

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

significantly more, so that we have ended up with a great deal of deficit spending. The difference between \$1.4 trillion and \$1.9 trillion in revenues, between the \$1.4 trillion we estimated 5 years ago and the \$1.9 trillion that is actually going to happen, even takes into consideration the tax cut we did last spring.

I would suggest that it behooves the United States to have the kind of economic expansion we want by not going deeper into debt, causing extra demand by the government in the money that is available for borrowing, which is ultimately going to increase interest rates and ultimately going to have a depressive effect on the economy.

I would close by again urging my Republican and Democratic friends to work towards a total unified balanced budget.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OTTER) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, ever present to Your people and closest to those in most need of Your mercy, we commend to You this day the Members of the United States House of Representatives with all their prayerful concerns.

Last week both Republican and Democratic Members set time aside to be on retreat, Lord.

As they drew away from the daily routine to gain deeper perspective, hopefully Your presence was made known to them.

As they examined issues facing this Nation and they crafted plans for the future, unexpectedly, Your provident love lifted their hearts to greater service to Your people.

As they became more aware of different opinions and the many possibilities open to achieve a common purpose, surprisingly Your spirit invited them to be respectful of others in every debate, patient in listening, as well as committed to finding solid resolve.

May personal convictions always be refined when civility reigns.

May partisan formulations always give way to what You require of this Nation.

For You are the eternal guide and strength for each Member personally and for the House as a whole both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the bill on the Private Calendar.

NANCY B. WILSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 392) for the relief of Nancy B. Wilson.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

MORE CRITICISMS OVER YUCCA MOUNTAIN: WHEN WILL THE DOE RESPOND?

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, last week the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board joined an ever-expanding list of independent experts who are criticizing the science being touted by the Department of Energy regarding the Yucca Mountain Project.

In its report the board called the DOE's science "weak to moderate."

Board member and hydrologist Paul Craig added that "many of the DOE's assumptions regarding Yucca Mountain are extreme and unrealistic."

John Bartlett, former Director of DOE's Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, stated that "the documentation does not provide a sound foundation for the basis of a site recommendation."

Moreover, the GAO has raised its own concerns with the Yucca Mountain Project, stating that "making a site recommendation at this time would not be prudent or practical."

Mr. Speaker, when will the DOE begin to answer the serious questions being raised about its failed science?

Hopefully they will do that before going any further into the site recommendation process and before the lives of millions of Americans are jeopardized.

ANNIVERSARY OF SIGNING OF TREATY OF GUADALUPE HIDALGO

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, February 2, 1848, marks the anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.

This is a treaty between Mexico and the United States which guaranteed Mexican citizens who remained in the United States certain property rights. One of the promises was to secure and protect the property rights of Mexican and Spanish citizens that have been granted land grants from Spanish and Mexican Governments.

The U.S. violated these promises. The General Accounting Office is looking into this historic wrong, and I have introduced a bill to remedy the situation and to correct these injustices. I urge my colleagues to help me in this effort. Please review my legislation and take a good hard look at it.

NO SPECIAL TREATMENT FOR JOHN WALKER LINDH

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about John Walker Lindh, the 20-year-old Californian who joined forces with the Taliban. Some observers have suggested that we cut him some slack since he is only 20 years of age.

There were 20-year-olds who showed up for work on 9/11 at the World Trade Center. Who cut them slack? There are 20-year-olds fighting in Afghanistan today, 20-year-old firefighters, 20-year-old policemen, 20-year-old EMS personnel who responded on 9/11. Who cut them slack? No. This young man should be prosecuted, and if convicted, appropriate punishment should be forthcoming.

Our Attorney General said it more eloquently than I, but I paraphrase: Simply because an accused is of tender years, Mr. Speaker, he is worthy of no special defense when he has committed criminal acts. No special treatment should be available to this young man or to others like him.

CAROL WRIGHT

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

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, with the Salt Lake City Winter Olympic Games just a few days away, today the Olympic torch will pass through Parowan, Utah.