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 $8 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 slowdown 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 Treasury 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 straightforward 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. Bipartisanship 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 at 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 spendthrift 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 ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
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
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
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Case
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
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
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
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
Hoeffel
Houghton
John
Kleczka
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.