSON, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.  
 H. Con. Res. 521: Mr. HERGER.  
 H. Res. 853: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

120. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Legislature of Orange County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 245 of 2004 petitioning the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Federal Aviation Administration, and the New York State Office of Homeland Security to investigate and address safety issues at the Indian Point Power Plant; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

121. Also, a petition of the Association of Pacific Island Legislatures, relative to APIL Resolution No. 23-GA-18, CD1, supporting the cause of securing just compensation for victims of radiation exposure as a consequence of activities related to the U.S. Government's nuclear tests in Micronesia; to the Committee on International Relations.

122. Also, a petition of the Association of Pacific Island Legislatures, relative to APIL Resolution No. 23-GA-09, supporting the Government and the people of the Republic of Kiribati for their efforts to address war reparations; to the Committee on International Relations.

123. Also, a petition of the Enough is Enough Campaign, Chicago, IL, relative to a petition for investigation, indictment, and prosecution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

124. Also, a petition of Mr. James N. Thivierge, a Citizen of Amesbury, MA, relative to a petition to amend the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.