

say they are refusing Medicare patients because they are not being paid enough. Out of that \$300 billion, we are going to pay for drug benefits, and we are going to pay for provider reimbursement. We are going to give more money to doctors and hospitals.

If we use the Congressional Budget Office figures, we have only \$124 billion. So the reason the other side uses the OMB figures is because it is \$350 billion. Which number would Members take? Of course the other side would take the \$350 billion.

If we look at this chart, we can see if we pay back the providers what we said we are going to give them, it costs \$174 billion out of that \$350 billion. If we are using the \$124 billion, we cannot even cover the providers. The doctors alone cost \$128 billion. So there is not enough money under this one to provide even for the doctors.

Now, let us say we take the \$350 billion and we say we are going to do only the doctors, so we are going to do \$128 billion. That gives us what, 225, 222. Now, is that enough for a drug benefit? Remember, I said it was \$400 billion to do a decent benefit? That is a benefit where seniors pay 50 percent and the government pays 50 percent. Do Members think that is an adequate benefit?

There are 9 million widows in this country who live on Social Security. They make less than \$10,000 a year off Social Security. They are supposed to come up with half the drug benefits. If they just have a few things, that is fine. But where are they going to get \$1,000 or \$2,000 to pay while the government pays the other \$2,000?

This simply is an inadequate benefit that they are talking about. Yet the other side tells the people, the President said in the campaign, we will have a prescription drug benefit. The President stood in this well twice and said we are going to have a prescription drug benefit. But there is no money. It is a shell game. They are hiding it and confusing people with statements, but the figures do not lie. Vote "no" on this thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PENCE) assumed the chair.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2356. An act to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2003

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS).

(Mr. WATKINS of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATKINS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the work that the gentleman from Iowa has done as our chairman on the Committee on the Budget. I left Congress in 1990, and one of the things that always bothered me was the fact that it seemed like when I sat on the other side, we could never come close to balancing the budget. I would like to say that it is great that we have not only balanced the budget since I have returned, but with the economy growing, we have reduced over \$450 billion in debt that was on the backs of our children. I would like to think that has done a great deal to help us in the future.

Yesterday Chairman Alan Greenspan and the Feds decided not to increase interest rates. They realized that there is still some softness out in the economy. I am thankful that we passed the tax relief package nearly a year ago, and also just last week, the job creation and work protection bill in a bipartisan vote. That vote was 417-3. Yes, even with the economic indicators that were soft and started downward in September, the last quarter of 2000 before the Bush administration took office, but really took a downward spiral after September 11, creating a loss of about a million jobs. Let me say, with this job creation work protection bill, not only are we allowing the uninsured to have 13 extra weeks of unemployment insurance, we want to make sure that those who are unemployed have a check and are meeting their obligations.

Also we have done some things with 30 percent expensing which is accelerating activity. Tractor implement dealers in my area, they are out buying. Farmers and ranchers are buying equipment. That is going to help us a great deal more, not only in just the facts, but in the spirit of things in moving this economy forward.

This budget is a compassionate budget because in it we have dealt with unemployment insurance. Yes, we have helped business, and we have helped a lot of individuals. There are work tax credits for welfare to work. It also deals with Native Americans, trying to work with them with accelerated depreciation, and letting them have jobs instead of relying on just gaming and some of the other interests. Native Americans have the worst economic conditions of any group in the United States.

We have a budget here that gives us an opportunity to move this country forward. I encourage a bipartisan vote on it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 9 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) for purposes of control.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, we will not find a Member on this side of the aisle who is not 100 percent supportive of winning this war against terrorism and bolstering our homeland security. However, we cannot forget our domestic priorities. Over the next 5 years, we will cut over \$96 billion below what it costs to maintain these programs at their current level.

For the next few minutes what I would like to do is put a human face on some of these funding cuts, and maybe people watching this debate back home will have a better understanding of what this budget does. For example, everybody knows that health care costs are skyrocketing on an annual basis. As a result, 40 million Americans cannot afford health insurance. That includes 9 million children. This budget pretends that these people do not exist.

Compounding that situation is the fact that there are some programs that provide some minimal health care. For example, the rural health care program, it is cut by 41 percent. Telehealth programs are cut by 84 percent. Another problem is the freezing of funding for the Healthy Start program. It is for expectant mothers for prenatal care. I cannot think of any Member here who thinks that depriving mothers of prenatal care is something that we should be doing.

Then there is the matter of our homeland security. The people on the front line are police officers. Yet this budget completely eliminates, not cuts, eliminates the Department of Justice local law enforcement block grant, which is designed to put more cops on our streets. As a result, hundreds of communities across the United States, large and small, will see less cops on the street, meaning we can expect an increase in crime because this budget, as I just stated, eliminates this program.

□ 1730

Then there are our public schools. Every State is having problems with revenues and high enrollments. Just a little over 2 months ago, we had the No Child Left Behind Act signed into law. Most people voted for it. If Members will recall, President Bush made this a pillar of his State of the Union address and rightly so, ensuring that every child has a right to a first-rate education. So what happened to this program? You can see that is what is authorized, that is what we enacted last year, and this is what we are proposing, a \$100 million cut just from last year.

As a former teacher, I have also talked to educators in Oregon. One of the things they begged me not to do was pass another Federal program and another Federal mandate without the funds. We are not giving them the funds. Then there is special education.

We are funding that at 18 percent. What did the Federal Government promise to do? Twenty-seven years ago we said we would fund it at 40 percent. Are we doing that? No.

We are now starting down the same path with the No Child Left Behind Act. Again we make a promise we are not going to keep.

Mr. Chairman, to talk further about education, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA), a former teacher and principal.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, as a former teacher and principal, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget, a budget that claims to leave no child behind, but in reality leaves many children behind.

Just a few months ago, the President and the Congress heralded the enactment of H.R. 1, the Leave No Child Behind Act. Yet as we all know, a bill is meaningless without the necessary funding and many of us wondered if the White House and the House Republicans would put our Nation's money where their mouths were for H.R. 1 when it came time to pass the budget. After looking at the House Republican budget offered today, it has become clear to me that the Republicans have no intention of making good on their promise to improve educational opportunities for our Nation's young people.

The Republican budget cuts funding for H.R. 1 by \$90 million. It cuts education programs by \$1.8 billion, including programs for teacher quality and after-school centers. The Republican budget also eliminates 28 education programs, including dropout prevention and technology training.

The Republicans say we on the other side of the aisle have no right to voice our beliefs on their plan because we have none to offer. Let me remind my colleagues that last week I offered an amendment in the Budget Committee that would have increased funding for professional development and teacher quality by \$325 million, title I funding for disadvantaged students by \$2.15 billion, and after-school programs by \$250 million from levels proposed in today's Republican budget. Every Republican on the committee voted it down.

Mr. Chairman, I support the President when it comes to the war. I, like all of us in this body, am confident that we will win the global war against terrorism. But I fear this budget may cause us to lose the battle at home to protect and educate future generations of Americans. As a former educator, I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution that leaves so many of our children behind.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely concerned whether this education budget is adequate. It is true that there are some program increases; but at a time of increased need and urgency, this increase is the smallest in a decade.

In the end, this education budget leaves me wondering whether we are truly keeping our commitment to our children and our teachers. I know my spirits were up when just 2 months ago the President signed into law the new education bill promising to leave no child behind. I am afraid to say that we are leaving more than a few children behind.

The budget we are debating today actually cuts funding for these programs by \$90 million. In fact, this budget funds the No Child Left Behind Act at \$4.2 billion below the authorized level. One cannot help but ask if we are keeping our promise. In fact, I fear this budget falls far short of that promise.

Looking at the details, this plan cuts or freezes many elementary and secondary education programs. It cuts programs to improve teacher quality at a time when we need them the most, down by \$105 million. It cuts the safe and drug-free schools program, down \$102 million. By the way, these programs are working in our communities. And it freezes funding for after-school programs when we need after-school programs more than ever.

However, the truth is that it did not have to be this way. During the Budget Committee markup, we offered amendments to strengthen education, to stand with the President on what he wanted in his education bill. But amendment after amendment to keep the President's promise to leave no child behind were rejected. Republicans rejected an amendment to provide \$3 billion more for elementary ed programs. They rejected raising the maximum Pell Grant award for our college students. They rejected an amendment to allow Head Start to serve 1 million more children.

While I could argue that education should always be a top priority, properly investing in education is more critical than ever. A strong commitment to education is good for the economy, and it is good for national security. We support the President on the war and homeland defense. We should be doing more for our children in education.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, there is much in this budget that is not as it appears. We have just now heard the fact that this actually cuts \$90 million from the President's much touted Leave No Child Behind Act. It cuts back on educational funding. In the area of the environment, the authors of the budget claim to fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund; but in fact if you remove from this the account that funds open space and parkland and preserving critical natural resources, if you remove the items that do not belong in there, that are added,

that are not really new spending, budget accounting gimmicks, it actually is a reduction. It does not fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

With regard to research and development in science, the authors here have claimed that there is an 11 percent increase. Actually if you do their math correctly, it is really closer to 8 percent. But then if you remove the accounting gimmicks, the things that have been added in there that are not new spending in the National Science Foundation, for example, the sea grant program and EPA education programs, you find out that there is really a growth of perhaps 1 percent. This is not enough.

If we shortchange research and development in the United States, we cannot hope to have the kind of economic growth that the authors of this budget resolution are counting on in some magic wand way to get us out of deficit spending. As a Nation we underinvest in research and development. This budget resolution not only fails to balance, it fails to fund our Nation's critical needs.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I urge my colleagues to vote against this budget so we can go back to work and put together a genuine bipartisan plan that truly addresses the ever-growing needs of our country.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), a very distinguished gentleman, who has some concerns with our budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is the toughest vote that I have made in my 16 years in Congress, because I campaigned for this President and made 200 speeches on his behalf in 25 States and raised a significant amount of money. I do not like to stand up here and announce that I am going to vote against the budget resolution. I have the highest respect for the budget chairman. But, Mr. Chairman, my job in this Congress has been to work on defense issues for our country. I take it seriously like all of my colleagues do.

I took the President at his word when he announced in his State of the Union that he would increase defense spending by \$48 billion to make up for the shortfalls of the past decade. But when you analyze that \$48 billion, you end up with a potential increase of \$38 billion because \$10 billion is being set aside for some future uncertain time and need. Of that \$38 billion, you end up with about \$10 billion to be used for the shortfalls that we have. The other money is going for health care costs; it

is going to make up for the unfair budgeting or the unfair accounting process that was used during the Clinton administration where they did not properly account for the cost of the ships and the airplanes that we ordered but did not pay for. The Rumsfeld leadership is trying to correct that and make it right, but the bottom line is \$10 billion does not come anywhere near the \$25.4 billion shortfall that the service chiefs have testified this year they need beyond the President's budget request. My colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services know that.

Mr. Chairman, the shipbuilding accounts, which I heavily criticized the Clinton administration for over the past 6 years, decrease under this budget by \$1.3 billion. We built 19 ships a year under Ronald Reagan. We go down to five ships next year. We just heard in a hearing I chaired, 15,000 more shipbuilders and workers are being laid off. Tactical aviation, our aircraft, the need is 180 aircraft a year. We bought 90 last year. This budget has us buying 87 aircraft.

I realize there are other pressures. I realize you have to fund all the priorities. I am an educator. I want to fund education. I want to fund the environment and other issues. But we have \$10 billion that the President said was for defense in that \$48 billion that all Americans agree should be spent on the military, and you know as well as I do we will give the President whatever amount of money he needs for a supplemental to pay for the war. This Congress voted 420 to one. The Senate voted 99 to zero. We are not going to deny him whatever he needs to pay for the war. But this \$10 billion needs to go for the shortfall we have.

I cannot intellectually and honestly stand up here in spite of the aggressive and successful effort of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and my colleagues who fought this good fight and did get some movement. The President has now said he will come to us and that \$10 billion may have a partial request for modernization. We do not know how much, and we do not know when.

Mr. Chairman, because of these reasons, I cannot in good conscience vote for this budget. President Bush is my President. I support him. It pains me unbelievably to stand up here and have to say what I am saying. But my job and the job that you have given me as my colleagues is to tell you honestly what we need to provide for our military and this year more than any other our military is being tested. Our soldiers, sailors and Marines are flying aircraft and working on ships that we are not properly replacing.

Unfortunately, I tell my colleagues, and I have not lobbied anyone on my position, that I just cannot in good conscience vote for this bill and I will vote "no" on the budget resolution. I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South

Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding time to me.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the budget resolution. I wish to commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the House Committee on the Budget. Just think of it: as a conservative, I believe we must keep careful watch of the public resources that we are given. Balancing the Federal budget must be a priority. Because of the work of the House Committee on the Budget and Chairman NUSSLE, but for our recent effort to help hurting families with an unemployment benefits package, this is a balanced budget. During war and recession, that is an astonishing accomplishment. We do fund our national defense and our homeland security as America's priorities.

And this budget demonstrates fiscal discipline. We just heard from the gentlewoman from Oregon some of what our friends on the other side of the aisle would like us to be spending more in this budget. The truth is, of the 17 amendments that the Democrats offered, it totaled \$205 billion in new spending and \$175 billion in tax increases to pay for it. Funding national defense, helping hurting families, cutting spending rather than raising taxes, are all good reasons to support this budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve the balance of the majority's time. We would be prepared then to move to the Joint Economic Committee's time under the rule.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

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

□ 1745

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, as a Member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I have a special appreciation for the work our military does in defending our great country. There should be no doubt, absolutely none, that my colleagues and I stand behind the President as he prosecutes the war on terrorism.

However, in a genuine attempt to work with both parties and the President, I join the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHE-SON) in offering a budget substitute that was denied fair consideration by the Committee on Rules, even though it included the President's own prior-

ities and spending levels and simply adjusted them to reflect the CBO's nonpartisan numbers; fully funded the war on terrorism and homeland security initiatives; held the line on spending; provided for a clean debt limit increase; and required the administration to provide a plan to get our budget back into balance and put Social Security surpluses off limits.

It is mind-boggling to think that the House leadership could have opposed these aims. But they did. I am disappointed that our good faith attempt at cooperation was dismissed, and I urge my colleagues to vote no on the budget resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me first begin by commending the members of the Committee on the Budget for the very commendable job they did in bringing forward this budget proposal, and particularly the hard work of the chairman, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), who has worked untiringly throughout the last 6 months, under difficult circumstances, I might add, and often without thanks, for bringing this budget proposal to us. It has been a great job, and I am pleased to stand here and say that I fully support the bill.

Let me also say that, aside from being the chairman of the Committee on Joint Economics, I am also one of the senior members of the Committee on Armed Services, and it is true that the members of the Committee on Armed Services had some reservations about the budget because of the way certain monies were being set aside.

I must say that I have a different read of the current situation than the gentleman who just spoke, however. Throughout the last 48 hours or so, the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman STUMP) has led us in the direction of defining what will ultimately happen with that seemingly elusive \$10 billion, and I am perfectly satisfied, after having sat in the Oval Office with the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman STUMP) and most of the senior members of the Republican side of the Committee on Armed Services, to talk with President Bush this morning about what his intentions are, and his intentions are to recommend that those monies be spent this year on measures yet to be defined.

I think it is important to point out that the Committee on Armed Services, upon which I and the just-completed speaker serve, will help define those needs. That is our job.

I am particularly thankful to the President for taking time to explain his position to us this morning, and I

am perfectly well satisfied that those monies can be well spent and invested in our national security through this mechanism.

So let me turn now to my real reason for being here today, and that is to try to put into the context what is going on currently with the economy and how this budget proposal fits into that scenario. The budget policies under debate today should be considered, I believe, in the context of the current economic situation and the recent economic history. In that spirit, I would like to say a few words about where the economy has been and where it is going.

My remarks will center on five or six areas. First, where we have been; second, why we got in trouble; third, how the stage was set for recovery; fourth, how the events of September 11 affected our economy in the context of setting the stage for recovery; fifth, where I believe we are now; and, finally, what policies do we need to address to provide for healthy economic growth in the future, and all that in the context of this budget.

Where we have been. In the eighties and nineties we had a phenomenon that many people did not recognize early on in the eighties. We had almost two complete decades of continuous economic growth.

Beginning in 1984, the economy started to grow, and it grew right on through 2000, the first half of 2000, and did not begin to slow until the latter half of 2000. What I said is almost precisely true. There was a very short and mild recession in the second half of 1990 and the first half of 1991. It was 8 months long. But aside from that very short period of interruption in economic growth, that is, and that is very unusual, the longest period of economic growth in our history, the most robust period of economic growth in our history, and we ought to recognize it as being so.

In the middle of 2000 we began to experience a significant slowdown in economic growth. More specifically, the growth of real Gross Domestic Product, consumption, investment, manufacturing activity and employment all began to slow down substantially around mid-2000.

There were several reasons to explain this sharp slowdown. First, the Federal Reserve raised interest rates six times, 175 basis points in total. That put a drag on the economy, and it was intended to slow the economy, because there were certain members of the Federal Reserve Board who believed that the economy was going to overheat, and so a conscious effort was made to increase interest rates.

Second, substantial energy costs, particularly oil prices, increased from early 1999 through 2000, and that additionally created a drag on the economy.

Third, higher interest rates and higher energy prices worked together to produce enough drag on the economy

that it weakened the somewhat overvalued stock market, and in turn the downturn in the stock market had a broad effect on the economy.

Finally, fourth, the tax burden or fiscal drag which was present in 1999 and 2000 also had its weakening effect on the economy.

These factors were all influencing the economy by mid-2000, thus the seeds for the slowdown were sown prior to mid-2000. Because of long lags, these factors continued to influence the economy for quite a long time.

I would also like to talk for a minute about how the stage then in 2001 was set for recovery. As the economy remained sluggish or continued to weaken, however, these casual factors moderated or unwound themselves during much of 2001.

For example, the Federal Reserve began to lower interest rates, and, over the next period of time, lowered short-term interest rates by 475 basis points, a very significant thing in terms of our monetary policy.

Second, energy prices retreated. Happily, as people watched the pump price, when they went to the gas station prices dropped dramatically, having a positive effect on the economy or setting the stage for a recovery.

Then stock prices stopped falling and the stock market stabilized, again unwinding one of the factors that produced a drag on the economy the year before.

Finally, the Bush tax cut plan was passed and signed into law in June, setting the stage for a rejuvenation of consumer and business rebound. As a consequence, by late summer of 2001, many economists were expecting a near-term rebound in activity, which began to occur.

The economic impact, however, of the terrorist attacks of September 11 changed this economic outlook in a number of ways. This is very important. We were set to begin a recovery by the end of the summer of 2001, and had it not been, I believe, for the terrorist attacks, that recovery would have proceeded forward.

In the short term, after the attacks, the attacks increased apprehension in the financial markets and adversely affected consumption and investment as confidence waned. So, over the long term, as people looked at the decision process of what they were going to do over the long term, uncertainty created a pessimistic attitude on the part of business people and others which affected our economy. Consumption was down, investment was down, and that acted as a new drag on the economy.

Second, the attacks had a direct adverse impact on certain industries, most notably the airlines, the travel industry, insurance, hotels, and, of course, activities that are related to those businesses.

Also in the long term, increased security costs, it became clear, would raise the cost of running a business and adversely affect productivity and earnings.

If you believe, as I do, that an economy has just so much value, and if, as was true during the eighties and nineties, we were making investments to increase productivity which in turn helped to build our economy, and if we now have to divert some of those investment dollars for security purposes, obviously those purposes, while necessary, do not create the productivity that investment in technology does. So, this was a factor which we believe was very important.

Similarly, spending on unnecessary military and security buildup to some extent crowds out more productive private investment. Consequently, the terrorist attacks may adversely impact productivity growth and the economy's long-term potential for growth.

In sum, as a consequence of the terrorist attack the economy was tipped into recession, as certified by the National Bureau of Economic Research, which now the recession is said to have begun in March.

Where are we now? Currently the preponderance of evidence suggests that the economy is finally coming out of the recession. If so, this recession will be one of the mildest on record. There are reasons for the rebound, which include the Federal Reserve's lower interest rates policies, lower energy prices and tax cuts which were put in place.

Recently, for example, most data are being reported as stronger than expected. For example, real GDP for the fourth quarter was up 1.4 percent, due to particularly strong consumption.

Second, leading indicators are up for the fourth month in a row, another positive sign.

Third, monthly consumption in retail, in auto sales and personal income are improving and holding up extremely well.

Fifth, housing continues to hold up very well.

Sixth, payroll employment gains were registered in February for the first time since last summer. That is right, we gained 66,000 jobs in payroll gains in the month of February.

Finally, there are even some signs of improvement in manufacturing activity, which has been the hardest hit sector. The purchasing managers survey is above 50 and durable goods orders are up, all positive signs.

Further, prices remain behaved and inflation is currently not a problem.

The most likely outcome for the economy is to continue to rebound for at least several more quarters, due in part to inventory rebuilding and continued low interest rates.

□ 1800

Let me move now to the future and why this budget and the policies surrounding it are important.

We should have learned some things from the last 20 years in the economic growth that we saw, and we should have learned some things based on what went wrong in 1999 and the first half of 2000.

Policies. The policies that we need to keep the economy moving are important, particularly important now, as we consider this budget. Given these developments, the question is, what types of economic policies are appropriate to keep the economy moving forward at a healthy pace without inflation?

I believe there are several policies that foster the favorable set of circumstances that we need to create.

First of all, we need to recognize that not all of this has to do with the Congress of the United States; not directly, anyway. The Federal Reserve, as I noted earlier, had a lot to do with both the period of economic growth that we had and something to do with the recession that began or the slowdown that began in 2000.

The Federal Reserve policy of gradually pursuing price stability can foster growth in a number of ways. Such policy lowers interest rates, reduces unnecessary uncertainty in the economy, enables the price system to work better, and acts like a tax cut because it provides for less cost in doing business.

The second factor that I would point out is that, just as was pointed out by John Kennedy in 1963 and just as was pointed out by Ronald Reagan in 1980, low marginal tax rates promote incentives to work, save, and invest, and to innovate. Entrepreneurial activity is fostered, and individuals are encouraged to enter market activity. All this promotes growth without inflation.

So the policies that we saw put in place early in the Bush administration are extremely important, and that is why we have advocated for additional stimulus packages by using tax cuts.

Third, and of particular interest in the context of this budget, government spending constraint had a lot to do with where we were during particularly the last decade. Keeping government spending shrinking as a share of GDP enables more economic resources to be allotted and utilized more efficiently and with productivity in the private sector, so tax policy remains an extremely important factor, as well as restraint in government spending.

Fourth, investment in technological innovations, which I alluded to a few minutes ago, is also extremely important. I will not go into a long explanation of this, but there is something that economists used to refer to which is called the Phillips curve, which says that essentially we cannot have long-term economic growth without inflation. That is because when the economy reaches full employment, because there is a continued demand for labor and a very limited supply, it produces upward wage pressures. Those upward wage pressures are inflationary.

We proved that not to be true in the 1980s and 1990s. It is not true, it did not happen, and the reason we believe it did not happen is because we were successful, as entrepreneurs and as members of society, with introducing new forms of technology that helped pro-

ductivity, which relieved the pressure on labor costs.

So investment in technology and promoting investment in these things, and innovation, can add productive capacity, thereby allowing for sustained economic expansion without inflation.

Finally, foreign markets play a continuing important role in our understanding of how to promote growth in our economy. Reducing tariff barriers and promoting open markets increases the size of the international sector, and all this helps with economic growth while fostering lower prices.

Increased international integration enables the economy to take advantage of larger markets and become more specialized and more efficient, productive, and competitive. This allows the economy to produce more goods with the same or less input, and to grow faster without inflation; the remarkable strategies that were used by the government, by the private sector, and by the Fed during the eighties and nineties.

Finally, the economic data released in recent weeks suggests the recession appears to be over and the recovery is now under way. In terms of budgetary policy, this means that we can expect the same kinds of things to happen in the future growth period that happened during the last growth period in terms of Federal revenue.

The economic outlook looks positive, and with sound policies in place, longer term prospects for an extended, sustained expansion look promising. The budget resolution sustains the Bush tax cuts and provides for restraint in Federal domestic spending.

Policies that will enhance the prospect for economic growth are present in this budget. I hope in the future we can also agree to make the tax incentives enacted in 2001 permanent, and maximize their positive effect on economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) be permitted to control the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Joint Economic Committee has been granted the debate on the budget message since the passage of the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978 authored by Senator Hubert Humphrey and Congressman Gus Hawkins, and it is our duty to present the views on the current state of the U.S. economy and provide input into the budget debate before us.

Members have just heard the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) give us a tremendous amount of economic data and explain very succinctly his opinion of what it will take to get the country growing again.

I am proud to be here today to continue the tradition begun by Senator Humphrey and Congressman Hawkins. However, the budget before us is not one of which either of those gentlemen would be proud.

Rather than leading us down an economic path of balanced growth and full employment, the budget before us today is nothing more than a political document seeking to hide the fact that the House Republicans' fiscal irresponsibility has led us into deficit spending for years to come, and endangers the future of Medicare, Social Security, and our children's education because the trust funds for the two programs for the elderly are used to finance the misplaced priorities of the Republican Party and their fat cat contributors, and the Leave No Child Behind Act has not been left with enough money for a bus ticket to bring the children along.

What this budget is is a document that outlines the Republicans' philosophy, and that is to reduce government and pay no attention to the poor or the disadvantaged among us.

It is interesting that the louder they talk about free enterprise, the more we find that very few of my Republican colleagues have ever had a job in a company they did not inherit, except at the public trough. And the louder they scream about free enterprise, the more we will find they probably earned their money at the expense of taxpayers, and probably we will benefit very little from these \$1.5 trillion tax cuts they passed out but it will go to their rich contributors, for whom they seem to spend all their time working in the House to protect, because they certainly are not doing anything to help the people who depend on Social Security or Medicare.

Last year, for example, the House passed the Social Security Lockbox Act by a vote of 407 to 2. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) voted for the bill, and said on the House floor, "This legislation prevents Congress from using the Social Security and Medicare surpluses to cut taxes or increase spending." My goodness.

And the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) during last year's budget debate on the floor said, "The bottom line is that the HI trust fund is part of the larger fund, and it can be only used for Medicare. And it can be used for Medicare reform, but the Democrats voted for a lockbox, as did we, by a vote of 407 to 2. Everybody voted for it, and the money will stay in the trust fund and it will only be used for Medicare and Medicare reform, so that is just that," said the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Apparently the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) were wrong about the effects of that legislation, and apparently they no longer care about protecting Social Security and the Medicare trust funds.

I hope the voters in their districts in Connecticut and Florida will ask them,

because I am sure that they will both support this Republican budget today; I challenge them not to. And the budget today will decimate the Medicare and Social Security trust funds.

So here we have the Republicans talking about the lockbox, and they are voting and they are going to vote tonight, Mr. Chairman, to destroy Medicare and Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) opposed amendments to the economic stimulus bill recently.

We had an amendment to extend an increase of employment benefits for displaced workers. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) voted no and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) voted no.

We had a bill or an amendment to extend COBRA coverage with a 75 percent subsidy. Both of these stalwart Republicans voted no on that.

We had an amendment to make tax cuts contingent upon not breaking into the Social Security and Medicare surpluses. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) both voted no.

So, as I say, Mr. Chairman, the budget here tonight is a farce; it is a sham; it is a joke. The Republicans are here to undermine critical Federal programs so they can give tax cuts to their rich fat cat friends. Who are the losers? Seniors, children, women, working families, poor people, immigrants, the homeless, the environment. The list goes on.

Last year we added we had a \$5.6 trillion surplus, and now, after a faltering economy and an enormous tax cut, the surplus is gone. This budget eats up 86 percent of the Social Security surplus over the next 5 years, the entire Medicare trust fund is obliterated for the next decade, and just last year, the Republicans were passing Social Security and Medicare lockboxes to protect these trust funds.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the lockboxes are gone. They not only threw away the key, they gave a duplicate to every one of the rich fat cats who have been supporting their campaigns. There is no drug benefit, there is no education benefit. We are leaving a lot of children behind.

Do Members know what they are going to do? They are going to say, let us have everybody get married. That will resolve the problem of poverty among the poor. What I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, is that poor people, having them get married just gives us a poor couple.

Mr. Chairman, we have education gone, special education funds gone, TANF money increases gone.

Housing? The Republicans think that the homeless, when the weather is nice, are campers, so they would offer them youth hostels, not money for housing. We have here an example of the arrogance of the people who care only for a

few rich people in this country turning their backs on the people that the Democrats are trying to help and protect.

Would I raise taxes? In a New York minute. Would I do away with the inheritance tax repeal that the Republicans made to give a few thousand people \$40 billion while they will not give the rest of the people drug benefits? You bet.

It is time we start seeing what the American people want. Do they want a few rich fat cats helped, or do they want to continue to see Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security as some of the safety nets for the seniors?

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), a member of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to lift this debate above the grotesque ad hominem quality we have been hearing too much on the floor today and focus instead on the real direction this budget takes us in.

I have to say, Mr. Chairman, it is important that people understand that I came here in 1994 with the first conservative and the first fiscally responsible Republican majority in my lifetime. At the time we inherited the House, we discovered that we had deficits as far as the eye could see.

In those 8 years, we have seen a radical change in the landscape because we have had a fiscally conservative Congress not spending on impulse, like the previous Congress had. We have trimmed the deficit, we have cut taxes, we have encouraged economic growth.

What is particularly important, Mr. Chairman, we have made a commitment to stay within a range of fiscal responsibility and activity that has allowed us to balance two budgets, and now this year we face the acid test: Can we maintain fiscal discipline under very adverse circumstances.

As this budget evidences, we can do that. Our answer is yes. This is a budget that will meet America's needs while keeping us on a path to balancing the budget as we come out of the recession.

As the Treasury Secretary testified before our Committee on Ways and Means, it is important to understand, the United States has never run a surplus during a recession. The last time someone tried that was Herbert Hoover, and it did not work very well.

□ 1815

And we have never run a surplus during war time. Well, Mr. Chairman, we are in the midst of a serious conflict, and we are trying to work our way out of a recession. And in that context this budget keeps us on a path to a balanced budget. The projected deficit is less than 1 percent of GDP. For most of the other industrialized nations that deficit would be a marvel. And it proves that this budget maintains sen-

sible funding levels. It is a fiscally responsible budget.

Contrary to what we have heard here today, despite the over-heated partisan rhetoric, this takes care of our social needs by funding Medicare with a prescription drug benefit and funding highway projects while adequately funding our national defense. It keeps outside a growth path by preserving tax cuts. We have heard them abominated here today, but the fact is that we need to have a continuing commitment to tax relief in order to provide economic opportunities for millions of Americans. As this country entered into the recession, American working families were suffering under the largest tax burden in history. And I do not doubt that some on the other side would raise taxes in a New York minute.

According to the Joint Economic Committee study: "Delaying, reducing or rescinding the tax cuts for working families would only reduce economic growth." This budget spends money responsibly while not punishing working Americans with back-door tax hikes.

Now today we have heard a lot of very unrealistic figures being thrown around by the other side, but that does not change the fact that this budget reflects the priorities of America and the priorities of the Bush administration. It is virtually unprecedented, Mr. Chairman, that the minority lacks the unit and focus and leadership to offer its own budget blueprint. The majority had the courage and leadership to stand up and offer a workable budget blueprint. We met the needs of working families and workers facing the challenge of finding good-paying jobs.

By contrast, the other party finds itself unable to be all things to all people, and accordingly, has recoiled from offering its own budget. We must support critical homeland security initiatives, fully fund highway and highway safety programs, and provide for the needs of our military. This budget does it, and I hope all of my colleagues will join us in supporting this difficult, but important, compromise.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, it is March madness like I have never seen it before. But I am not talking about college basketball. I am talking about the budget free-fall off the deficit deep end that the Republicans are creating for our country. This creates a \$46 billion 1-year deficit. President Bush still has an \$800 billion tax break, mostly for the wealthy, still pending in his budget. What is sacrificed? Well, the Social Security trust fund is sacrificed. It is not put in a lock box. It is allowed to be looted. Prescription drugs, it underfunds the promise the Republicans made to seniors on prescription drugs. Education, it undercuts by 60 percent the money that was supposed to have been spent on the poor children in our country.

And where did the March madness begin? It began a year ago when the Republicans said we can have a \$1.7 trillion tax cut and it will not effect the Social Security trust fund; it will not effect the Medicare trust fund. But what is happening now? They are both hemorrhaging. This is Enron-onomics. It takes from the poor, from their pension funds, from their health care funds while the wealthy walk off with the vast bulk of the wealth that was being created by everyone.

The greatest generation in nursing homes, the greatest generation with health care bills. And what are we telling them? We are going to loot their social security trust funds, their Medicare trust fund.

March madness. I will tell you who will be mad. The seniors will be mad, they will be angry, they will be outraged when they find out that the Republicans rather than shoring up Medicare, Medicaid. Medicare, half of all the seniors in nursing homes are on Medicaid because they have Alzheimer's. Where is the money 10 years from now for those seniors with Alzheimer's, for those seniors with Parkinson's? Where is the money? Where is the budgeting?

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself half a minute.

Where is your plan? Where is the plan? This is a terrible crisis, it sounds like the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) just laid out, and you would think the great Democratic Party would come forward with a plan to take us out of this crisis. What do they do? They run to the floor and play politics, they run to the floor and scare seniors, they run to the floor and what do they propose? Absolutely nothing. If we are in a crisis, where is your plan? If we need solutions, where is your budget? If Americans want answers, where are your answers? You have none.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN).

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, and I came back to the floor when my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), was talking about seniors; and he made me very concerned because he was not talking about our budget. There is nothing in this budget that reduces funding for Medicaid. In fact, Medicaid increases. There is nothing in this budget that reduces funding for Social Security. In fact, the trust fund is totally protected. All that has happened since I have been in Congress in the last years with regard to Social Security is two things: one, the Republican-led Congress increased the earnings limit to let people who want to work who are seniors keep their Social Security money. So it increased benefits. The second is in 1993 Bill Clinton proposed reducing benefits by increasing taxes on Social Security bene-

ficiaries. That is all we have done. Otherwise, we have retained the guarantee in law that the social security trust fund is sacrosanct, and it is.

The tax cut last year had nothing to do with the Social Security trust fund. It did not touch the Social Security trust fund. The question is very simply, Are we going to use a surplus to pay down more debt, which is what we have been doing? And we paid down almost a half trillion dollars worth of debt.

I think the seniors out there deserve to get a little truth and honesty in budgeting. What we have done over the last 4 or 5 years is we have reduced the national debt by using the surplus to pay down the debt, and I am all for that. Now we are in a situation where because of the recession and a lowering of receipts and because of the need for us to fund the war on terrorism and protect this country, we are, instead of using more money to pay down the debt, using some money to defend this country and increase our economic performance in the future. That is the facts. None of this relates to the Social Security trust fund.

I am on the Committee on Ways and Means. I work on these issues, as does the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK); and he knows as I know, as does the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), that the trust fund is sacrosanct. We cannot and will not touch the trust fund. The question is what we do with the surplus. In this budget we in a very responsible way deal with the three issues we have facing this Congress. One is national security, increasing defense, the biggest increase in 20 years. Second is homeland defense. We more than double what we need for homeland defense. And the third is economic security, including retirement security.

And that same tax relief bill that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) talked about as hurting retirement security, helped retirement security. It provided substantial resources for all of our seniors to be able to save more for their own retirement by letting them save more in their IRAs, 401(k)s, defined benefit plans. It increased economic security. It did not risk our seniors' economic security. This is a sound budget.

I urge my colleagues to support it because in fact it keeps the promise to our seniors. It does not touch Social Security. It does not touch Medicare except for an unprecedented \$350 billion increase in Medicare funding. More than the United States Senate, with almost every Democrat voting for it, proposed to increase just a year ago. This is something that is unprecedented, to allow our seniors to have prescription drug coverage and to modernize Medicare. This will increase the kind of retirement security we want to provide for all our seniors.

I urge my colleagues to strongly support this budget. Do what is right by our seniors and vote "yes" today.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) has 20 minutes remaining of this hour. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am about to yield a few seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), who realizes that the Democrats had a plan that they took to the Committee on Rules that was not made in order. They had several amendments, none of which were made in order. So we are operating under a gag rule. Our plan and amendments were not allowed. This is kind of the fascism of democracy that operates in a Republican-controlled Committee on Rules. The gentleman from Massachusetts also understands that it is a good thing that lawyers do not teach economics.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

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

We are operating under an economic plan, the Republican plan of last June. It is only 8 months ago. They said we have plenty of money for a \$1.7 trillion tax break. It would not affect our ability to deal with Social Security or Medicare or Medicaid or education. Eight months later with the wealthy taking the bulk of the \$1.7 trillion, the greatest generation are now looking out 5 and 10 years from now with our nursing homes flooded with 91 percent of all nursing homes with inadequate care, and no additional funding in order to deal with that long term. That is not right.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget said a couple of minutes ago that we had no plan, but we do have a plan. It is a very simple one. The plan is to defeat this budget resolution which is oppressing the American people and bring to the floor of this House a budget resolution that makes sense; one that does not do what this budget resolution does, which is to invade the Social Security trust fund every year over the course of the next decade.

A decade from now under this plan the Social Security trust fund will have \$1.5 trillion less than it has today because this budget resolution invades the social security trust fund every year over the course of the next decade.

This year it spends every dime of the surplus in the Medicare budget. So our principal objection to this budget, first of all, is it does not play straight. It does not play fair. It is not honest with the numbers. And it jeopardizes Social Security and Medicare at a time when we are going to be calling upon those programs because of the larger numbers of retirees that are coming into play. Furthermore, this budget resolution does not live up to its promises. It

takes money out of education. We promised money to the State for increased education funding. It does not deliver on that. And it makes virtually impossible a prescription drug program for the elderly.

All of that so it can continue the ruse, the farce, that we can afford the \$1.7 trillion tax cut which you rammed through this Congress last year. The money just is not there. And you want to continue to pay for that tax cut and the only way that you can do it is by borrowing money from the Social Security trust fund, \$1.5 trillion over the next 10 years, and taking all of the surplus out of Medicare, and by failing to deliver on the promises of health care and education which you have made. That is our plan: get a real budget on this floor.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, Republicans who control the House denied the most responsible fiscally conservative Members of the Democratic Party the right to their alternatives on this floor. You act as a big bully, and now you want to hold it out there as where is your alternatives, where is your suggestions. No matter how you want to paint it, a deficit is a deficit is a deficit; and the Republican budget is swimming in red ink and broken promises. President Bush and every Republican leader promised that they were committed to a balanced budget.

□ 1830

President Bush and every Republican leader promised that they would put the Social Security surplus in a lockbox and never use it again for other spending, but today, no matter, one thing my colleagues do deny is that Republicans want to take a sledge hammer to that lockbox so they can bust it open and loot the money that hardworking Americans have spent a lifetime contributing. It is that bad and it is that ugly.

The Republicans are doing this because they believe it is the only way that they can cover up the deficits they created as far as the eye can see, and that is why they are only giving us 5-year numbers instead of the 10-year numbers and that is why they are using the overly optimistic OMB estimates instead of nonpartisan CBO numbers.

Democrats spent 8 years putting this Nation on a sound fiscal course, and it has taken Republicans 14 months to undo that. Now they want to blame the recession for everything, but no one here or in the country really believes that this recession can be blamed for deficits 10 years from now.

The fact is we Democrats saved enough for a rainy day like this, but the Republicans spent every penny of it on an irresponsible economic plan, leaving few priorities that they claim to support like education, prescription drug coverage for seniors and environmental protection.

So vote against fiscal irresponsibility. Vote against red ink and deficits. Vote against looting the Social Security and Medicare, and vote against this budget resolution.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I think the plan is starting to materialize. I have been saying the Democrats do not have a plan, but what they are against was the tax cut. Okay. Their plan is to raise taxes. We are starting to see the plan. Starting to see the plan. Raise taxes on the American people. If it is not that, one would think they would come forward with an alternative.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), who understands that our plan would only raise taxes on the 1 or 2 percent of the very richest people in this country who the Republicans gave the \$1.4 billion tax cut to. It would help low income people for whom the Republicans do not really care.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate both of these fine gentlemen for setting the table for me because the comments I have to make play right into this. I did, during the debate, try to prepare my constituents for this possibility. The problem is that nobody believed what I was saying, and I guess I even had trouble believing it myself. How could over \$5 trillion in surpluses, projected surpluses disappear within 1 year? I mean, it was impossible for anybody to comprehend that.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Iowa would allow me to control my time, that would be helpful to me.

The problem is nobody would believe that this was even possible, but I want to just go through the facts.

This administration has been in office just over 1 year. We had \$3.12 trillion, not even including the Social Security surplus projected as a surplus for the next 10 years, and 1 year later it is gone.

Despite the administration's claims that this is all about September 11 or some economic downturn, over 40 percent of that vanishing surplus is due to the tax cut, and the commitment to hold Social Security in a lockbox has vanished. There is no commitment anymore.

A year and a half ago, we were out there worrying about whether or not we were going to pay the debt down too fast in this country and whether that would be detrimental. What are we doing now? We are talking about another trillion dollars or more in additional interest on debt over the next 10 years.

This is all in 1 year. So why could not my constituents believe it? Nobody could believe that this could happen in 1 year. What is the plan? We played out the plan over the last 8 years, and you have done away with it within 1 year.

You have done away with it. So if you want to know the plan, the plan is to get you all out of office so that we can have some responsibility in this place again. That is the plan, and I think the American people will understand that that is the plan.

The seniors, the children, the people who care about the environment, they will understand what the plan is when we worked so hard to put this country back on sound economic footing, and you will not even allow a proposed amendment to come to the floor, and you have got the nerve to come in here and say where is your plan. Where is the rule that allows anybody to offer a plan? The Blue Dogs cannot offer a plan. The Black Caucus cannot offer a plan. The Democratic Caucus cannot offer a plan because your rule does not allow any plan other than the demise of this country. That is what your plan is and the American people know what your plan is. They understand.

Now, do you want to give more tax cuts to wealthy people? This is about priorities. This is about priorities. We can either give more tax cuts to wealthy people or we can give better education. We can give more tax cuts or we can give more assistance to prevent AIDS from spreading around the world. We can give more tax cuts to wealthy people or we can do more employment training so people who have been laid off by this recession, so that they can get some jobs. That is what this is all about, and our plan is to get rid of this administration and bring some responsibility back to government.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I rest my case. We are seeing the plan develop before our very eyes. The gentleman said it. Get us out of office, raise taxes and then increase spending. Increase taxes, increase spending; increase taxes, increase spending. Here we go again. Do not tell me my colleagues do not have a plan. They have got a plan. It is called tax and spend.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), who had a plan to offer and was denied in a rather fascist manner his right to offer amendments here and led by the example by our new Attorney General who feels trampling on the Constitution is the way that fascist governments should run and I guess the way we are going under the Republican leadership, but we will let the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) tell us what his plan was and what the Republicans refused to allow him.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, could the RECORD be read back? Did the gentleman just call our government a fascist government? I am just wondering

if that was what was just said on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, no. I talked about the fascist wing of the Republican Party.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, excuse me?

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, the fascist wing of the Republican Party.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, let me just say, that we are in a time of war and the President called for unity, and in that spirit, four of us, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESSON) and myself, went to the Committee on Rules last night and asked that this amendment be made in order.

Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2003, we used their numbers, the Republican numbers. We offered this using their numbers. We offered to extend the debt ceiling till the end of this fiscal year without any strings attached save one, that was that we would be able to review the numbers in August when the CBO numbers come out again to see if we are on the right track and what they say today is actually coming to fact and coming to fruition. We were denied that. That is a plan. This is a budget that we tried to offer last night. Not in order.

People watching may wonder, why is all this arguing going on. I want to tell them. Only the majority can make a legislative body bipartisan. The minority cannot do that. We are like a jack-rabbit in a hailstorm, all we can do is just hunker down and take it, and if my colleagues do not want to be bipartisan, when we offer a budget based on their numbers, offering to extend the debt ceiling, without the approval really of our leadership and they turn us down and then come here today and say there is no plan, we do not have plan. Some of us did, I tell my friends. I saw naked raw partisanship work when I was in the majority here and my colleagues are practicing that today when they deny us the ability to at least debate using their numbers, a different approach.

People are not dumb in this country. They know unfair partisanship when they see it, and if they insist on keeping on doing this, we are going to have a very difficult time solving the problems that the people of this country face.

So I would just tell my colleagues that I am very disappointed in the way this debate has gone today, and I hope we can do better in the future.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

The very distinguished gentleman who just spoke, his plan does not raise taxes. I thought the plan was to raise taxes. That is what the last four gentlemen just said, to raise taxes. The gentleman basically came to the Committee on Rules with my budget and a trigger.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, we submitted a budget proposal, concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year 2003, using my colleagues' numbers and they were denied. How can my colleague say there is no plan. At least four of us had a plan, and now they come here and say our plan is to raise taxes. Our plan was not to raise taxes. Their plan was. All we asked was to review the numbers in August to see if what they say today is coming true, and we were not even allowed to do that, and naked partisanship is going to get my colleagues in trouble eventually. Got this side in trouble.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), who understands democracy and the right of debate and free speech.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, here we are for round three of the shell game.

This is Humphrey-Hawkins, and we are supposed to be talking about employment. We have got people who are getting off welfare, right? We have got all these women, we want them to go out there, and we are increasing the number of hours they have to work. So we are getting them out there, staying away from their kids even longer.

HHS says under this shell are 15 million children who need day care. Under this shell we find out what the Republicans take care of, 2.7 million children. One would think that if there were 15 million who needed it and they were only covering 2.7 million that they would put in some additional money. I mean they are not going to leave any child behind certainly. They really do care about children. I have heard them come out here and get almost weepy eyed over children, but there is only 2.7 million.

What is under this shell? Nothing. They flat-lined it. They said the money we gave last year is exactly what we are giving this year. What that means, according to the Children's Defense Fund, is 30,000 more kids are going to be out from under this shell. They are not going to be covered by day care, and at the end of 10 years of this they are going to have 114,000 more kids if they keep flat-lining it.

Now, we can try and confuse people, but when a mother leaves the house in the morning and she is going off to a job, she wants to work, raise her level of dignity. She feels good about herself, but she does not feel good and cannot concentrate on what she is doing if she does not know her kid is in good child care, and if we do not supplement what people making \$7 an hour in those jobs making beds in the hotels are making, they cannot get good child care.

Do not come out here with that rhetoric about leave no child behind. Vote no on this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Would the gentleman from Washington look under one of those shells and see if there is a Democratic plan? I mean they are leaving the entire country behind by not having a plan. The entire country is left behind by the Democrats today. Please look under that shell and look for a Democratic plan.

Mr. Chairman, I yield ¾ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS), the very distinguished chairman of the Republican Conference.

□ 1845

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I have heard a lot over the last couple of hours about what the Republican budget does not do, and it is ironic that in this budget we take care of IDEA, which we have been fighting for; we take care of seniors and prescription drugs; we protect the homeland security; we do things for national security; we do things to try to get some growth in the economy.

So I continue to ask the question, Where is the Democrats' plan? Where is their budget? And the fact is they have no budget. That tells the American people there is no vision.

I just want to share something. I could come up here and I would not have to say a word but point out what the Democrats are doing, because they have nothing. Wanted: Democrat budget plan. Suspected of raising taxes on American families; increasing wasteful Washington spending.

And I could go on forever. Again, I ask the question, Where do we go from here? Give me a plan on what you propose to win the war against terrorism. Give me a plan. It is easy to beat up ours, but give me something to show where you want to take the Nation.

Again I ask you the question, What do you want to do to secure the homeland? Are you going to raise taxes? Are you going to cut other programs? What are you going to do?

Give me a fiscal break. What are you going to do to protect America's homeland? Again, I ask the question, since we have taken care of families, we have done things to try to grow the economy, what is the Democrats' plan to grow the economy? Give me a fiscal break. If you are going to beat us up, give us your plan.

We have seen nothing over the last 2 hours, over the last 2 weeks, over the last 2 months. We have seen nothing.

Again, I ask the Democrats, What do you do to help workers? I see nothing in your budget. I have seen no budget

that you have submitted. I have seen no vision you have provided. Again, do you want to raise taxes? Do you want to cut programs? Do you want to take care of workers? What do you do to take care of workers? No vision. No budget.

What are you going to do for prescription drugs? We have money in our budget to take care of that need. Again, are you going to raise taxes; cut programs somewhere? Are you going to cut national defense? Give me a fiscal break. If you are going to beat us up, give us your plan.

Nothing for prescription drugs. Again I ask, Where is your plan for health care? No plan. Are you going to raise taxes? Are you going to increase wasteful Washington spending? Are you going to cut homeland security? Are you going to cut national security, the defense budget? What are you going to do to take care of the health care needs?

No plan. No budget. No vision. No nothing. My colleagues just come to the floor and beat us up over the things that we have done trying to help people. What are you going to do for Social Security? Nothing. Zilch. Not nothing. Not nothing do you do. No budget. No vision.

Give me a fiscal break. If you are going to beat us up over our budget, surely somebody's got a budget of their own; surely somebody's got some vision in that party; the great party that once said "All we have to fear is fear itself." Now all you have to offer is fear itself.

Give me a fiscal break. Offer your plan. No budget. No vision. Case closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) has 6 minutes remaining on the subject of economic goals and policies.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), who understands that gagging people and preventing them the right to speech is not incumbent in our democracy, and remembers a time when not all people in this country were allowed to speak out. The Republicans obviously are reverting to those times because they are afraid to hear another plan.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I wish the gentleman from Oklahoma had been here 3 hours ago when we were asking for a chance to speak, to present a budget, to not be gagged, to have a chance under the rules of the House of Representatives, the people's House, to debate. But under the Republican rule, which manages and controls all the time, we do not have an opportunity to present any plan because my colleagues will not give us a chance to present any plan. So what we have to deal with is what you give us.

I remember 2 years ago we had a President who said, and this was during harder times, he said we are going

to save Social Security first. It seems now we have a President and colleagues on the other side who say because we have hard economic times, and because we have to pass a budget, we have to take from Social Security first; take these tax cuts, that will go mostly to the well-to-do and large corporations, like Enron; take from Social Security first to fund programs like Star Wars, and you are going to take from education.

Mr. President, please explain to me why you will not fund drug-free school programs. Mr. President, please explain to me why you will not fund dropout prevention programs in our schools. Mr. President, please explain why you and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will not fund school construction monies so we can build more schools in our overcrowded systems. Mr. President, please explain to me why we gutted the monies for classroom size reduction so our kids would not have to be 30 in a classroom to learn.

Take from Social Security first? I intend to try to save Social Security first. And if I had a chance to present a budget, I would show you how we could save Social Security first. But you do not. Instead, we have a security blanket that is thrown around this budget. Everything is security.

Well, by your raiding Social Security and Medicare by about \$1 trillion, we could fund eight wars on terrorism. Instead, we are giving money to the well-to-do and corporations like Enron. Vote against this budget because it does not deserve our vote and the American people do not want it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to the President.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this budget.

The budget before us today reflects a failure to meet the promises made to members of the House Education and the Workforce Committee as we worked to make the compromises needed to create a bipartisan education reauthorization bill known as The No Child Left Behind Act.

One of the key issues was that if we voted to require extensive testing by all schools in the country in order to achieve accountability, we would also supply funding to support the improved teaching that may be needed to help school districts achieve their required goals and avoid expensive penalties. However, this budget cuts The No Child Left Behind Act by \$90 million.

It is unconscionable that programs have been cut that were integral to members agreeing to the compromises that led to passage of the Act. Yet, forty programs would be termi-

nated. These include such critical support for children as funding for elementary and secondary school counseling. A second area of support called for in the Act is to place qualified teachers in every classroom; however, the budget eliminates teacher technology training. The list of terminated programs includes the National Writing Project, which gives teachers experience in improving their writing and models best practices. It also cuts funding for another program that sets the standard for identifying accomplished teaching, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, which administers a highly lauded national process for identifying the highest quality teachers.

I have selected just these few examples of eliminated programs that would improve teaching quality so that indeed no child would be left behind. But this budget decreases resources for teachers by 4 percent and eliminates high-quality training for 18,000 teachers.

Many members of the House wanted the opportunity to vote to provide funding for a much older federal mandate which has been shamelessly under-supported since 1975, special education. Yet, we have not even been allowed to show our support for phasing in this commitment over a period of years. The modest increase in funding contained in this budget is only a third of the amount that real commitment would offer. Although the Education and Workforce Committee will be working on the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in the next Congress, there is no justification for holding this funding commitment hostage in order to implement whatever needed reforms may be agreed to by Congress at that time.

The list of other gaping holes in this budget for education is long—freezing funding rather than providing the \$500 million called for in the No Child Left Behind Act to support the 21st Century Community Learning Centers, which provide safe, healthy places for children to learn after school.

While the bill is targeted at the lowest income, lowest performing children, the key portions of that effort contained in Title I are woefully under-funded while the number of poor children mushrooms.

There are no funds to subsidize interest on school modernization bonds needed to address the \$127 billion backlog in school repairs, again a program that many members supported.

Finally, high quality child care must be available to enable more children to be ready to learn when they reach kindergarten. Yet, this budget freezes child care funding. What will be the value in reauthorizing the child care block grant this year, when we are told in advance that long overdue reforms cannot be made because there are no additional funds?

As members should be aware, virtually every national education support organization—such as the Parent Teachers Association, the National School Boards Association, and the 100-member consortium of education organizations called the Committee for Education Funding—have expressed their outrage at the inadequate funding for education in this budget.

Is this what our constituents want? Clearly not. A study released yesterday, conducted by the Ipsos-Reid polling and research organization, reported that education was, by a wide

margin, the highest national priority for spending on non-military or homeland security programs. An astonishing 85 percent agreed that a good reason to increase federal spending on education was that "our national security depends on our ability to successfully equip our children with the skills and knowledge they will need to function in today's increasing complex world."

The public supports a substantial increase in spending. Their commitment to our children must start with this budget so that no longer will so many be left behind.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are some of us who remember this world in the 1930s, when Hitler suspended the Bundestag to promulgate conservative ideology and not let people speak. It is a shame that the Republicans in the House, Mr. Chairman, have taken up that same ideology and are denying a chance for debate and open discussion of a budget. It does smack of fascism; and it is too bad, because the American people will recognize that and understand that in a free economy, and in a free country that created programs like Social Security and Medicare and special education and aid for dependent children and aid for people who are unable to care for themselves, for the disabled, that to deny them care is obscene.

I think it will be quite clear that, for whatever reason, whether it is deficits or anything else, that the overwhelming desire of the Republican Party is to destroy programs in the Federal Government, except those few intended for the very wealthy.

Most of the colleagues who are screaming about the war never wore a uniform other than the Boy Scout uniform. And I would like to suggest, as I said before, none of them have worked in free enterprise, which they tout so loudly. And yet, because that is where the campaign contributions come from, in the hundreds of millions of dollars, that is where their allegiance is. They are forsaking the seniors who need health care and who need an economic safety net. They are forsaking our children by denying them the chance to come along and get an education.

I am sure the American public is going to recognize this, and I am sure they are going to recognize it when they see wasteful money spent on things like Star Wars, which will not work, and programs which do nothing except to pay for large defense contractors, who are related to former Republican Presidents, and I think they are going to see that this is an obscene, corrupt, and undemocratic attempt to harm those people who are most fragile in this country only to benefit the 1 or 2 percent of the very wealthiest. And I hope my colleagues will vote down this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South

Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 8½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 9½ minutes remaining on the debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend and colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget is irresponsible, irrational, and just plain wrong. It is a sham, it is a shame, and it is a disgrace.

The Republican budget buries us in a pile of debt and puts us in a much deeper financial hole; and it is the obligation of the Republicans, the majority party, to dig us out.

The Republicans have destroyed the lock box and thrown away the key. Mr. Chairman, Social Security is a sacred trust, a covenant with the American people. It is a promise that should never, ever be broken. But the Republican budget spends \$225 billion of the Social Security trust fund on other government programs.

Social Security is a safety net for many Americans, allowing them to live with dignity. But the Republican budget takes away that safety net. Republicans are stealing the Social Security trust fund. The Republicans are taking the security out of Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues tonight to vote for the people, vote for the old folks, vote for the disabled, and vote against the Republican budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of strong words, I think even sometimes inappropriate words, disturbing, extreme words this evening, as we have been discussing this budget, particularly from the other side.

All of us agree that these are unusual times. It is a time for tough decisions, a time that defines people. Do they rise to the occasion, or do they cower when they should stand tall? Do they sit quietly when they should speak? Do they freeze when they should lead? I am amazed this evening that at a time like this the Democrats have not stood, they have not spoken, and they have not led. At a time when your country needs vision, they have none.

This year's budget reflects the tough decisions of those willing to lead when

events call for a clear vision and clear priorities. Our budget meets the demands of these historic times and provides for our national defense, it provides for homeland security, and it provides for personal security.

Let me talk about health care just briefly. Our plan provides \$350 billion to expand and enhance Medicare; to provide a prescription drug plan for our seniors, which is needed; to provide for the reform of Medicare. Would we like to add more? Yes.

□ 1900

But we have added a very reasonable amount. If Members look at prescription drugs, approximately 72 percent of our seniors are covered by prescription drugs. Yet the only thing that we have heard from the other side of the aisle is a plan that would control everything in the medicine box of our seniors, and would displace this money that already provides prescription drugs with an increase in taxes or an increase in deficit.

We also have expanded and enhanced our community health centers, which provide health care for those who fall through the cracks. We have expanded health care for the poor, the children, and the uninsured. We have increased funding for research by doubling the funding for NIH, and we have provided fiscal responsibility.

The other night in the Committee on the Budget when Democrats offered a string of amendments, the sum of those amendments would have increased our deficit by \$200 billion. That is why we do not see them offering a budget. That is why we did not see them offering a budget when we marked it up during the committee. If we combined all of those amendments, it would require us to increase taxes by \$150 billion to pay for the additional amendments they wanted.

We have not cowered. We have taken a stand, a tough stand in these days that require tough stands. We have provided a budget which establishes the needed priorities, and yet it is remarkable to me that we hear chilling silence when it comes to offering a budget of responsibility.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of anger on the floor today, and to me this is such a sad day. It is total reversal of all our former self-congratulation. The last administration took credit for beginning our deficit reduction course to save Social Security and Medicare. The majority said oh, no, we are doing it, and the country gave us both the credit. There will be no question where the blame lies for dynamiting the lockbox. The Social Security and Medicare lockbox will be remembered as the most fraudulent metaphor the majority has ever used on this floor.

The majority has taken us back to the dark budget ages of using budget

estimates by political appointees rather than by the professionals of the Congressional Budget Office. The American people are always willing to take domestic cuts in time of war. Members will never convince them. They are too smart to be convinced by a budget that tells them we can do tax cuts, fight a war, and defeat a recession at the same time. The seniors and the baby boomers deserve a lot better.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to myself to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, in an earlier colloquy today on transportation spending, I understood a couple of things. One is that although the budget provides for \$1.8 billion in outlays, I understood the colloquy to indicate that if the Committee on Appropriations only wanted to appropriate \$23 billion for 2003, and not the \$27 billion, a little over \$27 billion, we on the Committee on Transportation and the Infrastructure expected.

Secondly, I would query the chairman about the firewalls. I understand in the budget resolution we cannot construct firewalls to protect the TEA-21 dollars, and I am wondering where that will come and what the commitment is.

Thirdly, today the Senate marked up their budget and provided for an additional \$5.7 billion of Federal highway spending in 2003. I would solicit an opinion from the chairman.

Mr. NUSSLE. Number one, we have a reserve fund for the extra transportation dollars so it would only be released to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure if in fact they marked it at that higher level, 4.4 of contract authority, 1.3 in outlays.

Second, on the firewall that was discussed, that is for a future potential budget enforcement act reform bill that we intend to move on the floor.

The third question was whether or not we would try for a higher number with the Senate. We are working to try to get as much money to stimulate the economy as possible. We agree transportation is one of the ways. We will work for as high a number as we can.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my disappointment and discouragement with respect to the Republican budget proposal. We are failing the working men and women, children and seniors. My constituents elected me to come here to talk about issues that we are not having a fair chance to discuss. That is why the other side of the aisle hears our loud tone of voice and our cry. There are thousands of people in our districts who are unemployed who were affected

long before September 11, who had some hope, who thought that our leadership, that our President, was going to leave no child behind.

The President has decimated our budget with respect to education. He has made promises and broken them. People will have their energy bills cut. The LIHEAP program is going to be slashed. People will have to make a decision whether to buy food or pay the light bill. This is a harsh reality of the Republican proposal, and I stand here to say this is not acceptable and that my constituents in the 31st Congressional District want their voices heard. We want to be able to have our amendments in our presentations in our committees. I ask for a "no" vote on the Republican budget proposal.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have heard often on this floor today for a call of calm and reconciliation. I have also heard the discussion about the Democrats having no plan. Well, Mr. Chairman, let me say, these four volumes indicate why Democrats cannot have a plan because the Republicans and the administration have squandered the surplus. There is no surplus. This plan invades Social Security. This plan blows up the lockbox.

In fact, my constituents will be asking me why over the last 3 years, when the Democrats had a plan for a prescription drug benefit, why there was no response from the Republicans. Why Social Security is at the point it is when we had a trillion dollar surplus. No plan? We do not need a plan. Those who have destroyed the plan destroyed the surplus, and need to present us with something that Americans can be proud of.

It is interesting that Republicans would talk about homeland security and the war against terrorism. A minuscule amount in this budget is for homeland security. Most of it is squandered away by the invading of Social Security. I ask my colleagues to vote a resounding "no" for this budget because this is not a budget that Americans can stand on. It is a budget that is nothing but smoke and mirrors and walls that do not respond. This is a budget that does not work.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to myself.

Mr. Chairman, well, we are coming to the end of this very important debate. We have heard a lot of discussion and debate today about plans and who has got a plan and who does not have a plan. Let us review the bidding very quickly.

The President in response to September 11, the national emergency, the war against terrorism and a recession in our economy put a plan on the table in February. It was not a perfect plan.

There has never been in the United States history a perfect budget plan, but he has one.

What did we do in committee last week? We took that plan and we made it better. How? We said special education is going to get a little bit extra. Veterans are going to get a little bit extra. Science is going to get a little bit extra. Homeland security can get extra. We are going to treat defense, and all sorts of things that we thought were important priorities with a little extra, and the President today said the Republican plan is better.

We have taken the President's plan and we have made a better plan. So the President has a plan and the Republicans have a plan. During the last 6 months of the most crucial time in American history, what have the Democrats been doing? Well, three very important things that we did together in a bipartisan way. We said we are going to respond to the national emergency. So we dipped into that surplus, and we took some money out and we said New York needs some help. We did that in a bipartisan way. Every Member voted for it.

Then we said we are not going to let people come into this country and do what they did to the people of America ever again. We will find them. We will beat them. We will win this war, and we will do whatever it takes. In a bipartisan way, we stood together and we funded that war. Every Member voted for it.

Just last week, finally, we all said the economy is just too important for us to allow it to languish or for it to possibly falter. In a bipartisan way, we dipped in there again and took some of that money and said that is what we are going to do. All of this hand wringing about where did the surplus go, my gosh, it just vanished. Members, it did not vanish. Have Members forgotten Osama bin Laden? Have my colleagues forgotten what happened on September 11?

Members are saying the seniors are not going to understand. The seniors won World War II. Our kids understand. Our parents understand. The teachers understand. The nurses understand. Our veterans, by God, understand. So for the other side to run in and tell us now that nobody understands where the surplus went is a bunch of malarkey.

So what did the other side do over the weekend? Instead of writing their own plan, 96 pages of criticism. That is fair. We are living in America. We will fight to the death anybody's right to disagree. That is what America stands for, but at some point in time the other side does not just get to disagree. They have to lead. The great party on the other side of the aisle has led many times in our history, but now it fails.

The minority leader said, "We think the Republican budget in the House is a failure, an absolute, total failure in dealing with the big problems in America," and he let his voice drop.

Did the gentleman come down here with a plan? No. Did he say I have got some ideas? No. Did he criticize? Sure, and he has a right to do that. I will fight for his right to do that. But Members are not allowed to just complain. Members are not allowed to just play politics. At this most crucial time in American history, Democrats have to stand up and say what is important and put their plan on the table. They are not allowed to just snipe from the sidelines and say, oh, we are for national defense and homeland security. Yes, we want a prescription drug benefit. Gosh, we want more than the Republicans do for education. Oh, yes, in fact, we want more for science, and let me think, we want more for all of these things.

We cannot do that without a plan, or without raising taxes. So please, I ask the other side of the aisle to demonstrate their leadership by coming forward with a plan. I beg them. This is too crucial a time in American history for them to let us down.

I implore Members to vote for a plan to win the war and get this country secure again.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, the reason the sign used by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) was made yesterday was because the majority knew last night when we went to the Committee on Rules with our plan that we were not going to be able to offer it. So these nice charts we see about not having a plan, we would have a plan today, but the other side of the aisle would not let us offer it.

We would like to look in August and see if what the gentleman says tonight is actually coming true. What the other side of the aisle said last year we know has not come true, and we only ask to review it in August. We used the Republican plan as a gesture of bipartisanship. The other side of the aisle will not let us have a plan, and then they bring all of these charts down here that they made up yesterday and say the Democrats do not have a plan.

□ 1915

This raw partisanship, people are not dumb, they see it. It is going to get you in trouble just like it got this side in trouble sooner or later.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Here is one reason that we have not produced a plan. It is because the plan that we are confronted with, the budget, so-called, before us, is not a real budget. As I said earlier, it is a tip of an iceberg.

Here are just a few of the things that it does not include. It uses OMB scoring, and therefore it picks up \$225 billion because OMB estimates the cost of Medicare by that much less than CBO. It fails to fully fund discretionary spending at the level of inflation, that is all, current policy, and picks up another couple of hundred billion dollars.

We do not think that is realistic. If we had to put up a plan that would be comparable on an apples to apples basis, we would have to adopt these and many other devices in this budget which we think would be a bad precedent. That is why we declined to do it. There will be a Democratic plan. Senator CONRAD is producing one as we talk.

Let me just say once again with respect to the war, when the votes come on the defense appropriations bill and on the other appropriations bill with homeland security and national security, Democrats' names will be the board because we back the President and we support those appropriated items.

Let me say something else about the key concern that we have in this budget and the situation we are in today. This graph here shows the extent to which previous administrations have invaded Social Security. The Clinton administration came to office in 1993 inheriting a budget deficit of \$290 billion, a record deficit. On February 17, less than a month after being in office, they put on our doorstep a deficit reduction plan which passed this House by one vote. As a result, every year for the next 8 years the bottom line of the budget got better to the point where in the year 2000, we were literally in surplus without counting Social Security or Medicare, the first time in our fiscal history that that happened. It happened under the aegis of the Clinton administration. Sure you cast some of those votes and I cast some of those votes, they were costly votes in most cases; but this is where the handoff occurred to President Bush.

I have seen at least five Republicans come here to the well and tout the fact that you have had \$400 billion in debt reduced in the last several years. All of that happened on the Clinton administration's watch. Why did it happen? When you move your budget out of deficit into surplus, you have got money to pay off debt. That is why it happened.

But look what happens. Here at the pinnacle of this summit, there is a handoff to President Bush and immediately things go south. Some of that is due to the fact that we have had fundamentally unexpected, terrible tragedies to occur in this country; and I would be the first to admit that that has had an impact, no question about it. But your tax cuts had an impact, too. Your miscalculation of what the economy was going to do has had a big impact as well. It is at least 40 percent of this. But look at this. And the reason we cannot go with your budget tonight is it has no plan, it has no strategy, it has no way for us to reverse that course which is graphically laid out there, showing you that we are backpedaling right to where we were 10 years ago. After 10 years of progress on the deficit, we are literally backsliding.

Since everybody seems to be poo-hooing the deficit, as if this is a tem-

porary, transitory phenomenon, let me read CBO's analysis, dated March 6, of the President's budget. It says that this year we will incur a deficit under President Bush of \$248 billion; \$297 billion next year under his budget. Over the next 10 years it says we will incur deficits of \$1.8 trillion. The consequence of that is we will be invading Social Security to the tune of \$1.8 trillion.

Here is this chart which we have used before. You start with a blue stub there, you start with a blue stub there which shows that we handed off the budget to the Bush administration with a budget out of Social Security and out of Medicare and look what happened. Immediately the red lines below the line begin to appear. The yellow lines up here indicate that every year over the next 10 years we will consume the Medicare surplus. Every year over the next 10 years we will consume the Social Security surplus. There is no way around it. You do not have a plan in your budget to reverse course here. So everyone voting for this budget tonight should understand this is the bottom line that you are voting for, an invasion of the Social Security surplus for the next 10 years. That is the bottom line. What it means is that we will be incurring more debt. We will not be achieving our promise of paying off the debt so that we can alleviate the burden on the Treasury and make it able to meet its Social Security obligations.

This is a 180-degree reversal of where we were last year. That is why we respectfully decline to vote for this budget resolution. We think it is a badly designed element, and we think it will take us back to where we were. We hoped that we had recovered from that from a long time ago, but it does not appear that we have.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. HASTERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the President's budget, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this budget as well. The budget process helps the Congress to decide the spending priorities of this Nation. I am disappointed that some folks on the other side of the aisle have decided not to propose a real substitute. Instead of making tough decisions, some would rather complain from the sidelines.

This Congress has a responsibility to govern. I believe that this budget fulfills our responsibilities to our constituents and to our Nation. I want to congratulate our budget chairman for a job well done. I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Our first responsibility is to defend our Nation. Folks, we are at war. We must spend money to win this war. This budget contains a historic increase in defense spending. Our troops need this money so that they have the

weapons, the supplies, the equipment to do the job. Some say that there is not enough money in this budget to fight this war. I assure you if the President needs more money to fight this war, this Congress will make sure that any man or woman who wears the uniform of the United States military and puts themselves in harm's way, they will have the training, the equipment and the weapons and whatever they need to win.

This budget also contains the necessary money for homeland security. On September 11, we found out that terrorists can attack in the most unconventional way. We do not know where they will strike next. We do not know, but we have to be prepared. This budget helps our Nation prepare for these contingencies.

This budget also helps prepare our Nation for other challenges on the domestic front. It includes money to implement the President's ambitious education agenda, so that our schools will teach our children better. It includes the largest financial commitment to a prescription drug benefit in our Nation's history. We reserve \$350 billion to Medicare and prescription drugs for seniors in this budget. It also includes important funding for our Nation's veterans and for our Nation's farmers. The President's budget sets the right priorities for our Nation.

My friends on the other side of the aisle, some have criticized our budget with great enthusiasm; but they have failed to offer a real alternative. Why did they not offer an alternative? Some would like to play politics with Social Security. Any realistic budget would have to confront the fact that the surplus disappeared because of the economic slowdown, because of the war and certainly because of domestic terrorism in this country and our willingness to prepare ourselves for it.

Folks, we made a real decision last year. I heard some of our friends talk about surplus. We had a great surplus. We made a conscious decision to take some of that surplus off the table, because we thought moms and dads and local people who make money, punch a time clock, own their small business, they make better decisions with that money in their pocket than the Washington bureaucrats. We also made a conscious decision to pay down debt. During this period of time, we paid down over \$450 billion of public debt. I think that is probably better than having that surplus sitting there and being tempting for people here in Washington.

I know people have big plans, big thick books on how to spend that money. But times have changed. We must prepare this Nation to continue to fight the fight that we are in. We must prepare our people for domestic violence and prevent people from coming into this country and have terrorist attacks across this Nation. We need to take care of our senior citizens. We need to take care of our veterans.

We need to take care of farmers. This budget does exactly that.

I ask you tonight, put politics aside, put demagoguery aside, and vote for this budget so that we can move forward and this Congress can get its work done.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Chairman, I am having this statement placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today, although I am not physically present. As you know, I have been granted a leave of absence so I can be with my family in Mississippi to attend the funeral of a close relative. For this reason, I was away from the House floor yesterday, March 19, 2002, and am away today, March 20, 2002. I want this statement placed in the RECORD today so that I can be on record on today's most important proceedings pertaining to the Federal budget for Fiscal Year 2003.

Today the House is considering the Federal budget for Fiscal Year 2003. I stand by our President as he leads us in the war against terrorism. But I cannot vote for this budget proposal because I have serious concerns over this Budget's treatment of health care for seniors, veterans and retired military. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee refused to make in order the Blue Dog Coalition budget alternative. I cannot support a rule that will not allow for open, honest debate on a matter as important as the Federal budget.

This proposed Budget fails to address pressing health care needs but includes new unspecified tax cuts—tax cuts that have not even been proposed by anyone or considered by Congress. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), Congress' own accounting agency, there is no budget surplus. Therefore, funding for these tax cuts could only come from Trust Funds that are set aside for health care entitlements such as Social Security and Military Retiree Health Care. I cannot support a budget that threatens the well being of our nation's seniors and veterans, or those who will soon be part of those venerable segments of our society.

A particular matter affecting military retirees is Concurrent Receipt. Certain military personnel qualify for both military retired pay and veterans disability compensation. Current law requires that military pensions be reduced, dollar for dollar, by the amount of VA disability compensation received.

This is an injustice that should have been corrected long ago. The United States government promises certain benefits when young Americans are recruited to serve a career of military service, including health care and pensions upon retirement. Veterans who become disabled in the line of service also earn and deserve their health care benefits.

The proposed FY2003 Budget calls for concurrent receipt for a limited number of disabled retirees, but his Budget is woefully inadequate because it would continue to deny earned benefits to many other disabled retirees.

Yesterday, Congressmen GENE TAYLOR and I attempted to introduce an amendment to the Budget proposal, to fully fund concurrent receipt for military retirees who are also service-connected disabled. Funds for this proposal would have come from funds allotted in the budget for unspecified tax cuts that have not even been proposed or considered by this House. Unfortunately, on a party line vote, the House Rules Committee refused to allow the full House of Representatives to even consider the Shows-Taylor Amendment.

Reducing these promised and earned benefits—to disabled war heroes, of all people—is wrong. The FY2003 Budget Resolution that is being considered is called a "wartime budget." How can we recruit soldiers to fight the War on Terrorism if we continue our legacy of broken promises? Too many military veterans are telling their children and grandchildren not to join the service because the government does not keep its promises. This is precisely why we must keep our promises to our military heroes this year, today.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 353. As a senior member of the House Budget Committee, I am profoundly disappointed with this measure which unrepentantly retreats from the fiscal policies and practices that fostered enormous federal budget surpluses. In the Majority's push to craft a "nominally balanced budget," they have failed to put forth a plan to get our budget on the path to recovery. Further, Mr. Speaker, this budget blatantly ignores what everyone here knows—and what all the major economic forecasters, including CBO, OMB and GAO, told us well before September 11th—the federal budget will be overtaken by escalating budget deficits as the Baby Boom generation begins to retire in just six short years. This budget, which calls for cumulative non-Social Security deficits of \$1.052 over the next five years, spending all of the Medicare trust fund surplus and 86 percent of the Social Security surplus, actually worsens our long-term fiscal picture.

Mr. Chairman, last year, I stood on the floor of the House and cautioned against betting the ranch on ten-year estimates that the CBO itself has stressed are highly uncertain. Based on its own track record, CBO concludes that its estimated surpluses could be off in one direction or the other, on average, by about \$52 billion in 2001, \$120 billion in 2002, and \$412 billion in 2006. This year, the Majority seems to have come around to my view—why else would they put forth a budget based on five year numbers? Why indeed? It couldn't be because ten-year numbers would reveal just how much of the Social Security and Medicare surpluses this budget will really consume, could it? It wouldn't be to cloak the fact that over ten years, over half of the projected Social Security surplus will have to be diverted to cover other government functions, according to both the CBO and OMB, would it?

Mr. Chairman, to arrive at a "nominally balanced budget," my colleagues on the other side of the aisle not only ignore the impending budgetary pressures out past 2007 but, for the first time since 1988, discard CBO's projections, now that they have become inconvenient, in favor of rosier OMB estimates. Have they learned nothing from the dramatic reversal in our nation's budget picture? Mr. Speaker, last year, the Majority was more than willing to accept the CBO's estimate of a \$5.6 trillion surplus. Now that applying CBO's baseline to their budget resolution will result in a worsening of the non-Social Security deficit, to the tune of \$318 billion, over the next decade, the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, my colleague, Mr. NUSSLE, has decided that since he does not like the "weather report" as prepared by CBO, he will simply "turn the channel." Well, Mr. Speaker, while I respect my colleagues right to hope for the best, it does not erase our affirmative duty to prepare for the worst. The hallmark of responsible budgeting is leaving room for error. Last

year's budget left no room for error. In fact, by August, we were projecting that for the next seven years, virtually all of the non-Social Security, non-Medicare surplus would be spent, not to improve the programs, not to create a prescription drug benefit under Medicare or even enhance the solvency of these critical programs, but to cover other government expenditures. And, Mr. Chairman, that was well before September 11th and the resulting war on terrorism.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman I would note that to arrive at their "nominal balanced budget" for 2003 the Majority has put the blinders on with respect to the supplemental defense request that we all know is coming next week and has blocked out the memory of their much-touted stimulus bill that was enacted just over a week ago and has a five-year cost of \$94 billion. When the stimulus bill is included, this budget has a deficit of \$224 billion in 2003 and \$830 billion between 2003 and 2007, excluding the Social Security surplus.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, adding insult to injury is the Majority's proposal for a national prescription drug program for seniors. H. Con. Res. 353 claims to create a \$350 billion reserve to be spent, over ten years, for not only a drug benefit but also the Medicare "modernization" and provider givebacks. Without ten-year numbers for the rest of the budget, how can this proposal be credible? Further, the budget condition release of monies for a drug benefit on enactment of a Medicare modernization bill and provider payment adjustments. Last week, during the House Budget Committee's mark up of this bill, I offered a reasonable, budget neutral amendment that I offered to create a meaningful voluntary prescription drug benefit within Medicare for all Medicare beneficiaries. Regrettably, it was summarily rejected along party lines. Under my amendment, \$69 billion would be added over three years to the Medicare service, raising the total commitment to \$158 billion by 2007 and \$500 billion over ten years. These additional funds are essential if a Medicare prescription drug benefit is to be available to and affordable for the majority of those receiving Medicare benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this "spend today, borrow tomorrow" measure that turn its back on hard-learned fiscal of the passed decade and undermine longstanding domestic priorities, such as strengthening Social Security and Medicare, providing a universal prescription drug benefit. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to make the right choice today and reject this sham budget.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H. Con. Res. 353, the FY 2003 Congressional Budget Resolution. The budget resolution is fiscally irresponsible. It spends more than 86 percent of the Social Security surplus and uses up the entire Medicare surplus. There are only six years left before the baby-boom generation begins to retire, and now is not the time to deplete the Social Security and Medicare surpluses.

Over the past eight years we have had budgets culminating in real debt reduction, and a growing surplus that did not rely on Social Security or Medicare. The budget resolution before us today, quickly creates an on-budget deficit of \$974 billion over five years according to the Congressional Budget Office.

The tragic attacks on September 11, 2001, the short and shallow recession, and the con-

tinuing war on terrorism taken all together did not precipitate the budget deficit. Mr. Chairman, while I support the war on terrorism, and increased homeland security, I did not support the irresponsible tax cut passed last year. The fact is, it consumed approximately 43 percent of the budget surplus and led to our current poor fiscal health.

This budget does not lead to debt reduction or Social Security and Medicare solvency and it does not ensure that our other national priorities are met. Last year, the leadership went down the primrose path by enacting a tax cut that cost our country nearly 2 trillion dollars. But before this year is out we must get the budget back on track.

Further, for the first time in years, the budget resolution is only a five-year budget instead of a ten-year budget. It remains in deficit throughout the next five years, which leaves us to infer the damage that will result in the second five years. In effect, this budget cloaks the large amount of Social Security and Medicare surpluses that will be spent after FY2007 and it allows the Leadership to avoid deciding whether to sustain the sunset provision of the tax cut passed last spring or extend the tax cuts at an additional cost. This lack of a ten-year plan leads me to believe that either the House Leadership has no long-term plan of recovery or they have a plan that will not stand scrutiny under the public eye. Regardless, this resolution offers no targets, no objectives, and no strategies to return to budget surpluses.

In addition, this budget resolution attempts to make the deficit appear smaller by authorizing non-defense, and non-homeland security discretionary spending at almost five percent below the level necessary to maintain current levels of services. Perhaps, even more disappointing, the resolution cuts funding for the bipartisan No Child Left Behind Act recently signed into law, as well as other cuts in education, health care, and environmental protection.

Mr. Chairman, I am saddened that we are being forced to vote on this irresponsible budget resolution without any opportunity to create a bipartisan fiscally responsible budget. As Members of this great institution, we often deliberate important issues that effect our own and our children's futures. During debates of this nature, I frequently ask myself one simple question; will the vote I am about to cast make the nation and our society better and safer for my two sons, Johnny and Matt, as they live, learn and grow in the 21st Century. For once, lets put their future first, ahead of Washington politics.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the budget resolution for the fiscal year 2003.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution and I want to thank Chairman NUSSLE for the hard work he and his staff did pulling it together.

I just want to point out one feature of the Budget Resolution that may go unnoticed as we debate defense spending and tax policy and other macroeconomic issues.

This budget provides a healthy and needed boost for scientific research—a boost that goes significantly beyond what the Administration called for. I'm especially pleased with the funding for Function 250, the General Science function, which is based on an 11.1 percent increase for Research and Related Activities at the National Science Foundation (NSF).

Our nation's long-range future depends in no small measure on the investments we make today in research and development, and in science and math education. NSF spending is critical to ensuring a health R&D and education enterprise. The Budget Resolution recognizes that.

I want to thank Chairman NUSSLE for working so cooperatively with me and with other Members of the House Science Committee to ensure that the Budget paid proper attention to science funding and to balancing the federal research portfolio. We obviously haven't solved all our science funding problems, but this Budget Resolution is an important step in doing so, especially given how tight overall domestic discretionary spending is.

I urge my colleagues to support this Resolution.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my concerns about the budget resolution that is under consideration. I feel very strongly that the budget we are debating is seriously flawed because it contains cuts and funding amounts that are frozen at previous year levels.

Furthermore, the priorities reflected within the budget are a clear indication that vital needs and programs are being sacrificed. I am dismayed about this budget because the majority failed to make in order any of the amendments offered before the Rules Committee that would have restored many of the cuts proposed by the president.

None of the (4) amendments I offered in committee were ruled in order. Consequently, my efforts to restore \$379 million for Community Development Block Grants (CDBG's) to the purchasing power level of FY 2002 will not become a reality. These grants are critical to local communities. They fund programs that promote economic development in low and moderate-income communities and are used to eliminate or prevent slums and blight and to address needs that pose a threat to the health and safety of our communities. The cuts, if implemented, would affect wealthy and low and moderate-income communities that receive CDBG's.

I also advocated restoring funding for employment and training programs, which was cut by \$686 million from the 2001 level. My amendment would have restored the funding for the Youth Opportunity grants program back to its current 2002 level which would have amounted to a nominal add-back of \$180.6 million to the program for 2003.

Youth training services prepare low-income youth for academic and employment success. They are vital to curtailing high school dropout rates, increasing college enrollment, and improving the unemployment rate of young adults.

I also sought to restore a modest amount of \$3 million to the Public Health Service's Office of Minority Health that is located in the Department of Health and Human Services. The funding would be used to reverse the tragic imbalance and racial disparity in terms of babies born in the African American and white communities in our country whereby a black baby born today is twice as likely to die within the first year of life than a white baby. That baby is twice as likely to be born prematurely and at a low birth weight.

We must do all that we can to determine why out of 1,000 births, 14 African American babies die, while for their white counterparts it is only 6 out of 1,000.

Had my amendment been ruled in order, I would have been able to make the case to have the Secretary of HHS undertake research, in collaboration with other relevant agencies, to help address and eliminate racial health disparities in birth outcomes. This is one of our Government's Healthy People 2010 target goals.

Finally, I offered an amendment that would reduce the proposed \$28 billion in new tax cuts in order to pay for the additional highway spending. This amendment adds \$1.3 billion to the highway program for 2003 with similar increases in the following years, adjusted for inflation. This would put the total add-back from the President's budget to \$5.7 billion, since the budget committee has already added back \$4.4 billion.

Continued investment in highway infrastructure will contribute to job creation and protection as the economy recovers from recession. We simply cannot afford to shortchange our infrastructure needs.

Mr. Chairman, these are just some of the shortcomings of the budget being offered today. At this time in our nation's history, we can ill-afford to withdraw our important legacy of social and health services.

Too many Americans are in need and feeling the impact of September 11th. Our Government's support is more vitally required than ever in these difficult days. Our funding of key programs must be sustained, if our fellow Americans are not to lose faith in our leadership.

Money counts for all Americans but if you are unemployed, hungry, elderly and sick, homeless and or a dependent child, it is a lifeline and a commitment that must be kept. Our Government should shortchange no American and that is why this budget is so disappointing. The gap between our socioeconomic reality and this proposal is daunting. The Budget does not add up, Mr. Chairman, and should be voted down.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the budget offered by the Republican Majority.

Today's Washington Post contained a remarkable report that an Antarctic ice shelf the size of Rhode Island just shattered and collapsed into the sea. Scientists say that they have never seen as large a loss of ice mass and that the disintegration was all the more remarkable because of the extraordinary rapidity of the collapse. An ice mass 1,200 square miles in area and 650 feet thick that had existed for 12,000 years disintegrated in 35 days.

I bring this to my colleagues' attention because the disintegration of the Federal Government's budget position over the last year has been nearly as staggering. Eight years of hard-won budgetary gains and fiscal discipline were thrown out the window in a single year. Last year's projected ten-year budget surplus of \$5.4 trillion dollars collapsed literally before our eyes, sacrificed to the irresponsible tax and budget policies of the Administration and the Republican Majority in Congress.

Just nine months ago, the Chairman of the Budget Committee said, "This Congress will protect 100 percent of the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds. Period. No speculation. No supposition. No projections." This promise echoed similar pledges by the Speaker, the Majority Leader, and the Majority Whip to place the Social Security and Medicare sur-

pluses in a lockbox and build a firewall between the Social Security and Medicare trust funds and the rest of the budget.

Well, here we are twelve months later and \$4 trillion poorer. The lockbox has been smashed open. The firewall has been breached. The promises of the Republican Majority have been broken. The budget before the House today raids Social Security and Medicare this year. It raids Social Security and Medicare next year. It raids Social Security and Medicare the year after that. It raids Social Security and Medicare for as far as the eye can see.

Last year's budget resolution placed our nation's finances in a deep hole. The budget before the House today digs the hole deeper. It robs us of a chance to address critical needs, like a real prescription drug benefit for seniors and adequate funding to modernize our kids' schools and reduce class size. The return of large, multi-year budget deficits will also make it much more difficult to strengthen the Social Security and Medicare programs in advance of the Baby Boom generation's retirement, which begins in 2008 when the leading edge of the Baby Boom enters their retirement years.

I urge the House to vote down this budget so we can begin work on a bipartisan budget resolution that meets our responsibilities, restores our fiscal health, and keeps faith with the promises all of us have made to the American people.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican's fatally flawed budget resolution. Here we go again. The Republican resolution is simply smoke and mirrors. It's a "pretend" budget so deceptive that if it were an ad, the public would sue for violations of the truth in advertising laws and they would win!

Not even the transparent ploy of using five-year budget estimates from the President's Office of Management and Budget rather than the usual ten-year budget estimates from the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office can hid the fact that the Republican budget resolution would raid virtually all of the Social Security and Medicare surpluses over the next five years in order to pay for the fiscal chaos caused by last year's irresponsible tax bill.

Five times last year, here in the House, we voted almost unanimously for a Social Security "lockbox". The President and the Republican leadership repeatedly pledged their commitment to that Social Security lockbox. In this budget, the Republicans don't just pick the lockbox. They shatter it with a sledge hammer!

Don't be fooled. When you get rid of the accounting smoke and mirrors in the President's budget, the non-defense domestic spending is not even a "current services" budget. This budget is replete with severe program cuts. Cuts that low income Americans simply cannot take. We are left with much less than we had to begin with. Where is the money for a real prescription drug benefit? For affordable housing? For Head Start? For Education? For Job training? For worker health and safety?

The deceptive "pretend" Republican budget ignores the cost of the Supplemental that will be offered as soon as this budget resolution leaves the House. It ignores the cost of providing relief to millions of middle class taxpayers to keep them from being subjected to the alternative minimum tax. It ignores the cost of the Republican proposal to make permanent the tax cuts from last year's bill. It pro-

vides woefully inadequate resources for a prescription drug benefit and makes any prescription drug benefit compete with both the cost of provider "givebacks" and the costs of unspecified Medicare "modernization".

Mr. Chairman, we need a budget that provides a real prescription drug benefit, improves education, ensures the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, and pays down the national debt. We need an honest budget, not this sham Republican press release.

Securing our national defense and homeland security, adopting a real prescription drug benefit, improving education, providing affordable housing for the poor and the homeless, maintaining the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, paying down the national debt—that's the American agenda, not continuing to squander our resources on overly large tax cuts tilted toward those who need it least. We can and must do better. Reject the Republican budget.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, like all Americans, I believe that we must meet our most pressing priorities of protecting our country against terrorism, improving our international relations, and growing our economy. I agree with the president that these current challenges warrant small, short-term deficit spending.

However, I am concerned about the lack of sound budgeting practices in the Republican Budget offered today. Under their plan we cannot both address our most pressing current needs, and establish a framework for a long-term, sustainable revenue and spending plan without relying on massive borrowing.

The Republican Budget spends most of the Social Security surplus and all of the Medicare surplus, putting us in terrible position to deal with the impending entitlement crises when the baby boomers retire. Despite promises last year from both the White House and Congress to save every single dollar of the Social Security surplus and Medicare surplus, and Congress' votes for a Social Security "lockbox" five times in the past few years, this budget uses nearly all the Medicare and Social Security surpluses—more than 86 percent of the Social Security surplus and every penny of the Medicare surplus.

The Republican budget also just isn't honest—it doesn't take into account the tax and spending programs that both Republicans and Democrats know Congress is going to pass.

For example, the individual Alternative Minimum Tax will balloon twenty-fold by 2012, affecting 39 million households (34 percent of all taxpayers), but fixing that problem isn't in the budget. Republicans also support making permanent last year's tax cuts, which would cost \$569 billion and Speaker Dennis Hastert plans to bring up an additional tax cut bill this spring. None of these items are in the budget.

And in terms of spending, the White House has said that it will submit a supplemental appropriations request for defense and homeland security that will certainly be approved by Congress—but that isn't in the budget either. They are assuming non-defense, non-homeland security discretionary spending will be kept at only five percent of the levels necessary to maintain current levels of services in 2003. We all know that's an unrealistic projection—even under Republican control of Congress, spending has always increased on these programs.

Another problem with the Republican Budget is that it uses the optimistic, rosy projections from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) rather than the more conservative Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projections. Over the next five years, the difference between CBO and OMB revenue projections is \$110.4 billion. OMB also plans on the government spending \$48 billion less over the same five year period on mandatory spending programs like Medicare and veterans' benefits. That's a lot of ifs.

To be perfectly honest, I don't really care whether the numbers we use are labeled CBO, OMB or UFO, but I do believe that it's sound budgeting practice to use more conservative numbers when you're balancing your checkbook.

The bottom line is that even with all of these budget tricks and gimmicks that make it look like we can have everything we want, the budget is still in deficit and our debt is still climbing. The budget deficit for next year is projected to be \$46 billion, and we'll be in deficit every year for ten years. By 2007, when the baby boomers start to retire, the government will owe more debt to the public—nearly \$3.5 trillion—that it does today.

Our federal budget needs to be more balanced and fiscally responsible than today's Republicans proposal.

I had hoped that House Republicans would recognize the need and the real possibility for bipartisan cooperation on developing a proposal for the federal budget. If the House leadership is willing to invite more people to the table, to go to an economic conference as we've suggested, I am confident that we can have a federal budget that will protect the country against terrorism, lend needed support to our military, take care of workers at home, and pay for needed programs like education, healthcare and social security as well as ensuring a strong economic foundation for the future.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Fiscal Year 2003 Budget Resolution and to commend my colleagues on the Budget Committee for their hard work and efforts to produce a strong wartime budget that meets the needs of our nation. This budget directly addresses America's security needs—fighting the war on terrorism and protecting American citizens—without neglecting our domestic priorities.

I am especially proud of the way this budget addresses the needs of our nation's 25 million veterans. First of all, discretionary spending for veterans totals \$26.8 billion for 2003. That is a 12 percent increase over 2002 levels. VA medical care funding is increased to \$23.9 billion and another \$1.145 billion is included to prevent instituting a \$1500 deductible for Priority 7 veterans.

In addition, this budget provides the funds necessary to correct the concurrent receipt restriction for veterans with 60 percent or higher disability ratings. Current law requires that a veteran's retired pay be reduced by the amount of disability benefits he or she receives. This is an unfair practice and I am proud to support a budget that will end this restriction.

The FY03 budget has the support of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AMVETS and many others. Their support further indicates that we are on the right track to meet the critical needs of vet-

erans. I would like to thank Chairman NUSSE and the Budget Committee for putting this sound resolution together and urge all of my colleagues to support this measure and ensure adequate funding for our nation and our veterans.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, on July 11, 2001, Republican House Majority Leader DICK ARMEY said, "We must understand that it is inviolate to intrude against either Social Security or Medicare and if that means forgoing or, as it were, paying for tax cuts, then we'll do that." Unfortunately, the Republican Budget Resolution does not reflect that sentiment in the least. The House Republicans are offering a budget that virtually spends almost the entire Social Security surplus to pay for last year's tax breaks that mostly benefit the wealthy.

I urge all my colleagues to oppose this Budget Resolution and here is why:

First, the Republican Budget Resolution would take over \$1 trillion from the Social Security Trust Funds and eliminate the Medicare surplus over the next five years.

The President and every House Republican leader promised last year that every single dollar of the Social Security and Medicare surpluses would be saved for Social Security and Medicare. With this Republican budget, virtually no dollar of the Social Security and Medicare surpluses will be saved for Social Security or Medicare.

The Congressional Budget Office reports that the single biggest factor in the disappearing surplus is the Bush tax cut, not the war on terrorism or the recession.

Second, the Republican Budget Resolution abandons domestic priorities.

The Budget Resolution: cuts \$90 million from last year's bipartisan legislation that funds our nation's main elementary and secondary education programs; eliminates the Community Access Programs (CAP) and Health Professions Training program, freezes funding for the Ryan White AIDS Programs, and slashes funding for Rural Health Activities by \$54 million; cuts the Violence Against Women Act Grants, and funds the Legal Services Corporations well below needed levels; cuts state and local law enforcement grants by \$1.7 billion; funds the Community Development Block Grant program at \$379 million below what is needed to maintain current levels; does not include an additional \$1.3 billion in federal highway funding requested by the Democrats.

Third, the Republican Budget Resolution does not offer seniors a comprehensive, affordable, and voluntary prescription drug benefit under Medicare.

Finally, the Republican Resolution does not take into account future impending costs like additional funding for homeland security, response to natural disasters, which will require more funds for FEMA and other federal agencies. None of these or other certain or likely contingencies are accommodated in the resolution, making its projections highly suspect.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, this year's budget provides the resources for education reform while funding a nation at war.

As one of the authors of the bipartisan education bill signed by the President in January, I'm proud to support this budget. It's a compassionate one that reflects our nation's priorities and helps states and local schools meet the promise of education reform.

It's a clear statement that this Congress and this President will not turn its back on our children and their future, even in a time of war.

This budget builds on the significant increases provided for education in recent years—an average annual increase of 14.3 percent over the past four years.

[TEACHERS.] I'm particularly proud of the support this budget provides for school teachers. President Bush and Congress have provided a 35 percent increase in federal teacher quality funds to help states and local schools put a quality teacher in every classroom by 2005. The President's budget request this year maintains this historic level of support. We're asking a lot of teachers, and they deserve our support.

[SPECIAL EDUCATION.] The budget provides a \$1 billion increase for special education, putting us on track for full-funding of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act within 10 years. It also paves the way for us to make long-overdue changes to IDEA to ensure that children with special needs are not left behind. I'm especially grateful that our Budget Committee colleagues have taken this step.

Building on last year's reforms, the budget also:

[LOW-INCOME SCHOOLS.] Provides a \$1 billion increase in Title I grants to low-income schools—on top of last year's \$1.6 billion increase—focusing resources on the highest-poverty school districts.

[READING FIRST.] Provides a \$100 million increase for the President's plan to improve reading instruction by addressing reading difficulties at an early age through proven scientific methods.

[HEAD START.] Increases Head Start by \$130 million to increase children's preparedness for learning when they enter school.

[CHARTER SCHOOLS.] Provides \$100 million in new funding for charter school facility financing.

[EXPANDED PARENTAL CHOICE.] Funds new tax relief measures, such as education tax credits, to assist parents transferring their children from chronically-failing or dangerous schools.

[HISTORICALLY-BLACK COLLEGES & HISPANIC SERVING INSTITUTIONS.] Provides a 3.6 percent increase for assisting historically black colleges, universities and graduate institutions, as well as Hispanic-serving institutions.

[PELL GRANTS.] Maintains the maximum Pell Grant at a historic high of \$4,000.

The budget also paves the way for other priorities such as welfare reform and child care. Funding for the Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG) has more than doubled in the last five years to \$2.1 billion. This budget keeps that commitment to help move more Americans toward independence and self-reliance.

I also want to commend the committee for providing significant increases in funding for two key Department of Labor offices that help to safeguard the pension assets and retirement security of American workers. The budget provides a \$3 million increase for the Office of Labor Management Statistics, and a \$7 million increase for the Office of Inspector General.

Budgets are about tough choices. But there are some who don't want to make choices. There are some who dare to suggest that this budget somehow shortchanges our children.

They say they want more funding for education, but they won't put forth their own budget to tell us how they'd get to that goal. Students, teachers, and parents deserve to know: Which tax would they raise? Which program would they eliminate?

Last week's action in the Budget Committee offered a hint. Last week, Democrats offered 17 amendments to the proposed budget. Taken together, the amendments totaled \$205 billion in new spending and \$175 billion in new taxes over five years.

Mr. Chairman, in this time of national emergency, what Americans want is leadership—not gamesmanship.

I'm proud to support this budget, which responds to our nation's challenges without forgetting the promise to the children who are our future.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, last year, when the Republican leadership brought their budget resolution to the floor I commented that they were "leading us down a fiscally dangerous path." Now that we are debating the fiscal year 2003 budget resolution, it is clear that the Republican leadership has no intention of exiting that treacherous route.

This 2003 budget resolution, like its 2002 predecessor proposed by the same Republican majority, is fiscally irresponsible and puts at risk Congress's ability to live up to our commitments to public welfare, the environment, and important infrastructure projects.

The Social Security trust fund is being invaded for more than \$1 trillion over the five-year budget window. In addition the entire Medicare surplus will be sacrificed. At the same time, the purchasing power of our domestic programs is being reduced by more than \$20 billion in fiscal 2003 alone. Instead of providing necessary funding for critical domestic needs, the Republican leadership is taking Social Security and Medicare funds paid from the wages of working people and returning it through tax cuts to the corporations and individuals who are least in need.

The public deserves an honest, long-term budget, but Congress is not able to provide one when there is such a broad disconnect between what the Republican leadership promises and what they deliver. The opportunity for an honest debate with alternatives and amendments has been stifled by the closed rule the Republicans have put into place for the debate of this resolution.

In addition to funding the war on terrorism and ensuring homeland security, my constituents in Oregon want the federal government to fulfill its commitment to domestic priorities, which includes Social Security, the environment, education, and necessary infrastructure projects. This budget resolution fails our domestic priorities and, therefore, I oppose its passage.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, this is truly an Enron budget. The Republican Budget Committee has cooked the books and produced the most seriously flawed budget in my career.

The accounting gimmicks are spectacular. We have a 5-year budget instead of the customary 10-year budget. This is because it hides dwindling revenue from the gradually implemented Bush tax cut. If refashioned, a 10-year budget would show much larger deficits. Republicans also chose to use the politically crafted OMB numbers, instead of the non-partisan CBO numbers. Whether we insert political or non-partisan numbers into this resolu-

tion, the story is no different at the end of the day. Because all of the accounting tricks in the world cannot hide that we are still raiding Social Security and Medicare. And we are still growing the national debt. The Republican Party is trying to hide a budget deficit of \$257 billion next year and that is just plain wrong.

In this budget, providing a Medicare prescription drug benefit and increasing provider payments do not reflect half of what is necessary according to reasonable forecasts. And this budget does not even take into account the additional spending and further tax cuts proposed by the President. This time next year it is very likely we will have a budget deficit double or triple what is reflected in this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, we need an honest budget, one that provides a prescription drug benefit to our seniors, keeps Social Security solvent for the baby-boomers, and does not further saddle the national debt we are leaving to our children. We can provide a budget that does all this by simply ending the greed. So much of our revenue surplus was squandered on a tax cut that benefitted the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans. And last week, the President invited them back to the feeding trough. We must not pay for this giveaway on the backs of our seniors, children, and all those looking to Social Security for their retirement needs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to keep your promises to your constituents and vote down this budget.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget resolution for fiscal year 2003.

I understand that the nation is engaged in a vital enterprise in response to the vicious attacks of September 11th. I know that fighting to break up terrorist organizations and protecting our country and our people, which I support, are expensive undertakings and the highest national priorities.

But, Mr. Chairman, they are not our only priorities.

From September 11th on, the President has exhorted the American people to continue our normal activities—perhaps being more aware of what's around us, perhaps putting up with more security hassles and delays—but starving the domestic budget is not going to keep us moving forward as I thought the President meant we should.

We still need to invest adequately in health care, education, job training, law enforcement, clean air and water, energy efficiency, economic development, housing, science and technology.

We particularly need to address the impending retirement of the baby boom generation, strengthening Medicare and Social Security, not diverting their surpluses to general government operations.

At bottom, Mr. Chairman, what we need to do in this budget resolution is identify and provide the resources needed to do both of these things—defend and protect ourselves, and invest in the future—which means we must take another look at the huge, irresponsible tax cuts for the wealthy that were enacted last year.

Some people thought we could make the tax cuts and have plenty of money left over to meet the Nation's needs. They were wrong. This budget misses or avoids opportunities as it promises years of deficit spending. This demonstrates that we must revisit the revenue

side and, at a minimum, suspend further cuts until we can afford them.

Mr. Chairman. I am certain we can do better than this budget resolution. I urge my colleagues to vote against it and commit to working together to fashion a new budget resolution that provides the resources to provide both for our security and for our Nation's domestic needs.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to address the issue of funding veterans military retirement in conjunction with veterans disability compensation. I am pleased that the House fiscal year 2003 budget resolution includes funding to eliminate the veterans retirement and disability concurrent receipt offset. The \$6 billion over the next 6 years to gradually provide full benefits to all disabled retirees is long over due.

I firmly believe veterans should not have money taken out of their military retirement to pay for their disability compensation because these are two separate entities that serve two different compensations. I was pleased to co-sponsor legislation to repeal this offset, and I am pleased that by providing funding for concurrent receipt, Congress has finally recognized the importance of keeping its promises to those men and women who have risked their lives, and have suffered injuries in preserving our freedom.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Budget Resolution. This is a good budget that will serve our Nation well during this time we are at war with terrorists. It funds our national security as well as addressing our homeland security needs while ensuring that many other problems are addressed.

To touch upon just a few of the many worthy items in this budget, I want to highlight the support in this budget for local firefighters, disabled military retirees, home healthcare and IDEA funding.

Firefighters often provide the backbone of both rural and urban communities in our Nation. They risk their lives in order to save the lives and property of others. I am gratified that the Budget Committee was able to recognize their important contributions by encouraging this Congress to continue to provide grants directly to local firefighters.

I am also pleased that this resolution provides funding to address the concurrent receipt problem facing our military retirees who are disabled. This budget puts us on a path to eliminate the concurrent receipt problem within 5 years for our military retirees who are the most severely disabled.

I also want to applaud the Committee for continuing its commitment to ensure that home healthcare remains available to our elderly. A 15 percent cut in reimbursements to home health providers scheduled for October 1, 2002 will devastate the industry and ultimately force many of our elderly out of their own homes and into hospitals and nursing home facilities.

Finally, this budget continues the commitment of this Congress to work hard toward fully funding its commitment to assist schools in educating students with special education needs. We include \$1 billion over last year or a 12 percent increase. Further, we commit to providing 12 percent increases every year over the next 10 years so that we fully fund the commitment made by Congress on IDEA funding.

This budget also does so much more to protect the American people. I commend it to all

of my colleagues and urge you to support H. Con. Res. 353, the Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2003.

Mr. PASTOR, Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this misguided budget resolution.

After 28 years of deficit spending and digging our children into deeper and deeper debt, in 1998, we finally balanced the budget and experienced budget surpluses. This lasted for only 5 years, and then a misguided \$1.4 trillion tax cut threw us into fiscal irresponsibility once more. Now, this budget sends us into deficit spending as far as the eyes can see.

As bad as deficit spending may be, what is worse, we are once again raiding Social Security and Medicare.

We have taken endless votes in this House to ensure that we protected Social Security. We voted time and time again to place the Social Security trust fund into a "lockbox." But this lockbox has been smashed open and Social Security has been raided so that we can give the wealthiest among us a huge tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the President's efforts to stop terrorism. We must fund our military and homeland security. We must ensure that we are safe to travel our country and the world. We must support our President in this effort.

But, we cannot neglect the other needs of our people. We should fully fund education programs for all ages. We should ensure that our Nation's infrastructure is modern and safe. We must find a way to provide health care for those millions who have no health care options. We must find a way to provide prescription drug coverage for our elderly. And we must do whatever it takes to protect Social Security.

It is my contention that this budget is broken. We might be better served to start over, to sit down with the President and come up with a new plan, a plan that protects us from those who wish to do us harm, a plan to protect our children from ignorance, a plan to protect our elderly from sickness, a plan to protect our children from added fiscal irresponsibility, and a plan to protect Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, I regretfully oppose this budget. Let's start over with the President. If we work together we can do all these things.

Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. Chairman, the budget resolution we are considering today is more of a campaign pamphlet than it is a deliberative piece of legislation. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I'm pleased to say that the work of the Budget Committee is no longer grounded in fiscal reality but more apt to produce what we call soundbite legislation. Once again, we are seeing that budget resolutions can engage in flights of fancy, while the Appropriations Committee will be forced to do the hard work of deciding how the real money will be spent in this place. This resolution really makes the budget process a sham. This is a budget that's based less on sound economic assumptions and more on the principles of Enronomics.

The supporters of this budget are working on a selling job to make you believe that this plan will provide a balanced budget by fiscal year 2010. But what we are told is far different from the fiscal reality. This is feel good legislation that will exact fiscal harm and pain in the out years. To hide the real truth, the Republican budget purposely uses 5 year numbers instead of 10.

The Republican budget is simply irresponsible. In its budget, the GOP proposes new tax cuts and funds these cuts by spending hundreds of billions from the Social Security trust fund to pay for other programs. Moreover, the Republican leadership plans to bring to the floor next month even larger tax cuts and has expressed support for making permanent the provisions in last year's tax cut. CBO estimates that by making these tax cuts permanent, revenues would be reduced by \$569 billion over 10 years.

Democrats want a budget that reflects our Nation's priorities. Unfortunately, key Democratic amendments on key issues that the majority of Americans care deeply about were blocked by Republicans from reaching the House floor.

An amendment I offered relating to prescription drugs, which would have ensured that seniors receive a prescription drug benefit that is comprehensive and meaningful, was blocked from being considered on the floor. Unfortunately, the \$350 billion that the Republicans have proposed in their budget for Medicare reform and prescription drugs would barely make a dent in helping seniors and the disabled in getting the prescription drug coverage they need—and deserve. We have all made this a pledge with our words—the test is to show it with the numbers laid out in the budget resolution. The Republican resolution fails miserably at this test.

Their budget also fails to adequately fund other key priorities so important to Americans and our future, such as education, child care, and environmental protections.

The Republicans budget aims to hide the truth and the real costs over the years. I oppose this budget resolution and urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 107-380 is adopted and the concurrent resolution, as amended, is considered read.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 353) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2003 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2007, pursuant to House Resolution 372, he reported the concurrent resolution, as amended pursuant to that resolution, back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 209, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]
YEAS—221

Aderholt	Goss	Peterson (PA)
Akin	Graham	Petri
Armey	Granger	Pickering
Bachus	Graves	Pitts
Baker	Green (WI)	Platts
Balenger	Greenwood	Pombo
Barr	Grucci	Portman
Bartlett	Gutknecht	Pryce (OH)
Barton	Hansen	Putnam
Bass	Hart	Quinn
Bereuter	Hastert	Radanovich
Biggert	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad
Bilirakis	Hayes	Regula
Blunt	Hayworth	Rehberg
Boehler	Hefley	Reynolds
Boehner	Herger	Riley
Bonilla	Hilleary	Rogers (KY)
Bono	Hobson	Rogers (MI)
Boozman	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Horn	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (SC)	Hostettler	Roukema
Bryant	Houghton	Royce
Burr	Hulshof	Ryan (WI)
Burton	Hunter	Ryan (KS)
Buyer	Hyde	Saxton
Callahan	Isakson	Schaffer
Calvert	Issa	Schrook
Camp	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Cannon	Jenkins	Sessions
Cantor	Johnson (CT)	Shadegg
Capito	Johnson (IL)	Shaw
Castle	Johnson, Sam	Shays
Chabot	Jones (NC)	Sherwood
Chambliss	Keller	Shimkus
Coble	Kelly	Shuster
Collins	Kennedy (MN)	Simmons
Combest	Kerns	Simpson
Cooksey	King (NY)	Skeen
Cox	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Crane	Kirk	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Cubin	Kolbe	Souder
Culberson	LaHood	Stearns
Cunningham	Latham	Stump
Davis, Jo Ann	LaTourette	Sullivan
Davis, Tom	Leach	Sununu
Deal	Lewis (CA)	Sweeney
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Tancredo
DeMint	Linder	Tauzin
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	Lucas (KY)	Terry
Dreier	Lucas (OK)	Thomas
Duncan	Manzullo	Thornberry
Dunn	McCrery	Thune
Ehrlich	McHugh	Tiahrt
Emerson	McInnis	Tiberi
English	McKeon	Toomey
Everett	Mica	Upton
Ferguson	Miller, Dan	Vitter
Flake	Miller, Gary	Walden
Fletcher	Miller, Jeff	Walsh
Foley	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Forbes	Morella	Watkins (OK)
Fossella	Myrick	Watts (OK)
Frelinghuysen	Nethercutt	Weldon (FL)
Gallegly	Ney	Weller
Ganske	Northup	Whitfield
Gekas	Norwood	Wicker
Gibbons	Nussle	Wilson (NM)
Gilchrest	Osborne	Wilson (SC)
Gillmor	Ose	Wolf
Gilman	Otter	Young (AK)
Goode	Oxley	Young (FL)
Goodlatte	Pence	

NAYS—209

Abercrombie	Boucher	Cummings
Ackerman	Boyd	Davis (CA)
Allen	Brady (PA)	Davis (FL)
Andrews	Brown (FL)	Davis (IL)
Baca	Brown (OH)	DeFazio
Baird	Capps	DeGette
Baldacci	Capuano	Delahunt
Baldwin	Cardin	DeLauro
Barcia	Carson (IN)	Deutsch
Barrett	Carson (OK)	Dicks
Becerra	Clay	Dingell
Bentsen	Clayton	Doggett
Berkley	Clement	Dooley
Berman	Clyburn	Doyle
Berry	Condit	Edwards
Bishop	Conyers	Engel
Blumenauer	Costello	Eshoo
Bonior	Coyne	Etheridge
Borski	Cramer	Evans
Boswell	Crowley	Farr

Fattah	Lowey	Rodriguez
Filner	Luther	Roemer
Ford	Lynch	Ross
Frank	Maloney (CT)	Rothman
Frost	Maloney (NY)	Roybal-Allard
Gephardt	Markey	Rush
Gonzalez	Mascara	Sabo
Gordon	Matheson	Sanchez
Green (TX)	Matsui	Sanders
Hall (OH)	McCarthy (MO)	Sandlin
Hall (TX)	McCarthy (NY)	Sawyer
Harman	McCollum	Schakowsky
Hastings (FL)	McDermott	Schiff
Hill	McGovern	Scott
Hilliard	McIntyre	Serrano
Hinches	McKinney	Sherman
Hinojosa	McNulty	Skelton
Hoeffel	Meehan	Slaughter
Holden	Meek (FL)	Smith (WA)
Holt	Meeks (NY)	Snyder
Honda	Menendez	Solis
Hooley	Millender-	Spratt
Hoyer	McDonald	Stark
Insole	Miller, George	Stenholm
Israel	Mink	Strickland
Jackson (IL)	Mollohan	Stupak
Jackson-Lee	Moore	Tanner
(TX)	Moran (VA)	Tauscher
Jefferson	Murtha	Taylor (MS)
John	Nadler	Thompson (CA)
Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)
Jones (OH)	Neal	Thurman
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Tierney
Kaptur	Obey	Towns
Kennedy (RI)	Olver	Turner
Kildee	Ortiz	Udall (CO)
Kilpatrick	Owens	Udall (NM)
Kind (WI)	Pallone	Velazquez
Kleczka	Pascarell	Visclosky
Kucinich	Pastor	Waters
LaFalce	Paul	Watson (CA)
Lampson	Payne	Watt (NC)
Langevin	Pelosi	Waxman
Lantos	Peterson (MN)	Weiner
Larsen (WA)	Phelps	Weldon (PA)
Larson (CT)	Pomeroy	Wexler
Lee	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Levin	Rahall	Wu
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Wynn
Lipinski	Reyes	
Lofgren	Rivers	

NOT VOTING—5

Blagojevich	Gutierrez	Traficant
Ehlers	Shows	

□ 1955

Mr. JOHN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. RILEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 79, adoption of H. Con. Res. 353, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for FY 2003, I was too late to cast my vote because I was detained in a meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, regarding rollcall votes on today, March 20, 2002:

On rollcall 69, I would have voted "yea" on Approving the Journal.

On rollcall 70, I would have voted "yea" on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree, as Amended H. Res. 339, urging the Government of Ukraine to Ensure a Democratic, Transparent, and Fair Election Process Leading Up to the March 31, 2002 Parliamentary Elections.

On rollcall 71, I would have voted "yea" on Passage of H.R. 3924, the Freedom of Telecommute Act.

On rollcall 72, I would have voted "yea" on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree to H. Res. 371, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding Women's History Month.

On rollcall 73, I would have voted "nay" on the Motion to Adjourn.

On rollcall 74, I would have voted "nay" on the Motion to Adjourn.

On rollcall 75, I would have voted "nay" on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 372, providing for consideration of H. Res. 353, the Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2003.

On rollcall 76, I would have voted "yea" on the Motion to Table Motion to Reconsider H. Res. 372.

On rollcall 77, I would have voted "nay" on Agreeing to H. Res. 372.

On rollcall 78, I would have voted "nay" on the Motion to Table the Motion to Reconsider H. Res. 372.

On rollcall 79, I would have voted "nay" on Agreeing to H. Res. 353, the Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2003.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3694

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3694, the Highway Funding Restoration Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 353, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, Fiscal Year 2003.

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

There was no objection.

COMMENDING MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE AND STAFF FOR WORK ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 353, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2003

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first of all thank our competitors today. As the old saying goes, I think it was a saying by a former Speaker, the Democrats are just our opposition; it is the Senate that is the real enemy around here. I realize that is probably not appropriate.

The point I am trying to make is that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the Democrats on the Committee on the Budget did an admirable job of presenting their

points of view, both in committee and here on the floor today. I want to thank them for that, and I would also like to thank our staffs.

We get to come on the floor and do all of this debating, but the preparation to put this budget together, like it or not, is done by a lot of work during a lot of hours, many of them late nights, by our staff. Rich Meade and Tom Kahn and the whole gang at the Committee on the Budget do an excellent, professional job.

Again, as I say, like the budget or not, it is professional work and they need to be commended for that.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, throughout this year, the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) and I have tried to maintain an amicability and civility in the committee, which has worked between us because there is a natural relationship of friendship between us to start with.

I commend him for the manner in which he has handled this on the floor. We have deep disagreements, but nevertheless, we have been able to disagree yet not be disagreeable. It is partly because of the manner with which the gentleman has tackled this whole thing, and I commend him for that.

Let me also say to the House staff, they have worked, on both sides, long hours, hard hours. If Members want to see some evidence of the output, look at the walls of this place, at all of the posters they have presented, only a fraction of which ever made it in the well of the House; but nevertheless, they will be seen between now and the next several weeks.

They won, but we will revisit this, I am sure, many times in the future. In any event, I thank the gentleman for the manner in which he has worked.

Mr. NUSSLE. Probably much to the chagrin of many Members who had to listen to this part of the debate.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 2002, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 3762

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and the Workforce have until midnight on Thursday, April 4, 2002, to file a report to accompany H.R. 3762.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF HOUSE AND SENATE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 360) providing for an adjournment or recess of the two Houses, and ask for its immediate consideration.