



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2002

No. 7

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 5, 2002.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CASS BALLENGER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

THE BUSH BUDGET

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we have gotten the President's glossified 2003 budget, complete with color photos, for the first time. What a difference a year makes, not only in the format but in the content. A year ago, the President and the Office of Management and Budget said, there are surpluses as far as the eye can see, at least for the next 10 years, huge and growing surpluses.

A few of us were dubious about predicting the economy 10 years out and about this rosy scenario, but in any

case they persisted. They went on to also say, "We're going to create a lockbox for all of the Social Security surplus, \$2.5 trillion. We're going to create a lockbox for all of the Medicare trust fund surplus." And they were concerned that we would retire the \$6 trillion national debt too quickly. They were worried about that.

Well, here we are a year later and rather than paying down the debt too quickly, as was projected last year, the Bush budget will create an additional \$2 trillion of deficit by 2012, if you do not take the Social Security and Medicare trust funds and spend them, which, of course, he proposes to do. The President's budget would divert all of the Medicare surplus and 60 percent, or \$1.5 trillion, that is \$1,500 billion for those who cannot go to the Ts, of the Social Security surplus to pay for other government programs.

What are the causes of this? We would be led to believe there is only one cause, the attacks on America. Let us look at the real underlying causes. Actually, the disappearance of the surplus is due to, and these are figures from the Congressional Budget Office which is headed by a Republican, 41 percent are due to the tax cut, 23 percent are due to the recession, 10 percent increased military spending, 8 percent increased spending for homeland security, and 16 percent technical adjustments.

What is the reaction down at the White House? The reaction at the White House is, "Let's make those tax cuts," which are contributing 41 percent of the increase in deficit, "let's make them permanent. Let's in fact expand them." That is what the President's budget proposes. So that those who earn over \$383,000 a year and those with estates over \$5 million will be assured that the laughable assumption in last year's budget that their tax cuts will be sunsetted after 10 years and everything, all the tax cuts, will be going

away; let's make those permanent with the strange exception of one that would particularly benefit the middle class, which has to do with a complicated computation of an alternative tax for individuals, that one does not get made permanent.

But the exemption of estates over \$5 million does, and the huge reduction in rates for people who earn over \$383,000. At what cost? At tremendous cost. The cost is a whole host of reductions in worthy domestic programs which the President has proposed in this year's budget hidden sort of in the appendices and the asterisks and some obfuscation here and there; but there are cuts in education, there are cuts in needed social programs. There is inadequate funding for a prescription drug benefit for people on Medicare, with no cost controls on the pharmaceutical industry. Basically, the program would tend to very, very few seniors' needs. But all this is being done so that the tax cuts can be made permanent.

Usually, when a country is under attack, Presidents call for sacrifice; and many Americans and many in Congress agree with that, homeland security, necessary expenditures to arm our young men and women serving so valiantly in the military. There is tremendous agreement on those. But let us also make our economic future secure. Unfortunately, the only security in the President's budget goes to, again, those at the very top, those who earn over \$383,000 a year, and those who have estates worth more than \$5 million.

If you just froze the benefits for those people, the elite of the elite, the richest of the rich, those who do not care about Social Security, do not care about a prescription drug benefit, do not care about education funding because their kids go to private schools, if you just froze those people in place so they contributed a little bit more in this time of sacrifice and attack on the United States of America, then you

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H111

could reduce substantially the draw on the Social Security trust funds and the increase in the deficit.

But the President and his advisers say, no, absolutely not, those people, those \$5 million-plus estates, those people who earn over \$383,000, they need every penny of that tax cut because they will spend the money in ways that might put some people to work at a minimum wage which could then pay taxes which would help defray the deficit and the economy will be growing into the future.

I would hope that the Congress rejects these assumptions, these priorities, and substantially rewrites this budget.

INTRODUCTION OF ULTRASOUND LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this morning to alert Members to a piece of legislation that I will introduce today, and I hope they will consider it. It is a bill that will be of benefit to health clinics all over this country. Many health clinics that wish to provide medical services to unprepared pregnant women are prohibited from doing so because of the lack of funds to purchase medical equipment. The mother is, therefore, forced to wander from one clinic to another in search of the services she so desperately needs. Enabling these health clinics to purchase ultrasound equipment would be a persuasive push in the direction of transitioning from a health clinic to a medical facility.

Mr. Speaker, the advantages of ultrasound machines are many. It is fast and relatively cheap, costing as little as \$50 per exam. Ultrasound exams are performed at about 10 to 14 weeks of the pregnancy and are considered the best way to gauge growth and anatomy before birth. Ultrasound can diagnose heart problems in this country in the unborn child, find neural tube defects, including spina bifida, and determine the position of the placenta. There is now even ultrasound equipment that can provide a three-dimensional image that can rotate 360 degrees to see all the sides of the baby.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I plan to introduce a bill today that will authorize Health and Human Services to establish grants for which nonprofit health clinics could apply and, if awarded, purchase needed ultrasound equipment. This legislation will ensure that doctors can provide critical information to mothers in their decision-making process regarding their pregnancies. Nothing in this bill makes ideology regarding abortion a condition of the grant. Whether a center offers abortion or abortion alternatives, the clinic is still eligible.

In the fiery controversy over abortion in America, emotionally charged

rhetoric clouds the issue and does damage to the efforts made on behalf of mother and child. No matter what one's conviction is concerning abortion, we can all agree that the mother deserves as much information as is available in making this solemn decision. Information is the best weapon in defusing the volatile discussion and returning us to our first concern, which is the health of the mother and the child. The ultrasound is a valuable tool in expanding the debate beyond traditional platitudes on both sides of the argument.

Modern medicine has provided us with a window into the womb. These advances in technology empower women with as much information as possible regarding her pregnancy. The goal of this legislation is to provide women who find themselves with an unplanned pregnancy with the full scope of information such that they may make a fully informed decision.

This bill is about the dissemination of information. This bill is about extending more free services to women and about making available this vital technology to the poor and, of course, to the rich.

Mr. Speaker, there are times when people of good faith who differ on an issue can come together and find a place to agree. I believe this legislation brings us beyond the shrill arguments regarding abortion and makes a meaningful step forward, a meaningful effort to care for the mother and child and bring more information to the woman.

I urge the Members to support my bill.

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO REIN IN SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President released his budget yesterday. Congress and probably many in America and throughout the world are starting to analyze just what this budget does.

I compliment the President for sending out a warning to Congress that he is not going to stand for excessive discretionary domestic spending for additional social programs. I think most of us agree that his increase in spending for defense and national security is not only reasonable but is required, realizing what happened on September 11 and the fact of what we have discovered in Afghanistan, that there are many terrorists throughout the world dedicated to cause the same kind of damage that those 19 individuals did on September 11. We are faced with the fact that thousands of individuals went through that same kind of perverted religious indoctrination and eventually the training on how to be terrorists with a dedication to injure the people of the free world, especially in the

United States, and destroy some of our symbols of the freedom and liberty that we have in this country. It is a \$2.13 trillion budget, a budget that has continued to grow faster than inflation for the last 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, my particular concern is the fact that government is growing so rapidly. And I would hope that we could comply with the President's suggestion that we hold down the discretionary domestic spending so that the deficit is minimized, or hopefully there will be no deficit this year in terms of all funds coming into the Federal Government versus the funds going out of the Federal Government.

It was only a short time ago that both Republicans and Democrats in this Chamber pledged not to spend the Social Security surplus money. Maybe, maybe the kind of war that we are in justifies spending that money. But if I had had my druthers, I would have preferred that the President gave us a budget that was balanced, at least in the unified sense of total revenues coming in versus total expenditures going out. The reason for that is I think by the President suggesting that maybe it is okay this year to have an \$80 billion deficit, it is going to open the door for spenders, it is going to open the door for individual Members of the House and the Senate to suggest that as long as the President says it is okay to have a little deficit spending, let us have more deficit spending for some of these, quote-unquote, important programs that we think should go back to my particular district.

Pork-barrel spending has increased tremendously. I think that is because when Members learn that most of the other Members are getting things for their district, it is only fair for them in the treatment of their particular constituents to try to get pork-barrel spending for their particular district.

□ 1245

I think pork-barrel spending has got to stop. It is my hope and my encouragement to the leadership of this House on both sides of the aisle that this Chamber pass a budget resolution that is in balance; that we say here is the possibility of the \$80 billion that might go into a stimulus tax cut package to stimulate the economy, but, if that does not happen, we are going to balance the budget. The challenge now is holding the line on spending.

Let me give one example of what has happened in the last 5 years. In 1998 Congress said we promise to balance the budget by 2002. That balanced budget was predicated on an estimate by both OMB and CBO that there would be approximately \$1.4 trillion of revenue by 2002.

Guess what the revenue actually is going to be in 2002, this fiscal year ending next October? The actual revenue is going to be \$1.9 trillion. So my point is, Mr. Speaker, that revenues are much larger than we anticipated, but what happened is spending increased