

□ 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 the core of 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	Herseth
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
Akin	Burr
Alexander	Burton (IN)
Bachus	Buyer
Baker	Calvert
Ballenger	Camp
Barrett (SC)	Cantor
Bartlett (MD)	Capito
Barton (TX)	Carter
Bass	Castle
Beauprez	Chabot
Biggert	Chocola
Bilirakis	Coble
Bishop (UT)	Cole
Blackburn	Collins
Blunt	Cox
Boehlert	Crane
Boehner	Crenshaw
Bonilla	Cubin
Bonner	Culberson
Bono	Cunningham
Boozman	Davis, Jo Ann
Bradley (NH)	Davis, Tom
Brady (TX)	Deal (GA)
Brown (SC)	DeLay
Brown-Waite,	DeMint
Ginny	Diaz-Balart, L.
Burgess	Diaz-Balart, M.

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)	Tancred
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)
Gallely	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)	Velazquez
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	Klecza	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