

Waxman Wicker Wu
Weiner Woolsey Wynn

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Bonilla Nethercutt Wamp

NOT VOTING—7

Burton Lipinski Wexler
Deutsch Mascara
Emerson Traficant

□ 1823

Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Messrs. SANDERS, LARSEN of Washington, BAIRD and GUTIERREZ changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 94, noes 300, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

AYES—94

Ackerman Hefley Oberstar
Allen Hill Obey
Andrews Hinchey Oliver
Baird Hoekstra Owens
Barrett Holt Pascarelli
Becerra Honda Pelosi
Berman Jackson (IL) Pomeroy
Berry Jackson-Lee Rangel
Bishop (TX) Rodriguez
Borski Jefferson Roybal-Allard
Boucher Johnson, E. B. Sanchez
Boyd Jones (OH) Sandlin
Brady (PA) Kaptur Sherman
Brown (FL) Kelly Shows
Capuano Kilpatrick Slaughter
Clayton Langevin Snyder
Clement Lee Solis
Clyburn Lewis (GA) Spratt
DeFazio Lowey Stark
Delahunt Lynch Stupak
Doggett Maloney (NY) Taylor (MS)
Edwards Markey Thompson (MS)
Eshoo Matsui Tierney
Evans McCarthy (NY) Towns
Farr McDermott Udall (NM)
Filner McGovern Velazquez
Ford McNulty Visclosky
Frank Meehan Waters
Gephardt Meek (FL) Watson (CA)
Gordon Miller, George Waxman
Harman Mink Wynn
Hastings (FL) Neal

NOES—300

Abercrombie Barr Blumenauer
Aderholt Bartlett Blunt
Akin Barton Boehlert
Armey Bass Boehner
Baca Bentsen Bonilla
Bachus Bereuter Bono
Baker Berkley Boozman
Baldacci Biggert Boswell
Ballenger Bilirakis Brady (TX)
Barcia Blagojevich Brown (OH)

Brown (SC) Hulshof
Bryant Hunter
Burr Hyde
Buyer Inslee
Callahan Isakson
Calvert Israel
Camp Issa
Cantor Istook
Capito Jenkins
Capps John
Cardin Johnson (CT)
Carson (IN) Johnson (IL)
Castle Johnson, Sam
Chabot Jones (NC)
Chambliss Kanjorski
Collins Keller
Combest Kennedy (MN)
Condit Kennedy (RI)
Cooksey Kerns
Costello Kildee
Cramer Kind (WI)
Crane King (NY)
Crenshaw Kingston
Crowley Kirk
Cubin Kleczka
Culberson Knollenberg
Cummings Kolbe
Cunningham Kucinich
Davis (CA) LaFalce
Davis (FL) LaHood
Davis (IL) Lantos
Davis, Jo Ann Larsen (WA)
Davis, Tom Larson (CT)
Deal Latham
DeGette LaTourette
DeLauro Leach
DeLay Levin
DeMint Lewis (CA)
Diaz-Balart Lewis (KY)
Dicks Linder
Doolittle LoBiondo
Doyle Lofgren
Dreier Lucas (KY)
Duncan Lucas (OK)
Dunn Luther
Ehlers Maloney (CT)
Engel Manzullo
English Matheson
Etheridge McCarthy (MO)
Everett McCollum
Ferguson McCrery
Flake McHugh
Forbes McInnis
Fossella McKeon
Frelinghuysen McKinney
Frost Menendez
Gallegly Mica
Ganske Millender-
Gekas McDonald
Gibbons Miller, Dan
Gilchrest Miller, Jeff
Gillmor Mollohan
Gilman Moore
Gonzalez Moran (KS)
Goode Moran (VA)
Goodlatte Morella
Goss Murtha
Granger Myrick
Graves Nadler
Green (TX) Napolitano
Green (WI) Nethercutt
Grucci Ney
Gutierrez Northup
Gutknecht Norwood
Hall (TX) Nussle
Hansen Osborne
Hart Ose
Hastert Otter
Hastings (WA) Oxley
Hayes Pallone
Hayworth Pastor
Herger Paul
Hilliard Payne
Hobson Pence
Hoeffel Peterson (MN)
Holden Peterson (PA)
Hooley Petri
Horn Phelps
Hostettler Pickering
Houghton Pitts
Hoyer Pombo

NOT VOTING—41

Baldwin Coble Dooley
Bonior Conyers Ehrlich
Burton Cox Emerson
Cannon Coyne Fattah
Carson (OK) Deutsch Fletcher
Clay Dingell Foley

Graham McIntyre
Greenwood Meeks (NY)
Hall (OH) Miller, Gary
Hilleary Ortiz
Hinojosa Platts
Lampson Radanovich
Lipinski Rivers
Mascara Sanders

□ 1844

Mr. SHOWS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4775, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO INCLUDE EXTRA-NEOUS MATERIAL DURING CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 428

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to include extraneous material immediately following my remarks on the rule that has earlier passed.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1845

2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FURTHER RECOVERY FROM AND RESPONSE TO TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 428 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4775.

□ 1845

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4775) making supplemental appropriations for further recovery from and response to terrorist attacks on the United States for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring to the House the 2002 Supplemental Appropriations Bill. This is the first appropriations bill that we will be considering this year, and it should prove to be an interesting experience.

The Committee on Appropriations ordered this legislation reported last week. The bill is extremely important, and I believe it will enjoy broad bipartisan support. It is extremely important, Mr. Chairman, because this is a wartime supplemental appropriations bill. This is to pay for our wartime activities in Afghanistan and other places that our military troops might be deployed. This is a wartime appropriations bill to repay our military services for the monies they have already expended from their fourth quarter accounts.

This is an extremely important bill in that it also, besides providing money for the Defense Department, provides for our homeland security. As we get further away from September 11, we may be tempted to forget what happened on that day in the United States of America. But, Mr. Chairman, we were attacked. Our people were attacked. We are going to fight back. We are going to finance our effort to fight back.

The President of the United States is doing an outstanding job in leading our Nation in the prosecution of the military campaign. He is doing an outstanding job in leading our Nation in seeking out terrorist organizations wherever we can locate them and proceeding to bring them to justice. So it is a very important bill, Mr. Chairman. However, over the last 5 weeks, some of the focus has gotten lost on this important bill. It has been sort of like a ship growing barnacles. Everyone knows this is a must-pass bill, and there are probably 435 ideas of what should be added to or subtracted from it. But I want to remind everyone again, the focus of this bill is and must continue

to be that this is a wartime supplemental appropriations bill. It provides money for our troops. It provides money for our intelligence community. It provides money for the safety and security of our people and our community. It provides support for the victims of the attack in New York at the World Trade Center. And it provides funds to promote the U.S. foreign policy to prevent future attacks.

The committee reported a bill that provides \$29.387 billion and half of that, or \$15.8 billion, is for the Defense Department to continue to prosecute the war on terrorism. This bill supports the President. It fully funds his requirements for national security, foreign policy; and it provides an additional \$5.5 billion in support for recovery in New York. There is \$1.77 billion in additional funds for the Defense Department to pay for costs relating to the mobilization of the Guard and Reserve forces and to cover their operational expenses.

It provides for our country's biggest concern, securing our homeland, by providing \$5.8 billion. That is \$522 million above the President's request. It ensures that our nuclear assets can be secured and that law enforcement and our first responders, who are so important in providing for the safety of our people in our community, have adequate information to prevent, hopefully, or, if necessary, to respond to acts of terrorism.

It also gets the Transportation Security Administration up and running so that the traveling public will be safe. We have all heard the concerns raised over the past few days that the FBI had information that somehow was left out of security briefings for the President. The most important thing we can do to protect our country and our constituents from future attacks is to ensure that law enforcement and our intelligence community and the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, have timely access to accurate and complete information.

I have been to the FBI; and my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has been to the FBI. We have seen firsthand their antiquated technology equipment that needs to be enhanced, that needs to be updated, that needs to be brought into

today's world. We looked at this closely and determined that the President's request did not provide enough for that purpose. So in the terrorism supplemental last year we added \$132 million above the President's request for the FBI's information technology, and this supplemental bill contains an additional \$100 million above the President's request for additional technology enhancement for the FBI.

At this point, there will be some who try to assess the blame. We are here to find solutions and to provide the funding necessary to put those solutions in place.

Now, in addition to defense and homeland security, we had a shortfall in the Pell grant program, an important program for the education of our young Americans. We added \$1 billion to provide funding for the Pell grant program.

Our leadership, on a bipartisan basis, asked for funding to pay for the election reforms that we enacted earlier this year. So we added \$450 million for that purpose. We increased the President's budget request for defense by \$1.8 billion. In the committee, added by amendment, was \$250 million for Israel and for humanitarian relief for the Palestinians. We have added \$275 million over the President's request for veterans health care.

Mr. Chairman, we did not just spend the money. We had offsets. We had offsets of \$1.8 billion more than the President's budget request had asked for. And so, Mr. Chairman, this is a good supplemental bill. It is well within the budget limits placed on us by the 2002 budget resolution.

I hope that we can consider this bill as what it is, a wartime emergency supplemental. I hope that we are not distracted by the other issues that were debated heatedly during the consideration of the rule. Let us focus today on this wartime emergency supplemental for our troops, for our security agencies, for our intelligence agencies, for the FBI and for the President of the United States to be able to do the things that we are demanding that he do, and that is to make America secure and to seek out those who perpetrate or would perpetrate terrorist attacks against our Nation.

H.R. 4775—2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

(Dollars in thousands)

	Budget request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with request
CHAPTER 1			
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
Food Safety and Inspection Service (contingent emergency)		2,000	+2,000
Food and Nutrition Service: Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)	75,000	75,000	
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service: Salaries and expenses (contingent emergency)		10,000	+10,000
Natural Resources Conservation Service: Watershed Rehabilitation Program (rescission)	– 9,000		+9,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES			
Food and Drug Administration: Salaries and expenses (contingent emergency)		18,000	+18,000
General Provisions: Export Enhancement Program (limitation) (sec. 101)		– 450,000	– 450,000
Total, chapter 1	66,000	– 345,000	– 411,000
CHAPTER 2			
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
General Administration: Salaries and expenses (emergency)	5,750	5,750	

H.R. 4775—2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT—Continued

(Dollars in thousands)

	Budget request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with request
LEGAL ACTIVITIES			
United States Marshals Service: Salaries and expenses (contingent emergency)		1,000	+1,000
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Salaries and expenses (emergency)	10,000	10,000	
Contingent emergency		102,000	+102,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service: Enforcement and Border Affairs: Salaries and expenses (emergency)	35,000	35,000	
Contingent emergency		40,000	+40,000
Office of Justice Programs: Justice assistance (emergency)		175,000	+175,000
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES RELATED AGENCIES			
Office of the United States Trade Representative:			
Salaries and expenses (contingent emergency)		1,100	+1,100
European Communities Music Licensing Dispute	3,300		—3,300
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
Export Administration: Operations and Administration (emergency)	8,700		—8,700
National Institute of Standards and Technology: Scientific and Technical Research and Services (emergency)	4,000	4,000	
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration: Fisheries Finance Program Account (limitation on direct loans)	(24,000)	(24,000)	
Negative subsidy	—3,000	—3,000	
Departmental Management: Salaries and expenses (emergency)	400	400	
THE JUDICIARY			
Supreme Court of the United States: Care of the Buildings and Grounds (emergency)	10,000	10,000	
United States Courts of Appeals for the Federal Circuit: Salaries and expenses (emergency)	857		—857
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services: Salaries and expenses (emergency)	3,143	3,143	
Contingent emergency		3,115	+3,115
DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCY DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
Administration of Foreign Affairs:			
Diplomatic and Consular Programs (emergency)	51,050	51,050	
Capital Investment Fund (emergency)	2,500		—2,500
Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs (emergency)	10,000	10,000	
Contingent emergency		10,000	+10,000
Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance (emergency)	200,516	200,516	
Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service (emergency)	8,000		—8,000
International Organizations and Conferences:			
Contributions to International Organizations (emergency)	7,000	7,000	
Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (emergency)	43,000	43,000	
RELATED AGENCY			
Broadcasting Board of Governors:			
International Broadcasting Operations (emergency)	7,400	7,400	
Broadcasting capital improvements (contingent emergency)		7,700	+7,700
RELATED AGENCIES			
Securities and Exchange Commission: Salaries and expenses	20,000	20,000	
Contingent emergency		9,300	+9,300
Total, chapter 2	427,616	753,474	+325,858
CHAPTER 3 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY			
Military Personnel: Military Personnel, Air Force (emergency)	206,000	206,000	
Operation and Maintenance:			
Operation and Maintenance, Army (emergency)	107,000	107,000	
Contingent emergency		119,000	+119,000
Operation and Maintenance, Navy (emergency)	36,500	36,500	
Contingent emergency		17,250	+17,250
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (emergency)	41,000	41,000	
Contingent emergency		19,500	+19,500
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (emergency)	739,000	739,000	
Contingent emergency		12,975	+12,975
Defense Emergency Response Fund (emergency)	11,300,000	11,300,000	
Contingent emergency		1,393,972	+1,393,972
Procurement:			
Other Procurement, Army (emergency)	79,200	79,200	
Aircraft Procurement, Navy (emergency)	22,800	22,800	
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (emergency)	262,000	262,000	
Other Procurement, Navy (emergency)	2,500	2,500	
Procurement, Marine Corps (emergency)	3,500	3,500	
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (emergency)	93,000	93,000	
Contingent emergency		36,500	+36,500
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (emergency)	115,000	115,000	
Other Procurement, Air Force (emergency)	752,300	735,340	—16,960
Procurement, Defense-Wide (emergency)	99,500	99,500	
Contingent emergency		4,925	+4,925
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation:			
RDT&E, Army (emergency)	8,200	8,200	
RDT&E, Navy (emergency)	19,000	9,000	—10,000
RDT&E, Air Force (emergency)	60,800	60,800	
Contingent emergency		39,000	+39,000
RDT&E, Defense-Wide (emergency)	74,700	52,000	—22,700
Contingent emergency		20,000	+20,000
General Provisions:			
General Transfer Authority (sec. 305)	(1,000,000)		(—1,000,000)
MH-47 Helicopters (contingent emergency) (sec. 308)		93,000	+93,000
Chemical Demil (contingent emergency) (sec. 309)		100,000	+100,000
Rescissions (sec. 310)		—59,000	—59,000
Total, chapter 3	14,022,000	15,769,462	+1,747,462
CHAPTER 4 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS Operating Expenses			
Division of Expenses:			
Public education system (rescission)		(—37,000)	(—37,000)
Human Support Services:			
Child and Family Services Agency		(11,000)	(+11,000)
Department of Mental Health		(26,000)	(+26,000)
Repayment of loans and interest (rescission)		(—7,950)	(—7,950)
Certificates of participation		(7,950)	(+7,950)
Total, chapter 4			
CHAPTER 5 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY			
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Operation and Maintenance, General (contingent emergency)		128,400	+128,400

H.R. 4775—2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT—Continued

(Dollars in thousands)

	Budget request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with request
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY			
Energy Programs: Science (contingent emergency)		29,000	+29,000
National Nuclear Security Administration:			
Weapons Activities (emergency)	19,400	19,400	
Contingent emergency		106,000	+106,000
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (contingent emergency)		5,000	+5,000
Environmental and Other Defense Activities:			
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management (contingent emergency)		67,000	+67,000
Defense Facilities Closure Projects (contingent emergency)		16,600	+16,600
Other Defense Activities (emergency)	7,000	7,000	
Total, chapter 5	26,400	378,400	+352,000
CHAPTER 6			
BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE			
Funds Appropriated to the President			
United States Agency for International Development:			
Child Survival and Health Programs Fund (contingent emergency)		200,000	+200,000
International Disaster Assistance (emergency)	40,000		—40,000
Contingent emergency		190,000	+190,000
Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development (emergency)	7,000	7,000	
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance:			
Economic Support Fund (emergency)	525,000	460,000	—65,000
Contingent emergency		250,000	+250,000
Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union (emergency)	110,000	110,000	
Department of State:			
International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (emergency)	114,000	120,000	+6,000
Migration & Refugee Assistance (contingent emergency)		10,000	+10,000
Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining and Related Programs (emergency)	83,000	83,000	
MILITARY ASSISTANCE			
Funds Appropriated to the President:			
Foreign Military Financing Program (emergency)	372,500	366,500	—6,000
Peacekeeping Operations (emergency)	28,000	20,000	—8,000
MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE			
Funds Appropriated to the President: Special Payments to the International Financial Institutions (rescission)	—157,000	—159,000	—2,000
General Provisions: Rescission (sec. 602)		—60,000	—60,000
Total, chapter 6	1,122,500	1,597,500	+475,000
CHAPTER 7			
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
Bureau of Land Management: Management of Lands & Resources (contingent emergency)		658	+658
United States Fish and Wildlife Service: Resource Management (contingent emergency)		1,443	+1,443
National Park Service:			
Operation of the National Park System (contingent emergency)		1,173	+1,173
Construction (contingent emergency)		19,300	+19,300
United States Geological Survey: Surveys, Investigations, and Research (contingent emergency)		25,700	+25,700
Bureau of Indian Affairs:			
Operation of Indian Programs (contingent emergency)		134	+134
Rescission	—10,000	—5,000	+5,000
Indian trust fund management litigation			
Departmental Offices: Departmental Management: Salaries and expenses (contingent emergency)		905	+905
RELATED AGENCY			
Smithsonian Institution:			
Salaries and expenses (contingent emergency)		11,000	+11,000
Construction (contingent emergency)		2,000	+2,000
Total, chapter 7	—10,000	57,313	+67,313
CHAPTER 8			
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
Employment and Training Administration: Training & Employment Services (contingent emergency)	750,000	300,000	—450,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES			
Health Resources and Services Administration: Health Resources and Services (rescission)	—20,000		+20,000
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Disease Control, Research, and Training (contingent emergency)		1,000	+1,000
National Institutes of Health: Buildings and facilities (rescission)	—30,000	—30,000	
Administration for Children and Families: Children and Families Services Programs (contingent emergency)		500	+500
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION			
Student Financial Assistance	1,276,000	1,000,000	—276,000
Total, chapter 8	1,976,000	1,271,500	—704,500
CHAPTER 9			
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH			
House of Representatives			
Committee Employees: Standing Committees, Special and Select		1,600	+1,600
Library of Congress: Copyright Office: Salaries and expenses (emergency)	7,500	7,500	
Joint Items			
Capitol Police Board			
Capitol Police: General Expenses (contingent emergency)		16,100	+16,100
Total, chapter 9	7,500	25,200	+17,700
CHAPTER 10			
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE			
Military Construction, Air Force (contingent emergency)		8,505	+8,505
Military Construction, Defense-wide (contingent emergency)		21,500	+21,500
Total, chapter 10		30,005	+30,005
CHAPTER 11			
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Office of the Secretary: Transportation Administrative Service Center (obligation limitation)	(128,123)	(128,123)	
Transportation Security Administration: Salaries and expenses (emergency)	2,455,000	2,305,000	—150,000
Contingent emergency	1,945,000	1,545,000	—400,000
Total, chapter 11	4,400,000	3,850,000	—550,000
U.S. Coast Guard: Operating Expenses (emergency)	189,000	189,000	
Contingent emergency		21,000	+21,000

H.R. 4775—2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT—Continued

(Dollars in thousands)

	Budget request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with request
Acquisition, Construction, & Improvements (emergency)	189,000	210,000	+21,000
Contingent emergency	66,000	66,000
	12,000	+12,000
Federal Aviation Administration:	66,000	78,000	+12,000
Operations (transfer authority)	(100,000)	(25,000)	(- 75,000)
Grants-in-aid for airports (contingent emergency)	200,000	+200,000
Federal Highway Administration: Federal-Aid Highways, Emergency Relief Program (Highway trust fund) (emergency)	167,000	167,000
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration:	19,300	19,300
Border Enforcement Program (Highway trust fund) (emergency)	5,000	+5,000
Hazardous materials security (Highway trust fund) (contingent emergency)
	19,300	24,300	+5,000
Federal Transit Administration: Capital Investment Grants (emergency)	1,800,000	1,800,000
Research and Special Programs Administration: Research and Special Programs (emergency)	3,500	- 3,500
General Provisions:
Airline loan program limitation (sec. 1103)	- 393,000	- 393,000
Air carrier compensation (sec. 1104) (rescission)	- 250,000	- 250,000
Total, chapter 11	6,644,800	5,686,300	- 958,500
CHAPTER 12			
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY			
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (contingent emergency)	15,870	+15,870
Financial Management Service (sec. 1201) (rescission)	- 14,000	- 14,000
Internal Revenue Service: Business Systems Modernization (sec. 1201)	14,000	+14,000
United States Secret Service (contingent emergency)	46,750	+46,750
POSTAL SERVICE			
Payment to the Postal Service Fund (emergency)	87,000	87,000
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS			
Appropriated to the President:
Office of Administration (emergency)	5,000	- 5,000
Office of Management and Budget (rescission)	- 750	- 750
Election Administration Reform and Related Expenses	450,000	+450,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
Federal Election Commission	750	+750
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION			
Real Property Activities: Federal Buildings Fund (emergency)	51,800	51,800
General Activities: Policy and Operations (emergency)	2,500	- 2,500
Total, chapter 12	146,300	651,420	+505,120
CHAPTER 13			
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS			
Veterans Health Administration:
Medical Care	142,000	417,000	+275,000
Medical and Prosthetic Research (rescission)	- 5,000	+5,000
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT			
Public and Indian Housing: Housing certificate fund (rescission)	- 300,000	- 300,000
Community Planning and Development:
Rural Housing and Economic Development (rescission)	- 20,000	+20,000
Community Development Fund (emergency)	750,000	750,000
Housing Programs: Rental Housing Assistance (rescission)	- 300,000	- 300,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES			
National Institute of Health: National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (emergency)	8,000	+8,000
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry: Salaries and expenses (emergency)	11,300	+11,300
Environmental Protection Agency: Hazardous Substance Superfund (emergency)	12,500	- 12,500
Federal Emergency Management Agency:
Disaster relief (emergency)	2,750,000	2,750,000
Disaster assistance for unmet needs (contingent emergency)	23,320	+23,320
Emergency management planning & assistance (emergency)	326,728	151,700	- 175,028
National Science Foundation: Education and Human Resources (emergency)	19,300	- 19,300
Total, chapter 13	3,975,528	3,511,320	- 464,208
Grand total (net)	28,404,644	29,386,894	+982,250
Appropriations	(1,513,300)	(1,975,350)	(+462,050)
Emergency appropriations	(24,447,344)	(24,091,099)	(- 356,245)
Contingent emergency appropriations	(2,695,000)	(5,341,195)	(+2,646,195)
Rescissions	(- 251,000)	(- 1,177,750)	(- 926,750)
Offsets	(- 843,000)	(- 843,000)

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to first of all congratulate the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), for doing his usual good job in trying to produce a bipartisan bill.

As members of the committee know, our committee worked for 6 weeks and produced a bipartisan bill. And I want to tell you some of the things that it did to correct some of the chaos that we see in some of the agencies that are dealing with counterterrorism.

We found out that the Department of Energy had asked for \$380 million to upgrade security so that weapons of mass destruction and nuclear material would be less susceptible either to terrorist attack or theft. OMB only approved 7 percent of that money. The committee provided the amount that was needed.

We also discovered that the Immigration and Naturalization Service had asked for \$52 million because they had the reasonable idea that we ought to be able to determine which immigrants, or which persons here on visas I should say, had overstayed their visas; visas had expired; they had been asked to

leave the country and, yet, had refused to do so. The INS wanted \$52 million to set up a system to stop that nonsense. The OMB denied it all. The committee put in enough money to deal with the problem.

The FBI, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has indicated that we discovered after September 11, the FBI had a great need for computer modernization. We discovered, for instance, that less than half the computers at the FBI could be used to send a picture of a suspected terrorist from one FBI office to another around the country. So last year, over the threat of a veto by the President of the United States,

we inserted enough money to see to it that that problem was corrected. As a result, Operation Trilogy will be up and running by the end of this summer, and we will have that capacity at the FBI.

In January, the FBI asked for an additional \$635 million to secure their records and to take other actions necessary to protect against terrorism. OMB denied 625 of the \$635 million, and the committee corrected that. In the last bill last year, we provided enough funds so that the Corps of Engineers could provide additional security for the hundred most vulnerable Federal sites in the country. The Corps of Engineers asked for an additional \$128 million to deal with threats to additional sites. OMB denied it. The committee moved to take care of it.

We also saw the chaos at the Transportation Security Administration, very well described in the committee report. That planning has been so bad that the agency, for instance, suggested that we ought to be paying the guards who are looking over the shoulders of screeners at airports up to \$84,000 a year, more than local mayors, more than airport directors would be paid in those same towns. It provided for 650 additional headquarters staff people here in Washington. And yet the budget request provided no money to house the new screening equipment that airports are supposed to install. So there would have been no way that we could have met the deadlines for having that equipment up and running. And the administration requested insufficient dollars to make certain that cockpit doors are fully secure by the end of the calendar year.

□ 1900

So the committee took actions to correct that.

The OMB also turned down the request from the Department of Defense for \$790 million to avoid the demobilizing of 20 percent of the Guard and Reserve forces who presently are filling slots on the border, in ports, on a temporary basis until people can be trained to take their place, and the committee took action to fix that problem. So I think that we had a good bipartisan product.

Now, there were problems with the bill after it emerged from the full committee. We did have an amendment offered by the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), which gave the President the authority to use our military forces to invade The Netherlands, if necessary, in order to extract Americans who might be held by the World Court.

I have a chart here labeled TOM DELAY's Proposed Invasion of The Netherlands. Gives you some idea of where The Hague is and what will be required by way of carrier capacity, tanker capacity, if we were to invade The Netherlands. If somebody wants to take that seriously, feel free. I think that it leaves us open to considerable

ridicule. But in spite of that I was willing to support this bill. But then we had the leadership attach this ridiculous rule to this bill which provided a convenient device by which the Nation's indebtedness could be raised by \$750 billion without any Member ever having voted on it directly, and they also imposed the House budget resolution, which will mean, I guarantee you, we will not have enough resources to produce appropriation bills that the House will pass.

So we have seen again, and this has happened often in this House, we have seen an original bipartisan piece of legislation emerge from this committee, and we have seen it fundamentally screwed up by adding extraneous items that have no business on an appropriations bill.

So I think we are going to be here a long time because some of us feel that the ability of the House to proceed in an orderly and fair-minded fashion is worth arguing about, and we will be doing that through a series of actions that we will be taking and amendments that we will be offering.

I do ask one additional question. As I said, we have had 116 of our Republican friends offer a resolution requiring that a three-fifths vote of this House be required in order to raise the indebtedness of the United States, and yet we have seen this flip-flop action here today, and I would ask the following Members, Representatives ADERHOLT, BACHUS, BARR, BARTON, BILIRAKIS, BLUNT, BONO, BRADY, BRYANT, CALVERT, CANTOR, CHABOT, CRANE, CULBERSON, DELAY, DOOLITTLE, DUNN, ENGLISH, FORBES, GEKAS, GOODLATTE, GRAVES, HAYWORTH, HERGER, BAKER, BARTLETT, BASS, BOEHNER, I can't read that signature, CANNON, CASTLE, CHAMBLISS, CUNNINGHAM, DEAL, DEMINT, DUNCAN, and all the others whose names I put in the RECORD earlier, I would ask them how they can go home to their constituents and tell them that they are going to vote to require a new higher threshold of votes on this House before the Nation can be plunged into more indebtedness and then engage in the flip-flop that they engaged in today whereby they have guaranteed that we will see a huge increase in national indebtedness when this bill comes back from the Senate?

I find that to be quaint and interesting.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), a member of the committee.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for allowing me to speak tonight and I stand in support of this bill.

This bill does 3 things, and it all goes back to that horrible day, 9/11. This bill continues the war on terrorism. This bill continues the battle for homeland

security, and it helps rebuild our beloved national city of New York.

Just remember, the American people will never forget September 11 and what this Congress has done immediately after 9/11 to start the battle. We will never forget the brave who died. We committed ourselves almost immediately to make sure that Osama bin Laden and all the terrorists around the globe would not be victorious.

This bill tonight is part of that battle. This bill has \$15.77 billion to support our troops, and I had the opportunity, with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations, to go on a bipartisan basis to Afghanistan. We went to Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Pakistan. We visited 4 of our bases, and we met with our troops, we met with Afghan soldiers, and I can say that they appreciate what the United States of America is doing. They are happy that we are there.

Their biggest concern is will we stay committed, and this bill tonight helps show the world that we are committed, not just behind our troops but behind the people over there so they can have a secure future. But the battle is not just in central Asia; it is all over the streets of America.

So the second thing this bill does is help secure our homeland. One of the things that it does is work with local law enforcement personnel to track down any potential suspicious terrorists or activities on a local level. This bill also helps secure everybody who is traveling; \$850 million to help check for baggage, explosives and detection systems; \$630 million for baggage screeners; \$75 million for security enhancements at U.S. ports. And I just want to talk about this.

Not all of us are traveling. Prior to 9/11 there were 1.2 million Americans in the air at any given day. Nowadays it is about 800,000, and what this does is it secures our airlines even further, but also our ports.

I am from Savannah. Last year in Savannah, we had 1 million containers come in. Of the 1 million, only 1 percent were actually screened and checked as to what their contents were. This bill helps expand that so that our ports can be secure.

It also strengthens our communities for any other disasters, working with EMS facilities and giving the local hospitals the support that they need and the expertise.

Our war against terrorism is not going to be over until every city in America is safe. As somebody told me, this war is about making sure we can go to Wal-Mart and not have to worry, and I think that that is something we all have to keep in mind.

Finally, in this bill is \$5.5 billion to help rebuild the great New York City, and that is going to be a long job, and I think it is certainly in the national interest to do so.

There are some other things in this bill that are less high profile but very important, and one of the things is there is \$1.6 million for additional staff and resources for the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and one of the issues that has come up recently is do we need a blue ribbon committee to study what went wrong on 9/11 and how can we do a better job.

Well, this bill addresses that because we already have an existing intelligence committee. It is bipartisan. One chairman is BOB GRAHAM of Florida, a Democrat. Another chairman is the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), a Republican. A bipartisan committee that has been working since January to look into 9/11. It is bicameral, Senate and House together, and it is comprised of experts. This bill addresses that, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding me the time, and I also want to take the opportunity to thank our chairman of the committee, and to me it has been a pleasure to work with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, and I rise to address the foreign operations component of this bill.

The foreign operations portion of the supplemental contains \$1.6 billion for various priorities and provides for the vast majority of the administration's requests. I am particularly pleased that the committee did not grant the broad waivers sought by the administration along with these funds but, rather, included specific waivers where appropriate.

This bill will give the President the broad latitude and flexibility that he sought to carry out the war on terrorism. While many have expressed concern that unnecessary funds for foreign operations were added to the bill, in excess of the President's request, I believe the funding added by this committee is extremely important.

In light of the fact that the committee received few details as to how the funding requested will actually be spent, we were well within our discretion to provide what we thought was necessary. I strongly support the additional funding in this bill for rebuilding Afghanistan, a long-term commitment we simply cannot shortchange, and I also support the additional funds provided for Israel.

The bill contains both military and economic assistance to a number of countries outside the immediate area of Afghanistan, such as the Philippines, Georgia and Yemen, where United States troops are or will be engaged in training indigenous forces to combat terrorism. The committee has approved funding in these instances with the clear expectation that the ad-

ministration will keep Congress fully informed of any change or expansion in the role of the United States forces. I hope this will indeed be the case.

As I said before, I strongly support the additional assistance to Israel that is included in this bill. Maintaining Israel's security and stability has long been a fundamental priority of the United States foreign policy. Israel has devoted precious resources to fighting the terror that continues to threaten its own citizens, 3 of whom were murdered just this week by suicide bombers, and the country is a key democratic ally in our war against terror.

This funding originally requested by the State Department as part of its supplemental request to OMB is essential to ensure our key partner in the Middle East remains strong. I urge my colleagues to oppose amendments to cut this funding.

I would like to take a moment to discuss 2 specific items of concern. First, the current status of fiscal year 2002 funds for the United Nations Population Fund. The conference agreement on the fiscal year 2002 foreign operations bill provided \$34 million for the organization, a deal that was painstakingly negotiated. The administration knew about our negotiations, and after the bill passed the House by an overwhelming margin, the President signed it on January 10, 2002.

Only after signing the bill did the administration express concern about as-yet unproven allegations that UNFPA supported coercive family planning practices in China in violation of U.S. law. In a direct challenge to clear congressional direction, the President waited 5 months to even investigate these claims, and UNFPA was forced to cut its staff and curtail its life-saving programs around the world.

During committee consideration of this bill, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and I offered an amendment which would have ensured that UNFPA received the funds intended for it by July 10, 7 months after the signing of the bill, unless the President determines that the organization is in violation of the U.S. law.

I am deeply disappointed that the Committee on Rules left this provision and another dealing with UNFPA unprotected. In my judgment, it was inappropriate to single out this particular issue while allowing the bill to come to the floor with highly controversial provisions regarding the International Criminal Court, the budget resolution and Medicare provider payments.

I anticipate the Senate bill will have something to say about UNFPA, and I look forward to discussing it in conference.

I am also disappointed that the rule did not allow me to offer an amendment increasing funding to address the global AIDS crisis. While this bill already contains \$200 million for HIV/AIDS, a clear indication that Congress recognizes the emergency nature of the

crisis, we can and should be doing more. Applications to the Global Fund to Combat Infectious Diseases have far exceeded the fund's resources, and this situation will only get worse as time goes by. Our own bilateral programs, while highly effective, will reach 25 percent of affected areas.

□ 1915

Our response to this tragedy must be as expansive as the pandemic itself so that we stop the wholesale destruction that AIDS is causing in Africa and will cause in other areas around the world.

As a global leader, we have the responsibility to take the initiative, jolting other donors into contributing more. Again, I anticipate that the Senate bill will far exceed ours, and I look forward to discussing this in conference as well.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the bill.

This bill provides much-needed appropriations for the Department of Transportation, particularly the new Transportation Security Administration and the U.S. Coast Guard. The bill also provides \$1.8 billion in additional expenses for the City of New York to address its transit needs in the wake of 9-11. And I am pleased that we were able to provide the vast majority of requested funds for all DOT agencies, except the TSA; and that is a special case.

The administration requested \$4.4 billion in supplemental funds, but the request made a curious statement. It admitted that OMB did not have a clue whether or not \$1.9 billion, almost half of the amount, was necessary. It asked Congress to write a blank check for that amount and let OMB figure it out later. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is not the way we do things on the Committee on Appropriations. We expect the administration to justify their request, all of it, in great detail. While some of that material is now being developed and being presented, it is clear much more work remains to be done. Because of that lack of supporting justification, the committee was unable to support the full request for contingency emergency funding for TSA.

Members should know that unless a change in direction is made, the TSA will be monstrous in size. When this agency was established last year, we thought we were creating an agency of about 33,000 people. The current estimate now is almost 70,000. We are planning to create a vast army of new Federal workers, some of whom would do nothing more than check your driver's license and airplane ticket or run your shoes over to an x-ray machine and bring them back to you. TSA plans to

hire over 3,000 people just to sit in a chair and make sure someone does not run the wrong way down an exit lane.

Mr. Chairman, there has to be a better way. I do not intend to recommend funds for a 70,000-man bureaucracy full of shoe runners and exit-lane watchers. Technology can obviate the need for thousands of these positions, and others are not the purview of TSA or simply not essential. So I believe strongly that TSA needs to look more carefully at its growth plans, and I will continue to press them as the fiscal year 2003 appropriations process unfolds.

This supplemental bill asks TSA to begin that review now. We provide full funding for the procurement and installation of bond detection systems at airports. In fact, we even raise those funds because the request, we thought, was inadequate. But we have not provided funds to build up that 70,000-man agency. The bill caps staffing at no more than 45,000 full-time positions. I believe that anyone who reviews TSA's plans in detail, as I have, will conclude that this is sufficient for the first year of that agency. In fact, it is about twice the number of people who were performing screening activities just 1 year ago.

I am pleased that the bill provides even more funding than requested by the Coast Guard, an agency on the front line of the fight for homeland security. We provide the FAA flexibility to address operating budget shortfalls which stem from extra security expenses at air traffic control facilities, and we provide additional funds for review of truck drivers who apply to drive hazardous materials within the country. These are all vitally needed transportation security improvements, and I am pleased we were able to fund them, especially given the tight budget constraints placed on us in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good bill given the constraints placed on the committee, and I ask Members to support it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise with some concern about the process here in the United States House of Representatives. I am a proud member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I am proud of the work we do there. I am also very proud of the Chair, who I think manages that committee very fairly. But something happened on the way through the process here that stinks.

The committee worked very hard to try to pay for the needed costs of what has happened in this country since we were here last year, the unexpected costs; and that is why this bill is needed. This is an emergency bill. It provides additional funds to pay for essentially contingencies that were not anticipated; and as we have heard, 9-11 is the biggest of those. But also there is an old adage here that says this is the only train that is going to make it all

the way to the White House, and if you want to be on that train, you better load up.

I think that the committee did a good job of making sure that this was not a big pork process and that it did not load up too much; and that is always a tough bipartisan effort to put out a good bill. But after the bill was put out of the committee, it went to the Committee on Rules, and there the word came down that this bill was going to be beefed up. It was going to be loaded up, and it was going to take care of the political problems that certain Members of this House were having.

I am from California, and we all know that California is facing a big financial problem. It is in debt. It is a big State, the biggest producer of taxes in the United States, and the biggest contributor of taxes to the Federal Government. It is a State that probably can take credit for the surge in the economy in the last decade, and a State that was hardest hit in the recession, particularly to the dot-com industry that was such a success.

So that is why the State is in debt. Its revenues just did not meet expectations. It had incredible costs to pay for energy, costs that we are now seeing were not the State's problem, but a manipulation of the market by the private sector. Yet we find in California that we have a lot of hard-liners who feel that we ought to have constitutional amendments on requiring a balanced budget, as we do in California. The State is not allowed to go into debt; and, therefore, the legislature, at this moment, is cutting like mad and in fact doing some tough political things in an election year. They are even raising some new revenue.

But Members of the California delegation who are here in the other party have come out in signing a resolution, H.J. Res. 86, introduced this year, to amend the United States Constitution to require a two-thirds vote if we are to raise the debt limit. But guess what, they are the ones, the first ones to criticize a Democratic Governor in California and then turn around in this House, put their name on a resolution to require a constitutional amendment to do the same as California.

But this bill, because of the way it was amended in the Committee on Rules, it allows them to essentially duck a vote on the debt increase, a huge debt increase, of the Federal Government. We have a dozen Republicans from California that are coauthors of that bill who now run away from the responsibility of having a balanced budget to allow the United States Government to go into a big deficit. That is wrong. It is the wrong way to handle this emergency appropriations bill.

We will see in the debate tonight a sort of in-your-face; that if you do not vote for this bill, you are not voting for the soldiers; if you do not vote for the bill, you are not voting for the firemen; if you do not vote for this bill, you are

not voting for a half dozen other particular interests out there. That is not the reason why a lot of people are going to vote against this bill. The reason is that this process has been corrupted by essentially hijacking a legitimate bill and making it a bill with all kinds of other political riders on it, the kind of process that we around here always complain about; that we ought to be fair and open and full of transparency. The process was hijacked. And it is not the fault of the appropriators; it is not the fault of the good work of the Committee on Appropriations. It is the fault of the Committee on Rules taking mandates from Republican leadership. That is wrong.

I just hope that tonight, as the debate goes on, that people realize this was a good bill, put out by a good committee, and it was hijacked along the way to do wrong for the United States and to do evil in the budgetary process. This essentially takes money that is in our Social Security account, takes money that is in the Medicare account and requires those monies to be spent on things that should not be spent on by those accounts.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water.

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

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

First, let me say I have great admiration for the chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and for the efforts he has put into this bill, as well as those of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) representing the minority of this House.

Secondly, as I approach the last year of my tenure here in the Congress of the United States, I just want to tell my colleagues that today is a classic example of how great this institution is. In America and in every democracy, a majority rules. Just a few minutes ago I was in the well of this House arguing against something on a principle that I believe very deeply in, and I lost, because a majority rules. When this bill passes it will be because a majority of us will vote for it. And if a majority votes for it, it will go on to the Senate.

But this is a great institution, filled with great people, with great minds, with great Americans, who have one thing in common, and that is we all want to do what is best for America.

As I listen to the debate on this floor each week, I hear the Democrats on the one hand saying this is not the right avenue to take. And I hear my majority Republican Party saying this is the avenue we should take. But very seldom do we have different destinations. We are all trying to get to the same corner of the room. Now, the Democrats, in many cases, choose to go to

the left to get there; and the Republicans choose to go to the right to get to, guess what, the same destination.

There is no doubt that we want to do everything we possibly can in this war on terrorism. There is no doubt that we all want to support the President of the United States to make certain that the administration has ample facilities and ample resources to provide the services they need to provide to the American people. It is only right that we disagree, but it is only right that a majority rules. And while I was defeated in my quest to change the rule to move in a different direction, a majority of the Members of this House voted to tell me that they disagreed with me, and I respect that.

I will have amendments tonight to change the direction of this bill, amendments that will reduce some sections of this bill I do not like. But guess what, I have \$378 million for energy and water in this bill, which is vitally needed by the areas of government that my committee has jurisdiction over. There are so many good things in this bill, and there are a few things that I wish were not in there. So a majority should prevail there too, Mr. Chairman.

As we debate this issue tonight to decide whether we ought to vote "yes" or "no" on final passage, we weigh the good over the bad. And while these are some things that I disagree with in here, the good in this particular case outweighs the bad.

So as I leave, I respect this institution. I respect all of my colleagues. I respect the great tradition of this House. And I respect that we live in a democracy where we can differ, but, nevertheless, in a democracy where a majority rules. And that is what America is all about.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), the distinguished deputy whip.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend and my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for yielding me this time.

This evening, I rise in strong opposition to raising the debt limit.

□ 1930

The Republicans are trying to sneak in a provision that increases the debt ceiling without a full, fair, open and honest debate. Apparently the other side, the majority party, are hiding something. What are they hiding? What is the great secret?

The American people deserve to know that the funds for a debt limit increase will come directly from the Social Security trust fund. We need to protect Social Security and ensure that we meet our obligations today. Instead, the majority party, the Republicans, are stealing from the Social Security trust fund and increasing our national debt every chance they get. For the next 10 years, we will increase

the debt by more than \$300 billion. Something is wrong with that.

This party, the Republicans, are mortgaging the future of our children. They are ripping away the safety for our Nation's seniors. Increasing the debt limit is like increasing the credit limit on your credit card. What does this do? It just puts you in a deeper and deeper hole. That is what the Republicans are doing. So do not be fooled. They are putting us in deeper debt and it is their obligation to get us out of it. We should not spend Social Security on anything other than Social Security. American families work hard to pay into a system that they should be able to count on when they retire. Social Security is a sacred trust, a sacred covenant between the American people and our government. We must never, never, ever take away the security out of Social Security. Let us keep our promise to the American people.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to my colleagues that this bill contains \$1 billion for the Pell grants. Why? Because more Americans are seeking these grants. This amount ensures that every qualified student applicant will receive a Pell grant and this can spell the difference of more opportunities for a better job and a chance to participate more fully in the American dream. I think it is vitally important that we approve the legislation with this particular feature in the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. The bill includes \$112 million for the FBI, which is \$102 million above the request of the administration; but it will help the FBI do what they have to do. The recommendation also includes \$10 million for the foreign terrorist tracking task force, a multiagency effort to prevent terrorists from coming into the country. We certainly need that as quickly as possible.

\$75 million is recommended for the INS, \$40 million above the request. Again the administration was low in its request. You cannot complain about the INS and then not fund its necessary programs, including \$49 million to address the shortfall in the immigration inspection account; \$25 million to bolster efforts to track and apprehend people who have absconded on deportation orders; and \$1 million to continue development of an entry-exit system.

The bill also has \$175 million for the Justice Department for State and local first responder equipment, training and planning needs. This funding is provided to the Department of Justice as authorized by the USA Patriot instead of being provided to FEMA as requested.

For the State Department and the Broadcasting Board of Governors, the bill includes a total of \$337 million for critical embassy security and public diplomacy needs. After September 11, a lot of attention has been paid to the inadequacy of public diplomacy efforts. We are not doing an adequate job of telling America's story to the world and communicating effectively with the foreign public. To improve this effort, the bill includes \$52.6 million for information, exchange and broadcasting programs of the State Department and the Broadcasting Board of Governors, \$27.7 million above the request. The amount also includes \$17.5 million for information programs, \$20 million for international exchange programs, \$7.4 million for the continuation of the Radio Free Afghanistan, and \$7.7 million to expand the reach of the Middle East Radio Network.

Then in closing, the bill also includes \$20 million for 100 additional positions at the SEC to address the immediate and urgent need for increased oversight of the accounting industry.

Finally, the bill includes a provision authorizing the closed circuit transmission of the Moussaoui trial to victims of the September 11 attacks, and we also provide the requisite funding for that.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important and an emergency issue. I urge quick passage of the bill, hopefully through the Senate and to the President for his signature.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) concerning INS fee collections.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I would be pleased to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 2002 Commerce Justice State appropriations bill authorizes the Attorney General to charge and collect a \$3 fee per individual for immigration inspection and preinspection activities related to commercial ships.

It is my understanding that it was not the intent of this provision to levy additional costs on regularized commuter ferry traffic between foreign countries and the United States and that it was this concern that led the committee to include an exemption for

ferries operating on the Great Lakes between Canada and the United States in the legislation. I would like to bring to the committee's attention another region of the United States that I believe should be provided an exemption from this fee. Several passenger ferries operate between Washington State and Canada carrying passengers, cars and freight daily between the two countries. The new fee would significantly increase ferry ticket prices charged to commuters and businesses.

It had been my intent to offer an amendment to this bill exempting certain ferry vessels from this fee. However, the committee has indicated that it would prefer to deal with this issue comprehensively in the fiscal year 2003 Commerce Justice State appropriations bill. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from New York if my understanding accurately reflects their intention.

Mr. WOLF. I would say, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington is absolutely correct. It was our intent to differentiate these commuter vessels from cruise ships. As part of the fiscal year 2003 appropriation process, we absolutely will explore legislative exemptions to ensure that the fee does not have unintended consequences. I thank the gentleman for bringing this to our attention. We will take care of it.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SERRANO. I agree with the gentleman from Virginia and look forward to working with him and the gentleman from Washington to ensure that this fee is fairly and equitably imposed.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen very much for engaging in the colloquy.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

Mr. ISTOOK. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for the opportunity to speak in favor of this legislation that is before us.

Mr. Chairman, as it has been mentioned, there are three purposes behind this bill: it is a wartime supplemental. First, to pay for the expenses, the huge expenses of our war against terrorism. Secondly, to pay the major expenses of homeland security to protect the United States borders and the people in the country. And, third, to provide the emergency assistance for those that have suffered through these disasters relating to terrorism.

I rise to address some of the elements relating to homeland security. We did not begin just after September 11 to try to address homeland security. Our subcommittee, among other things, funds the U.S. Customs Service. Even before September 11, we had allocated major funds to put 285 additional agents of the Customs Service at our

borders, to add \$33 million in inspection technology to examine the cargo that is coming into the country, looking for dangerous substances as well as drugs that could be sought to be brought in. Then we continued this process in the supplemental that we passed in December, not only paying for recovery and restoration of the offices that were destroyed in New York City but also beefing up the air and marine operations of the Customs Service, providing the funding with which the Customs Service is already adding over 300 additional special agents, over 600 additional border inspectors and the support people to go along with it.

There is another \$68 million in the technology to be able to examine, without having to open all the containers, the cargo that comes into the country; and the major expansion of the training that is necessary for the people that are coming in as new Federal law enforcement people. This supplemental continues those efforts. For example, the Federal law enforcement training center in Georgia has to train some 6,000 investigative personnel of the Transportation Security Administration. This bill has the funding for those personnel. It has additional funding to add more security at the Federal buildings under the supervision of the General Services Administration which is the landlord for our Federal Government. It has some \$87 million to help pay for better filtration equipment and other items to protect workers in the postal system against the threats of anthrax or any other substance that someone might send as part of a terrorist act through the mail.

There are major other elements of this bill trying to protect our Nation, trying to secure our borders, to detect and deter and halt threats before they get into the United States of America. This is a major and significant effort. I want to thank Chairman Young and everyone who has been responsible for making these resources available to better secure our homeland.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my concern about the procedures used to bring this important legislation to the House floor and the lack of inclusion in doing so. I would point out in the rule that was adopted earlier today in this Chamber, section 1404 was added to the underlying legislation relative to the treatment of certain counties for the purpose of reimbursement under the Medicare program. I do not rise today to express my opposition to the inclusion of those counties if relief is necessary for them. I rise in opposition to a point that other counties were not included as well.

The fact is, under this legislation, counties in Lackawanna, Pennsylvania; Luzerne, Pennsylvania; Wyo-

ming, Pennsylvania; Columbia, Pennsylvania; Lycoming, Pennsylvania; and Mercer, Pennsylvania, were included. Hospitals in Orange County, New York, were included. Hospitals in Dutchess County, New York, were included.

On November 7 of last year, I wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means explaining that Porter Memorial Hospital in Porter County, Indiana, was experiencing similar difficulty as far as an inequitable reimbursement under their classification in Medicare reimbursement. On January 22 of this year, I received a response from the honorable chairman indicating that he had received my communication, that hearings would be held and I would be notified. On February 5 of this year I wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and asked that we be allowed to testify on behalf of Porter Memorial Hospital in Porter County, Indiana.

□ 1945

Subsequent to February 5, no hearings were held that I am aware of. We were not asked to provide any materials for justification as far as the arguments for Porter Memorial Hospital. But tonight, on May 22, I find out that we have 8 hospital counties in the States of Pennsylvania and New York whose problems are being rectified tonight. That is not fair. That is not inclusive in this legislative process. Porter Memorial Hospital in the State of Indiana, in the County of Porter, is as deserving.

I would hope as this session proceeds that the representations made by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means on January 22 that hearings were going to be held and that action on this vital issue to Porter Memorial Hospital would be taken.

The fact is that Porter Memorial Hospital is located very near Chicago, Illinois. Their costs of providing care to residents in that area are comparable to the City of Chicago, Illinois, but the reimbursements are not. There is a differential for an adjoining county between Cook County, Illinois, and Porter County, Indiana. That is Lake County, Indiana, and that places the people at Porter County in a further disadvantage. I would hope that this problem is rectified.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for being a champion for my State, New York.

As a number of Members have mentioned, there are 3 goals to this supplemental. I would like to address the New York City component of that. We remember well President Bush's pledge to do whatever it takes. A number of

\$20 billion was discussed. There was a lot of discussion, a lot of contention about that in the last supplemental. The President said, "I am good for my word." The chairman said the President's word is good. I said the President's word would be good. And the President's word is as good as gold. In fact, this brings the total appropriation for New York City to \$21.5 billion.

There is \$5.5 billion additional in this for the reconstruction and recovery of New York, \$1.8 billion for transportation, \$2.75 billion for FEMA, and \$750 million for HUD. The HUD fund, CDBG funds, have enabled New York City to begin to put itself back together again and at the same time retain the businesses and the residences of the people who live in that Lower Manhattan neighborhood.

I was there just 2 weeks ago, and I was there the Friday after the attack, with President Bush. It is a remarkably different place. Then it was total devastation. Today the World Trade Center site looks like a construction site. It is hallowed ground, clearly, but New York is back to work.

Is there more to do? There is lots more to do. Decisions have not yet been made on what to do at that site. But the fact of the matter is the neighborhood is alive, it is vibrant, and it is New York City again. It has that hum in Lower Manhattan.

So the President kept his promise, the Congress is keeping its promise, and it is a remarkable thing to see the vibrancy of that city returning.

Is there more to do? Yes. Is there planning to be done at the World Trade Center site? Yes. But the New Yorkers will make that decision, with the help of the Federal Government and the people of the United States.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I was very supportive of the supplemental appropriations bill as we worked our will in committee under the quite able leadership of our chairman and ranking member. I am, however, somewhat concerned about the rule and the self-executing nature of the various amendments to this, particularly the one related to the debt ceiling and the like.

I just want my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations to know that I think the original work of the committee as reported represented, I think, an appropriate response to a number of issues facing the country at this time, and I was particularly pleased with the work that was done to help the District of Columbia meet some of the needs that have been associated with September 11 in terms of police overtime and the like. I just want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work on those important matters.

As we conclude our work, I would hope that in the future we would not have these types of add-ons. But it is part of the process, unfortunately, and

we will have to work our will here on the floor. But the committee deserves, I think, appropriate thanks from the House for the original work that was done.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time. I do so to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, first may I compliment the gentleman and his committee on his efforts to get needed support to our first responders, our firefighters, so they can better prepare for any terrorist attack that may occur.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, the President's fiscal year 2003 budget request proposes consolidating existing preparedness programs under the Office of National Preparedness within the Federal Emergency Management Agency. This is a proposal Congress will be addressing in the coming months.

However, a concern I have is that the first responder supplemental grant funding for fiscal year 2002 in this bill goes to the Department of Justice. I understand the reason behind providing Justice with funding, but I hope it does not mean that the anti-terror needs of firefighters and emergency medical personnel will be implemented without the input of the U.S. Fire Administration, which is part of FEMA.

Can the chairman provide some assurance that he and his House conferees will take into account the needs of firefighters and EMS personnel as it distributes these supplemental funds?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman makes a good point. There is no question, as we watched on television as the recovery and the first response in New York City and at the Pentagon unfolded before our very eyes, we saw the importance of the first responders in not only protecting property, but especially saving lives. So I would have to tell the gentleman we are still in the process of figuring out the best division of responsibility among the various agencies for providing assistance to first responders, which we are going to do. There is no question about that.

I agree with the gentleman from Michigan that we have to involve those agencies with responsibility for assisting firefighters and EMS personnel to help assure that they are prepared. I can assure the gentleman that the Committee on Appropriations will continue to work to make sure it takes into account the needs of firefighters and EMS personnel, as well as law enforcement officers, when it considers how to distribute the supplemental funding in this bill and in the fiscal year 2003 appropriations bill.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I thank the chairman for his statement, and certainly all his personal support for our first responders and law enforcement personnel in this Nation.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for this opportunity to have that colloquy.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of emergency security assistance to our democratic ally Israel. The \$200 million in supplemental assistance to Israel contained in the FY 2002 Supplemental Emergency Appropriations bill provides vital emergency resources to a key U.S. ally and a frontline state in the war against terror.

Mr. Chairman, it became painfully evident after September 11 that Israel and the United States are engaged in a common struggle against terrorism. Neither country asked for this struggle; both have constantly chosen a path of peace when given the choice. Israelis must know that the U.S. stands with them in this difficult hour, as they have repeatedly stood with this country throughout the years.

The United States has never been more resolved to eliminate the threat of terrorism against innocent civilians and free society. The democratic State of Israel stands shoulder to shoulder with the United States in this effort. Terrorist attacks against innocent Israeli civilians are taking place on a constant basis. In the face of terror, Israel is attempting to rout out the forces that threaten the daily lives of its citizens. But Israel continues to suffer a systematic and deliberate campaign of terror aimed at inflicting as many casualties as possible.

Mr. Chairman, as the world's leading democracy, we have a responsibility to stand by a democratic friend and ally threatened by a wave of terrorist aggression. At this volatile stage of developments in the Middle East, Israel needs to know that it can count on U.S. security assistance.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4775, the Supplemental Appropriations Bill. For the last few years supplemental appropriations bills have been brought to the floor to cover shortcomings in the previous year's appropriation bills. Increasingly, these bills have strayed from their original purpose of merely appropriating funds for certain programs. Instead, they make changes in policy, create new regulations, or implement new and completely unrelated laws. This bill continues this unfortunate trend. It sends billions of dollars in foreign aid to other countries, cuts funding to low-income and elderly housing, and includes specific Medicare "fixes" for hospitals in the districts of three Republican House members. Most egregious of all, the bill raises the federal debt limit to let the government keep spending money above what we should.

The Republicans have a problem and they don't know what to do about it. Their irresponsible tax cut has eaten up so much of the government's resources that we are about to exceed the federal debt limit. Rather than admit that they caused this problem, the Republicans have slipped language into the bill to raise the debt limit without anyone knowing. In other words, they've taken a page from Ken Lay's book: cover up irresponsible spending

with hidden accounting tricks. What a disgrace.

Keeping up these tricks, the Republicans want to send \$1.4 billion in aid to foreign countries four months ahead of time in order to dodge the budget bullet. There is simply no justification for this funding. Even worse, the bill further relaxes controls that prevent human rights violators from receiving military assistance.

And the bill doesn't stop there. Listen to this: we're going to give Israel \$200 million to continue destroying Palestinian infrastructure while at the same time giving the Palestinians \$50 million to rebuild! The bill relaxes restrictions on aid to Colombia despite its ongoing human rights violations in its war against revolutionaries within its own borders. It even appropriates \$1.8 billion in military funding above the President's request.

The Republicans naturally need a method to pay for all this new spending and they have proposed to do so in two ways: first, as I've already described, they want to raise the debt limit. Second, they want to cut valuable programs here at home. For example, the Republicans have cut \$300 million for low-income and senior housing in order to pay for this bill. In doing so, they turn their backs on 13 million Americans who spend more than half of their income on substandard housing.

This bill wastes more of our precious resources and then covers up for it with hidden, below-the-table gimmicks. I will vote against this awful bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, once again the GOP leadership in the House has taken a necessary bipartisan effort to fund our war on terror and bolster our homeland security, and riddled it with partisan budgetary maneuvers including a thinly veiled provision that would permit an increase in our nation's debt ceiling.

This supplemental appropriations bill includes \$15.6 billion in necessary military and defense-related expenditures to fight the war on terror, and another \$13.6 billion for homeland security, financial help for rebuilding efforts in New York City, and foreign assistance, including \$200 million for Israel—all necessary expenditures that I support and will vote for.

However, the rule for this legislation includes seemingly innocuous language that would allow a huge increase in the debt ceiling to be inserted in the conference report without a separate vote. This is unconscionable.

Raising the debt ceiling, coupled with the current reckless fiscal policy of increasing spending while reducing tax revenue, will put us on the track for a fiscal train wreck.

This will plunge this country back into a level of debt, borrowing, and higher interest rates that we thought we had permanently left behind. In just a year, we have seen actual and projected surpluses erased. Today, the most recent analysis suggests that we will run a \$300 billion non-Social Security deficit in this fiscal year. Even if we spend Social Security dollars to fund the government—a policy that I adamantly oppose—we will still run a \$150 billion deficit this year.

Our debt ceiling is like a limit on a credit card, and if we keep raising it without taking action to put our fiscal house back into order, we are heading for fiscal disaster. It is not prudent for a family in financial trouble to seek a higher limit on the family credit card nor

should Congress impose a long-term debt ceiling increase without a sound fiscal plan.

I would support a time-limited increase in our debt limit to help fund our war efforts—possibly one to three months—but that must be accompanied by a budget summit between leaders of Congress and the Administration to put our budget back into order and prevent us from further fueling our debt with money from the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds.

While the supplemental bill is generally a good bill—absent the provisions contained in the rule—I am troubled by one particular provision. In order to keep the cost of the bill under \$30 billion, the bill drafters offset \$643 million of the costs by striking airline loan guarantees that Congress passed after 9/11. These guarantees are a matter of survival for the airlines, particularly US Airways. I will work with my colleagues in the Senate to see that this language is not included in the conference version.

Although I support this supplemental spending, I will quite possibly vote against it in a conference report if an unfettered debt ceiling increase is included. Funding our war on terror, making America safe and putting our fiscal house back in order are not mutually exclusive pursuits. We need a budget summit to come to a bipartisan agreement on ways to fund our current spending needs, stabilize our tax policy and protect Social Security and Medicare without throwing our budget into turmoil from which it will take years to recover.

I have been a hawk on our national debt since I came to Capitol Hill, and I will remain so in this crucial fiscal period.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Appropriations Committee's effort to bring forward a bill that provides funds to address the current shortfall in the Pell Grant Program for this nation's neediest students.

Specifically, this bill puts forward an additional \$1 billion to ensure the largest maximum award in the history of the Pell Grant Program—\$4,000. This bill, while providing for the \$4,000 annual maximum Pell Grant award as proposed by the President, will also provide assurances to students and their families that the necessary funds will in fact be available for them when they are needed.

This President and this Congress stand firm in their commitment to the Pell Grant Program. That commitment is clear as evidenced by this chart, which shows a steady and substantial increase in the annual maximum award since fiscal year 1995, the point when Republicans gained control of the Congress, through the current year. We will continue our pledge to support the Pell Grant Program as we move forward with the President's education agenda.

The Pell Grant Program is the foundation of the Federal need-based student financial assistance programs, and is often the only hope low-income students have to achieve their dream of obtaining a higher education. Currently, the Pell Grant Program serves more than 4.4 million students and in FY 2003, the President's budget request will serve an additional 55,000 students, allowing more students to move forward and obtain a quality education.

We can do nothing better than provide an opportunity for this nation's citizens to obtain a quality education.

In addition, I'd like to thank the Appropriators for including \$190 million to help replen-

ish the National Emergency Grant program, and for restoring \$110 million to the dislocated worker program. These funds will go a long way in supporting American workers who have lost their jobs due to the economic slowdown and last year's terrorist attacks.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to show their support for American workers and the very important Pell Grant Program by voting yes on this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and the amendments printed in House Report 107-484 are adopted.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4775

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

CHAPTER 1

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

For an additional amount for "Food Safety and Inspection Service", \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

For an additional amount for "Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)", \$75,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003, which shall be placed in reserve for use in only such amounts, and in such manner, as the Secretary determines necessary, notwithstanding section 17(i) of the Child Nutrition Act.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Salaries and Expenses", \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended, to assist in State efforts to prevent and control transmissible spongiform encephalopathy, including bovine spongiform encephalopathy, chronic wasting disease, and scrapie, in farmed and free-ranging animals: *Provided*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes

designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Food and Drug Administration, Salaries and Expenses", \$18,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 101. None of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act for the Department of Health and Human Services may be used to consolidate the Food and Drug Administration Office of Public Affairs or Office of Legislation at the Office of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that section 101 of the bill, beginning on line 18 through line 23, violates clause 2 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives prohibiting legislation on appropriation bills.

The language in question prohibits the Food and Drug Administration from consolidating its Office of Public Affairs or Office of Legislation at the Office of the Secretary of Health and Human Resources under this bill or "any other Act." As such, the language changes current law and constitutes a violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reluctantly, I must concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded.

The point of order is sustained. The provision is stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 102. Of the funds made available for the Export Enhancement Program, pursuant to section 301(e) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, as amended by Public Law 104-127, not more than \$28,000,000 shall be available in fiscal year 2002.

CHAPTER 2

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, people at home must be scratching their heads wondering what are these folks talking about? Let me tell you what we are not talking about. There is no disagreement between the majority of Republicans and

the majority of Democrats as to whether we should fund our war against terrorism, because we all support that; or that we should increase funding for the Defense Department, because we support that; or increase funding for agencies that protect us and inspect things coming into the United States, things and people, Customs, Secret Service, et cetera; or provide money for the rebuilding of New York City. There is no disagreement.

So what have we been hearing about this debt ceiling that bothers the Democrats so much? Well, you see, the problem is that my friends on the Republican side of the aisle decided that they would force through a rather large tax cut, a \$1.35 trillion tax cut, last year, that benefited, in my opinion, disproportionately, the richest 5 percent in the United States. At the time they said America could afford that, there would be no deficits; that surpluses that were present under President Clinton would continue now under President Bush, even with this \$1.35 trillion tax cut.

Something happened. A war on terrorism; the recession was still going on. But then about 45 percent of what will now be a \$300 billion deficit in the year 2003 is a direct result of this tax cut forced through by the Republican party.

The problem with this bill, and I am going to support this bill because I support all the aid to our men and women overseas defending us, standing in harm's way, and all of the good things in the bill, the problem with the bill, that we hope will get fixed by the Senate because the Democrats are in control of the Senate and they will hopefully hold the line on this, is my Republican colleagues have inserted into this supplemental appropriations bill a way for the new deficits created, 45 percent of the reason for which is their tax cut, they have created a way to fund these national deficits that are expected for the next 10 years, and they buried it in this bill. They did not have a debate on it. They would not let us debate whether we should postpone the tax cuts for the very richest of Americans in order to eliminate 45 percent of these new deficits, next year projected to be \$300 billion, and we all know where this money is coming from. It is coming from our children and grandchildren and Social Security, as they stick their hands deeper and deeper into the pockets of future generations to pay for a tax cut that benefits primarily the rich.

Again, they did not plan on it this way. They thought there would be surpluses. Then the war on terrorism came, and the recession. So we said now there is a war on terrorism and a recession. Perhaps we ought to delay this tax cut that benefits primarily the very rich. They said no. So rather than admitting to the American people that the Republicans have now created this huge deficit, 45 percent of which is related directly to their tax cut that goes

to primarily to the rich, admit they have a deficit this year and projected for the next 10 years, admit that 45 percent of the reason for this new deficit is their tax cut that goes primarily to the very rich, they have buried language in this bill preventing a debate on it so that the American people will not realize that when they said they could do a tax cut that benefited primarily the rich and created surpluses, they were wrong. They guessed wrong.

□ 2000

I think that that is a terrible mistake that needs to be rectified.

What else could we do with this money? We could pay off our debts if we did not have this tax cut for the very rich. We could even just postpone it, delay it for a year, take a look around, see what the war on terrorism is like, whether we are out of the recession or not. Reasonable people of goodwill could debate whether a tax cut is important in the midst of a recession. We are out of the recession, according to all of our official estimates, and most of this tax cut is going to take effect for the rich in the next 10 years, except we have to pay for it now.

So if anyone is wondering why there appeared to be a disagreement between Democrats and Republicans about a bill where we all support an increase in defense, the war on terrorism, all of the agencies rebuilding New York, et cetera, et cetera, we all support that. What we do not support on the Democratic side is the unwillingness of the Republican majority to hide the effect of their tax cut, which by conservative numbers, 45 percent of the reason for the upcoming deficits will be as a direct result of their tax cuts; and we say, if you want to cause these deficits, cause us to dig into Social Security, to pay for your tax cuts that disproportionately benefit the wealthiest of Americans, at least debate it out in the open. Do not hide it in this bill. We are hoping that the Democratic Senate, when this bill goes to conference with the Senate bill on this emergency supplemental, will be resolved at that point.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, but encourage the Senate and the conferees to remove this hidden, deficit-hiding device.

MOTION TO RISE OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 134, noes 250, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 196]

AYES—134

Ackerman Gephardt Napolitano
 Allen Gonzalez Oberstar
 Andrews Hall (OH) Obey
 Baca Hastings (FL) Olver
 Baird Hefley Owens
 Baldwin Hill Pallone
 Barrett Hilliard Pascarell
 Bentsen Hinchey Pelosi
 Berkley Hinojosa Peterson (MN)
 Berman Hoeft Pomeroy
 Berry Holt Price (NC)
 Bishop Honda Rangel
 Blagojevich Hooley Reyes
 Bonior Inslee Rodriguez
 Boucher Israel Roybal-Allard
 Boyd Jackson-Lee Rush
 Brady (PA) (TX) Sabo
 Brown (FL) Jefferson Sanchez
 Brown (OH) Johnson, E. B. Sanders
 Capps Jones (OH) Sandlin
 Capuano Kaptur Schakowsky
 Cardin Kennedy (RI) Schiff
 Carson (IN) Kilpatrick Serrano
 Carson (OK) Kind (WI) Sherman
 Clement Kleczka Snyder
 Clyburn Kucinich Solis
 Condit Larsen (WA) Spratt
 Conyers Larson (CT) Strickland
 Crowley Lee Stupak
 Cummings Lewis (GA) Tanner
 Davis (FL) Lofgren Taylor (MS)
 Davis (IL) Lowey Thompson (CA)
 DeFazio Lynch Thompson (MS)
 DeGette Maloney (NY) Thurman
 Delahunt Markey Tierney
 Dicks Matheson Towns
 Dingell Matsui Udall (NM)
 Doggett McCarthy (NY) Velazquez
 Engel McGovern Visclosky
 Eshoo McNulty Watt (NC)
 Etheridge Meehan Waxman
 Evans Meeks (NY) Woolsey
 Farr Millender-Wu
 Filner McDonald Wynn
 Ford Mink
 Frank Nadler

NOES—250

Aderholt Davis, Tom Hunter
 Akin Deal Hyde
 Arney DeLauro Isakson
 Bachus DeLay Issa
 Baker DeMint Istook
 Baldacci Diaz-Balart Jackson (IL)
 Ballenger Doyle Jenkins
 Barcia Dreier John
 Bartlett Duncan Johnson (CT)
 Barton Dunn Johnson (IL)
 Bass Edwards Jones (NC)
 Bereuter Ehlers Kanjorski
 Biggert English Keller
 Blumenauer Everett Kelly
 Blunt Ferguson Kennedy (MN)
 Boehlert Flake Kerns
 Bonilla Fletcher Kildee
 Bono Forbes King (NY)
 Boozman Fossella Kingston
 Borski Frelinghuysen Kirk
 Boswell Gallegly Knollenberg
 Brady (TX) Ganske Kolbe
 Brown (SC) Gekas LaHood
 Bryant Gibbons Langevin
 Burr Gilchrest Lantos
 Callahan Gillmor Latham
 Calvert Gilman LaTourette
 Camp Goode Leach
 Cannon Goodlatte Levin
 Cantor Goss Lewis (CA)
 Capito Granger Lewis (KY)
 Castle Linder Graves
 Chabot Green (TX) LoBiondo
 Chambliss Green (WI) Lucas (KY)
 Coble Greenwood Lucas (OK)
 Collins Grucci Luther
 Combest Hall (TX) Maloney (CT)
 Cooksey Hansen Manzullo
 Costello Hart McCarthy (MO)
 Cox Hastings (WA) McCollum
 Coyne Hayes McCrery
 Cramer Hayworth McHugh
 Crane Herger McInnis
 Crenshaw Hobson McKeon
 Cubin Hoekstra McKinney
 Cunningham Holden Menendez
 Davis (CA) Hostettler Mica
 Davis, Jo Ann Houghton Miller, Dan

Miller, Gary
 Miller, Jeff
 Mollohan
 Moore
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Morella
 Murtha
 Myrick
 Nethercutt
 Ney
 Northup
 Nussle
 Ortiz
 Osborne
 Ose
 Otter
 Pastor
 Paul
 Payne
 Petri
 Phelps
 Pitts
 Platts
 Pombo
 Portman
 Pryce (OH)
 Putnam
 Quinn
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Regula
 Rehberg
 Reynolds
 Riley
 Rivers
 Roemer
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Ross
 Rothman
 Roukema
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryun (KS)
 Saxton
 Schaffer
 Schrock
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Shays
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Shows
 Shuster
 Simmons
 Simpson
 Skeen
 Skelton
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Souder
 Stearns
 Stump
 Sullivan

Sununu
 Sweeney
 Tancredo
 Tauscher
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thornberry
 Thune
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Toomey
 Turner
 Udall (CO)
 Upton
 Vitter
 Walden
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Watkins (OK)
 Watson (CA)
 Watts (OK)
 Weiner
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Wexler
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson (NM)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wolf
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—50

Abercrombie
 Barr
 Becerra
 Bilirakis
 Boehner
 Burton
 Buyer
 Clay
 Clayton
 Culberson
 Deutsch
 Dooley
 Doolittle
 Ehrlich
 Emerson
 Fattah
 Foley
 Frost
 Gordon
 Graham
 Gutierrez
 Gutknecht
 Harman
 Hilleary
 Horn
 Hoyer
 Hulshof
 Johnson, Sam
 LaFalce
 Lampson
 Lipinski
 Mascara
 McDermott
 McIntyre
 Meek (FL)
 Miller, George
 Neal
 Norwood
 Oxley
 Pence
 Peterson (PA)
 Pickering
 Sawyer
 Scott
 Slaughter
 Stark
 Stenholm
 Tauzin
 Traficant
 Waters

□ 2023

Mr. SUNUNU changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. HILLIARD and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the motion to rise was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise as a Member of the Committee on Appropriations, having served with the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), who was very dignified as this Committee on Appropriations spent over 3 days, 14 hours on the first day, trying to bring to this House of Representatives a supplemental bill to really react and respond to our war on terrorism.

Many of us, over 60 of us who sit on that committee, vowed that we would do the work necessary. We put 20 hours-plus on the bill over 3 days, and brought a bill to this floor, an emergency supplemental. I am appalled with what the Committee on Rules has done with our work. It has emasculated the committee system in this House.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) has done a wonderful job, and our ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). We have worked together

in a bipartisan way to bring the bill to the floor of the House. But what we have before us is not the bill that came out of the Committee on Appropriations. It is not the bill we were told was an emergency and had to be passed right away to address the war on terrorism.

What we have before us now is a bill with all kinds of amendments added onto it, and all kinds of things we cannot amend as Members of this House that do not address the emergency before us.

This bill will increase the debt limit without a vote of this House. We may have to increase the debt limit, primarily because of the \$1.3 trillion tax cut that was given to the wealthiest of Americans just last year at the time when the economy was slowing.

The CBO has told us that we will be in deficit \$2.7 trillion, so perhaps we will have to increase the debt limit, but let us vote on it. Let us debate it. Do not bury it in this emergency supplemental that we spent so much time and energy and hours on.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is unfair, and it emasculates the committee system in this House of Representatives. The Committee on Rules has gone ahead and gone deeper into the Social Security trust fund, leaving everything to be taken care of in conference, and again, not allowing us, the elected Members of this House, to have the proper forum in which to debate it.

There is no new money for education, and again, if we adopt this supplemental that the Committee on Rules has rewritten, we automatically adopt the Republican budget resolution that passed this House earlier this year. That budget resolution, if we remember, did not fortify Medicare, did not take care of Social Security, did not take care of education. If we adopt this Committee on Rules supplemental tonight, we automatically adopt that poor budget resolution that was passed a few months ago.

Mr. Chairman, these are trying times for our country. We are at war. We do need to address the emergency needs of our troops, our homeland security. But we also need to address the national defense, homeland, problems of education.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KILPATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

□ 2030

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentlewoman that it was the Committee on Rules because that is where the action is. But it was the majority on the Committee on Rules that undertook this. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for making that caveat. It was the majority, the Republican members of the Committee on Rules who emasculated the work of the fine Committee on Appropriations and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and

the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and now we have before us not an emergency supplemental that deals with terrorism, but a bill that will raise the debt limits for this country, making us have more bills to pay and at the same time not having an up-or-down vote on it; nor will we be able to debate that. I think that is unconscionable.

We live in a time in this country where leadership is paramount, where we must stand up and be counted. This is not the way this House should be run. This is not the way the majority should run it. I hope we will vote against the supplemental. Some people say they cannot vote against it because of what is in it. I think you can vote against it, come back and put together a supplemental for the American people that will address the emergency needs of our country.

Our health care industry is about to collapse. I have been visited by doctors in this country. I am sure you have too. They are not taking Medicare senior citizen patients. The reimbursements are too low. Our children cannot stand up to the competition of people all around the world. We can fix that. This supplemental does not begin to address that.

At a time when we need leadership, we are finding more and more that we are doing the wrong things for the people of this country. They expect us to be leaders. They sent us here for that.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues, watch what we do over the next few hours. Vote against this supplemental.

We are being asked to do something today that we have not done in almost 6 years—pass legislation that paves the way for increasing the debt limit that will allow the government to borrow money to pay its bills. The majority is attaching this on to a must-pass bill, an emergency supplemental appropriations to fund homeland security and the war on terrorism, in order to minimize its exposure as the party of fiscal irresponsibility.

For more than 60 years, the other side of the aisle has billed itself as the party of balanced budgets, budget firewalls and Social Security lockboxes. But their rhetoric does not comport with reality and they know it. In the last half of the 20th century through last year, the only budget surpluses this nation enjoyed came under Democratic administrations and Democratic financial management.

That's a point the Republican majority does not want to acknowledge. Consequently, it wants to slip debt-increase legislation through on the sly without a full and fair debate of the fiscal position of the country, how we got there, and how we're going to deal honestly about digging ourselves out of the hole in which we now find ourselves.

The problem is the other side is in a state of denial. It does not want to expose itself as the party of deficit spending after a Democratic administration produced the longest string of budget surpluses in the history of this country. And it doesn't want to own up to the fact that it has to raise revenues before the country can get back on the right track to fiscal sanity. Yes, the economic slowdown and

the war on terrorism caused us to spend more than general revenues allow. But the primary reason we are spending beyond our means is because of a \$1.3 billion tax bill Congress passed last year.

Because the other side doesn't want to deal with the deficit situation honestly and openly, the majority wants us to approve must-pass legislation, so it can have a license to raid the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

We need to ensure that all areas of our budget are adequately funded. While it is necessary to fund defense and national security priorities, it is not acceptable to ignore domestic priorities that are of crucial importance to our nation and the American people. By insufficiently funding key priorities such as education and prescription drugs, we are short-changing our families and children. Yes, they might be safer on the national security front, but if we cannot ensure our nation's children a quality education, if we can't ensure seniors a sound prescription drug coverage, and if we can't ensure the solvency of our Social Security for so many people in the future, we are truly off the mark.

The budget resolution presented a distorted vision for our future by laying out a budget that does not sufficiently fund our education and health care needs. This is not a budget that the appropriations committee should adhere to if we really want to keep the promises we have verbally made to our people. It is time to match our words with real funding levels on paper.

EDUCATION

In January, the President signed into law landmark education reform legislation with the "Leave No Child Behind Act." Yet, his proposed budget and the Republican budget that was passed in the House does not make the title of this bill a reality. If we continue along the Republican funding path, more and more children will be left behind. Both budgets provide a \$1.4 billion (2.8 percent) increase over FY 2002 funding levels to the Department of Education, which represents the smallest increase in funding in recent years.

Not only does the budget for education represent the smallest increase in recent times, it actually eliminates funding for 28 key education programs such as Drop-Out Prevention, Rural Education, Close-Up Fellowships, and numerous other programs that enrich students' education.

At the same time, the budget resolution proposes cutting or freezing many other elementary and secondary education programs, including educational technology (cut \$134 million—15.7 percent), improving teacher quality programs (cut from \$105 million to \$3 billion total), and safe and drug-free schools (cut \$102 million or 13.7 percent). It also freezes funding for 21st century community learning centers after-school programs, comprehensive school reform. Even keeping funding for programs for FY 2003 at their current level represents a cut in funding when inflation and rising costs are taken into account.

If we expect schools to implement the provisions laid out in the "Leave No Child Behind Act", then we must give them the funding resources needed to help them succeed. Mandates without adequate funding is leaving our schools and teachers with their hands tied.

In my state of Michigan, funding for educational priorities such as school construction and class size reduction have been elimi-

nated. Other programs have been cut, such as Even Start which provides grants for family literacy projects that include early childhood education for children through age 7.

HEALTH

The Republican budget proposed a mere \$350 billion for Medicare reform and prescription drug coverage over ten years. This represents a gross underfunding just for a prescription drug coverage, which would cost \$700–800 billion over 10 years alone if we want a comprehensive, meaningful drug coverage plan for seniors and disabled individuals. This funding level does not even account for what will be needed to strengthen Medicare for our future. If Republicans, in their maneuvering today, really expect us to stick with the funding levels proposed in the budget resolution, then their actions on the floor definitely contrast with the verbal promises that they offer seniors everyday on the floor and in their districts.

Overall, the health care outlook in the GOP budget is bleak. If we are asked to stick with their numbers, major programs will be cut, such as rural health programs (41.9 percent cut), Telehealth (84.6 percent cut), and other programs that assist in coordinating care for the uninsured.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE RAIDS

The huge tax breaks for the wealthy that Republicans passed have left us looking at deficit spending. And where will the funds for all our programs come from? Social Security and Medicare trust funds. This is what they have to resort to when just last year, Members pledged not to raid Social Security and we passed Social Security lockbox legislation on the floor. This promise has been broken and the lockbox is locked no more.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projected last January that the course of the Republican path would lead Congress to spend \$845 billion of the Social Security trust fund over the next 10 years. And this in only taking into account the FY 2002 budget.

This return to deficit spending and raiding of the Social Security trust fund cannot be explained by the recent recession or the war against terrorism. When taking into account the Administration's own numbers, the national debt will be \$2.75 trillion higher than what was originally projected early last year before the President's FY 2002 budget proposal. When adding recessionary costs and the war, these numbers combined total \$800 billion of projected debt. This means that \$1.9 trillion is left that cannot be explained either the economic downturn or the war against terrorism.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, we are gathered tonight in a place of great and high honor. This is a Chamber in which decisions that have profoundly affected the history of our Nation and of humankind have been debated with great dignity and honor. In this Chamber we have debated questions of civil rights, questions of war and peace, questions of education and health care. And what brings honor to this institution and what humbles each one of us privileged enough to serve in this institution is the process of debate, of exchanging ideas, of laying before the

people of the Nation, the people of the world, our divergent and heartfelt views.

What we are doing tonight in this Chamber does not measure up to the standards of honor of this Chamber. Because this bill is being used as a vehicle to make a decision of monumental importance for the future of this country, but we are not debating that decision. We will not take a vote on that decision. We will not let the public hear our voices on that decision.

There is a plan to move innocuous language in this bill that talks about protecting the full faith and credit of the United States to a conference with the other body. There is an anticipation that the other body will add a law which authorizes the borrowing of \$750 billion, the bill which will be handed off to the children of this country. The bill will then be brought back here, and it will be put to a vote where that \$750 billion borrowing is wrapped in the holy garments of all the good things that are in this bill, aid to the troops, aid to loyal allies of this country, reconstruction of New York City, things for which there is broad, even, unanimous appeal.

The majority has chosen to hide its plan rather than to debate its plan, and that is just plain wrong. I think I know why, Mr. Chairman, the majority has chosen to do that. In 1990 when I came here, for every \$100 that we needed to run the government, we were bringing in \$70 worth of revenue. And we made up the difference by pilfering money from the Social Security trust fund and borrowing the rest from the private markets in a way that drove up interest rates and drove down economic activities. President Clinton made good decisions to change that. Members of Congress of both parties made good decisions to change that. The American people worked very hard, paid a lot of taxes and changed that. And by 2000, for every \$100 we spent to run our country, we brought in \$108. And we were told that \$108 would be \$115 and then \$125 and then \$135, and there would be all this money to spend.

In the summer of 2001, the majority voted to rid the Treasury of about \$2 trillion worth of money in one of the largest tax cuts in American history. There were voices, mostly on this side, who warned against the risk of that proposal. Our warnings when unheeded. The bill became law. A recession came along. The terrorist attacks of September 11 came along. And where do we find ourselves?

For the fiscal year that will end this September 30, instead of having \$108 in revenue for every \$100 we will spend, we will have 80. So here we are once again borrowing the rest. Borrowing once again from the Social Security trust fund and robbing the pensions of Americans. Borrowing once again from the same markets that our entrepreneurs and companies looked to grow their businesses.

The majority understands that the public would rebel against such a plan. So rather than bring that plan to this floor and defend it, they have chosen a procedural vehicle that will obscure it. That is the wrong thing to do. This is a bill that does much good and many of us will support it for that reason. I believe that if the leadership of this committee had been permitted to bring this bill forward, that is all the bill would have done.

But the majority leadership has a different agenda. It is to obscure the agenda that will result in the borrowing of \$750 billion. We vote on congratulating the people of the East Timor in this Chamber. We vote on the naming of Federal buildings. We vote on resolutions honoring people that win NCAA basketball championships; but we are not going to cast a vote on indebteding the children in this country to the tune of \$750 billion.

It is so wrong, it is so indefensible the majority will not put this on this floor. It is the wrong way to proceed.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the committee, as well as my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), also I think that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) also are concerned.

This regards section 1103 of the bill dealing with the Federal loan guarantee program for air carriers. The airline industry has changed dramatically and permanently since September 11. Business air travel is down 30 percent industry-wide and total industry revenue is down 15 percent since 2000.

It is an unfortunate reality that some carriers' financial situation is currently unsustainable. We cannot now pass the provision that moves the goal post on the very companies for whom the legislation was intended when it was passed a mere 9 months ago.

I ask the chairman, this section would upon enactment of the bill delay disbursement of loan guarantees until October 1 of this year. Is it the chairman's understanding that while this provision would prevent the actual issuance of a loan guaranteed until October 1, that the air transportation stabilization board may continue and complete processing of applications during the remainder of this fiscal year?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, first let me say it is essential to the United States that a viable air transportation system be up and run-

ning. So I would say to the gentleman that what he suggests is my understanding.

The Office of Management and Budget in a letter sent to our committee interprets this provision as only preventing the actual issuance of credit pursuant to the Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act. The stabilization board may continue accepting and fully considering qualified applications as authorized by that act.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for further inquiry.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that statement.

As the chairman knows, many of our colleagues, and certainly I am in that group, strongly support this program and we want to ensure that no changes are enacted that would prevent a qualified carrier from receiving a loan guarantee as early as the stabilization board may act on the application. This particular program was enacted to assist carriers suffering losses as a result of the terrorist attack on September 11. The Federal Government's closure of Reagan National Airport made matters even worse for some of the carriers.

I know the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) have been very, very concerned about this. We are aware of one or more carriers that may apply for a loan guarantee before the deadline of June 28, 2002.

There are concerns that the provision, if enacted, might have the unintended consequences of preventing a qualified carrier from securing a Federal loan guarantee in time to avoid bankruptcy or other irreparable harm to a carrier's operations, employees and customers.

Would the chairman be willing to work with us and other Members, and there were so many that were interested in this, to ensure that that provision does not have those unintended effects?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman would yield again, the committee does not intend to prevent any carrier from having an application fully considered, nor does it intend for this provision to result in the kind of outcome the gentleman is concerned about.

We will work with the gentleman and other Members as we go to conference with the Senate on this bill to address any concerns that affected parties may have.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his assurances.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Office of Management and Budget which clearly states the provisions which we are considering today permit the Air Transportation Stabilization Board to continue to complete the processing of

qualified loan guarantee applications that are properly filed.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This letter provides the Administration's interpretation of Section 1103 of the pending House FY 2002 supplemental appropriations bill (H.R. 4775) regarding airline loan guarantees. This provision was not proposed by the Administration but was added by the House Committee on Appropriations during committee consideration of the supplemental appropriations bill.

Under Section 1103 of the bill, the Air Transportation Stabilization Board would be able to continue and complete processing of qualified applications for loan guarantees during the balance of FY 2002 consistent with the authorities of P.L. 107-42, the Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act.

While the Board could not obligate loan guarantee funds during the balance of FY 2002 (from enactment through September 30, 2002), it can, after October 1, 2002, issue the loan guarantees to qualified applicants.

Sincerely,

NANCY P. DORN,
Deputy Director.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), all of those folks who have tried to protect USAirways' ability to be financially solvent.

I have to say, though, that I am convinced that the language in this supplemental appropriations bill does just the opposite. I do know that the Chair of the Committee on Appropriations and the Chair of the subcommittee want to make it right. But I think we need some assurance that it will be made right. I see the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), who will be affected.

There are 204 cities whose economy is going to be severely damaged if USAirways is not able to continue operations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) has expired.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, there are 204 cities who are dependent upon the air service that USAirways provides. There are 40,000 employees who are dependent upon the income that they earn from employment with USAirways. This is a very, very serious issue. I know we have discussed previously that it looks an awful lot like a budget gimmick, \$1.3 billion by terminating the ability to apply for a

loan. But it is serious business when you are talking about one of our premiere airlines. And I know that we have substantial support on the other side of the aisle, and certainly those who voted against the rule, this is one of the reasons that virtually all Democrats voted against the rule. And I know there is substantial support on the majority side. But we have got to find a way to make USAir whole, at least to the extent we are capable of doing so.

And that is why we passed the airline guarantee program. We did it right after November. We know that USAirways is the most adversely affected. National Airport was closed down for an entire month and for 8 months it has been in partial operation. How can an airline survive under those conditions? I do not know.

So this is the airway that was most likely to benefit from the legislation we passed, and now we turn around and say we are going to terminate the loan program knowing that they are ready to apply so we can save \$1.3 billion to get under their nonofficial ceiling?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that USAirways has indicated that it needs this loan guarantee so it can get loan proceeds by August 1. But under the bill as presented to us, nothing will be payable until October 1, the first day of the next fiscal year and this is sooner than it could possibly be paid. It would be soon after that, that is the soonest possible date, and that is too late according to their indication, is it not?

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member on the House Committee on the Budget. What he says is absolutely the case. USAirways indicates that it will run out of money by August and it will need the infusion of loan money by then. What this language does is to not make any of that money available until October 1. And unless we can work out some language, it has no assurance that it can give to the creditors that money, in fact, will be authorized.

□ 2045

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I think one of the purposes of colloquy is to assure we have full leadership working to make sure one way or the other, the right thing happens should they qualify for this loan. In fact, the money will be available on a timely basis. We have received assurances that this, it still has to go through conference. There is Senate language that still needs to be worked through, and I just want to say I am comfortable with the fact that we are going to work this out, but I appreciate

the gentleman's being very aggressive on this issue because I think it is very important, not just for the airline, as the gentleman has mentioned before.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I will reclaim my time to tell my good friend from Virginia that I know he has been aggressive as well in supporting U.S. Air, but I think the gentleman also knows that on the Senate side they have capped this loan program in such a way that U.S. Air will not have access to the money. So if the money is not available on the House side, if it is not available on the Senate side, we are not going to be able to get it in conference.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, they have only capped it in committee. It still has to go to the floor. It has a long way. I know Senator BYRD is concerned about this as well.

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that CBO has scored this particular provision as saving temporarily for this fiscal year \$343 million, that is all, under the Credit Reform Act. It is not the full amount of the loan. It is the likely loss on the loan that is scored as an expenditure on the loan this year. However, this is nothing but an obligational delay, so it does not really save anything.

What it means is that what would be obligated in the remaining few months of this fiscal year will instead be obligated after October 1. Why go through shenanigans like that and send a message to the lenders that U.S. Air will not be able to take down the cash it needs to survive until after October 1? Sure, it can complete its loan application, but it cannot get the cash it needs, and that message will go out again tonight. It will chill the atmosphere for lending. My colleagues know the Transportation Stabilization Board will not want to process anything for fear that Congress is about to undercut it. Why are we doing this? What sense does it make? It does not save a dime.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) has expired.

(On request of Mr. OBEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MORAN of Virginia was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), ranking member of the full committee.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's dedication to this issue, as well as the other Members on his side of the aisle and on our

side of the aisle, and I would tell my colleague that we are very committed to doing everything we can to make sure this problem is taken care of.

Yes, there is a problem here on the House side, we understand that, but by the same token, it does have to work its way through the whole process, and that is what we are looking at and working on, to get the assurances that we need that the money will be there, that they will be able to get these loans, and that they are not going to go bankrupt. We have no intentions of allowing that to happen.

It is very unfortunate these provisions were put in this bill the way they are, but we want to do everything we can through our leadership and through the Senate to make sure that this is taken care of, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There are 2 distinct issues on this point. First is what will happen to U.S. Air, and, frankly, I cannot tell, and that is the problem.

The second problem is that the original committee provision was scored as saving \$400 million. That was the proposition that said that the Transportation Department could not issue any loans from this point on for the remainder of the fiscal year. That was estimated by CBO to save \$400 million, but now we are being told that even though it is being suggested that this loan may go ahead, we are still being told by OMB, and I understand the House Committee on the Budget, that we are going to save \$1.3 billion by this provision, even though the loan that is being foregone is allegedly going ahead.

I find that hard to follow.

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, CBO scored it, I have a letter and I put it in the RECORD, at \$343 million. That is the accurate scoring for this, and that is the question I am raising. For that sum of money, why put U.S. Airways flying into jeopardy?

Mr. OBEY. My point is, I understand that is a legitimate concern, but my point is another concern. I am concerned about putting the integrity of the Federal budget process in jeopardy, and my problem is that when we are told that the loan that was not going to go through is now going to go through and yet we are going to save more money than we were to spend originally, that is sleight of hand to me, and it looks a little bit like Arthur Andersen accounting to me.

So I do not understand how we can say this loan is going to go through and yet we are going to save three times as much money as CBO origi-

nally estimated. It does not compute and it also does not make clear what is going to happen to the airline, which is an overriding and justifiable question in the minds of many Members tonight.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, if I could simply ask, am I wrong? I believe the \$343 million is exactly what CBO scored it as, and number 2, does this really save anything? If this is just an obligatory delay that says that the money cannot be obligated during the summer, but come October 1 it can be obligated, it does not save anything, why do this? Why go through shenanigans like this just to claim a credit that is not really a credit? It is not a savings. If I am wrong, I will stand corrected.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman, I have seen the CBO analysis dated today, that it is only \$343 million. It is not \$1.3 billion.

Mr. SPRATT. But that is for 4 months.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is absolutely correct.

My other concern is I know how sincere the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the chair of the Subcommittee on Transportation, the chair of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) has been working very hard on this.

I believe we had the votes in full committee to strike the language. We were assured that we would not have to do that because it would be taken care of, and my concern is that I do not know at this point how it is going to be taken care of, and if the House bill leaves the floor, I am very much concerned it is going to be too late.

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest the answer to the gentleman is that the only reason at this point that this is in here with this outlandish estimate is to make the bill look like it is paid for when it is not. This \$1.3 billion savings, in my view, is a fictional savings of OMB and the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was listening with interest to the discussion about U.S. Airways. I represent Baltimore, which has an interest in the direct health of U.S. Airways, and I think it is very clear that we are using accounting gimmicks again in order to satisfy budget rules because we do not have a straightforward budget, and I mention that, Mr. Chairman, because there is a lot of good things in this supplemental appropriations bill, and many of us are going to be voting for a lot of the issues that are underlining the bill itself, but we are compelled to speak about the unfair procedure and the un-

democratic principles that are being used in the legislation that we are considering on the floor this evening.

We are talking about provisions that were added after the bill came out of the Committee on Appropriations. I want to compliment the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. Many of these issues were worked out in committee that are good provisions, and we want to move them forward, but, unfortunately, what was added by the Committee on Rules and by our last vote, we are, for example, deeming the Republican budget as being enacted for the purposes of the Committee on Appropriations work.

Well, that gives approval to a budget that is just not realistic. It does not protect the priorities that many of us believe in, that the majority of this House believes in. We are not going to be able to deal with education or Medicare, prescription drug or transportation or homeland security or the airline industry in a straightforward way on the budget that was deemed by the rule that we approved a little bit earlier this evening.

So now what are we going to do? We are going to go back to gimmicks. We are going to go back to waiving all these rules. No budget discipline at all. That is the concern that many of us have about the procedure that is being used tonight.

We clearly are going to move to large deficits again. We are going to protect large tax cuts, but we are going to move to large deficits, and we are going to use Social Security funds. We are going to borrow those funds to cover the other obligations of the United States Government.

How often have I heard the Members of this body talk about a lockbox? We are going to make sure that money is not used, and, oh, yes, we have had some unexpected expenses, but that is not the reason we have the large deficits. The large deficits are a direct result of the budget and the tax bills that were passed. My colleagues know that; I know that.

We should be able to debate that issue here on this floor, but, instead, what are we doing, we are using a magic wand to do certain things rather than having a full and open debate on the budget issues and on the debt ceiling. So it will be extremely difficult for us to deal with Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out that the moneys that were in the surplus were used in just about every proposal that has been brought forward to deal with Social Security, including the bill that was filed in the last Congress by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Archer) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), and now those funds are to be borrowed and used for the general obligations. That is wrong, and we all know that we are using a stealth process so we do not have to deal with the direct debate on this floor on the debt ceiling.

We should have a direct vote on that issue. We should talk about it. We

should talk about how we are going to deal with the future debt. As I understand it, Republicans are going to be asked to raise the debt by \$750 billion. \$750 billion. Look at how much of the tax bill is going to have to be paid for by additional borrowing. I am not sure that is exactly what the American public wants us to do.

We are going to go back to the red ink again. What we should be doing, we should take a little pause in the action, we should sit together and work out a bipartisan agreement on a budget, and if we had a bipartisan agreement on a budget, with the other body, with the administration, then we would have a supplemental appropriation bill here that could be considered in a relatively short period of time.

We could have a prescription drug bill for Medicare that we could all agree upon and really get something done for our seniors at last. We could have a budget that would speak to the priorities on education and on homeland security, on the other issues, and we could really deliver for our constituents.

So, Mr. Chairman, many of us are going to express the frustration tonight that the process that the majority is using is unfair; not unfair to the Democratic Members, it is unfair to the American people. We deserve better. The American public deserves better, and I would urge my colleagues to use the time to get together so that we can produce a bipartisan budget so we can produce results for the people of this Nation.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I listened attentively to all of these speeches. What I have to say is this is an emergency, wartime supplemental. Political speeches about whatever my colleagues want to make political speeches about, that is all well and good. Why do my colleagues not do that on some other bills? This is a wartime, emergency supplemental.

The military is running out of money, especially those who are directly involved in the war in Afghanistan. We have got to protect those soldiers that are deployed. We have got to make sure that they have whatever it is that they need to fight this war. We have got to provide for the FBI and the intelligence agencies. Let us focus on what this bill is all about, and it is about protecting America. It is about seeking out those who would terrorize America. It is about securing our places and our people, our seaports, our airports, our airplanes, public gathering places. That is what this bill is about. This should not be a vehicle for political speeches.

□ 2100

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. And, Mr. Chairman, I do so to applaud the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) for raising appropriately the issue of USAirways. I think it is, to put it

mildly, bad faith on the part of Congress to terminate the loan guarantee program, and it is an act at the worst possible time for this carrier, and for other carriers along with it, who have indicated their likely need to apply for the loan guarantee program.

Virtually everybody in this House voted for both the compensation program and the loan guarantee program last fall when it was crucially necessary to save America's airlines from financial liquidation. That legislation passed overwhelmingly to the great credit of the administration. They came forward and said, yes, we need to do this, when we in the House were already talking about the need to save America's airlines, who were bleeding at the rate of \$360 million a day because they could not operate.

And the reason we enacted that legislation was that it was an act of government that shut down the Nation's airlines in the national interest, out of security concerns. It was an appropriate action. But we caused the airlines, we, the government, caused the airlines to lose billions of dollars in the national interest. We recognized that it was a necessity for the government then to come back and not make the airlines whole, but at least put them in the position they were in at the moment of the order for all airline operations to cease on September 11.

Mr. Chairman, 2,460 commercial airliners were brought on the ground within 2½ hours and did not operate for 3 days. And then, for a month after other airports were opened, National Airport remained closed. This is the hub, the base of USAirways' operations. The order of government not to operate out of National Airport hit this carrier disproportionately greater than any other carrier in the United States. I find it short-sighted, bad faith, poor judgment, poor calculation to say, oh, we have taken back what we offered you last fall. It is just simply not right. It is not fair.

And I do not want to get into all these other discussions about what else is in this supplemental appropriations bill. This particular provision is really harmful and hurtful and goes back on our word that we gave in this body to the airlines of the United States: we will make you whole to the point that you were at when you could not fly, and we will provide loan assistance, payback with all sorts of guarantees that I participated in crafting into the loan guarantee program in the Speaker's office, the night of the President's address to the Nation. And now the program is there; and all of a sudden you are pulling the rug out from under this carrier that has suffered a disproportionate burden compared to other carriers in the country because of the shutdown of National Airport for over a month.

Now, I heard the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) say that we will fix this somehow over the course of the next few days. "Somehow" is no help

to the financial institutions. It does not give them a whole lot of confidence at all. It gives them zero confidence, in fact. This needs to be fixed now, before this bill leaves the House, whether it is a statement by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or a statement by the Office of Management and Budget.

I think our ranking member on the Committee on the Budget has already spelled out how little, how ephemeral, how chimerical the savings will be. Surely we can do something in the course of this evening, which apparently is going to be a very long evening; and I appeal to the chairman. I do not fly USAirways. They do not serve Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBERSTAR was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an interest only because of my many, many years of action in the aviation sector as the former Chair of the Subcommittee on Aviation and a desire to do the right thing.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we want to do the right thing as well, but I want to remind the gentleman that this loan program was enacted into law on September 22 last year.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I said that just a moment ago.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I just want to remind everybody. And as of tonight, as we stand in this Chamber, certain airlines have not even made their application, knowing full well that under the law that we passed last September the application process terminates on June 28. That is rapidly approaching. So the airlines are not totally free of guilt in not getting the job done.

All that aside, we are prepared to try to help keep our airline industry viable. And the only airline that I can fly direct to my district is USAir. I do not want USAir to go out of business or to go bankrupt. I want to help them. But I have to tell my colleague that they could have applied for this loan guarantee a lot earlier and they did not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBERSTAR was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out to the chairman that the regulations for the loan guarantee program were not available until early this year, along about January-February. And the person administering the program was not put in place until just about that time. It has been very difficult for the carriers to understand how this program would be

administered. Further, they wanted to wait and see whether they could be whole on their own.

So I do not exonerate the airlines, but there were mitigating factors. And this carrier is particularly vulnerable. If we lose USAirways, then on the east coast the cascading effect will be that there will be a diminution of competition in the airline sector.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBERSTAR was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, our heart is in the same place, I would tell the gentleman. But the gentleman's facts are not exactly correct, because the first application under this program was America West and it was filed on November 28 of last year. So the regulations were in order much earlier than the gentleman suggested.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, America West filed before the regulation process had been fully implemented. They were in much more desperate shape than USAirways, no question about it. The full set of regulations was not in place at that time.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, let me just share some information regarding USAirways. In the first place, USAirways attempted to sustain its operations as long as possible without having to draw on a Federal loan guarantee.

In the second place, as I think the gentleman knows, USAir has been working very diligently in working out labor agreements and showing a long-term plan so that this loan guarantee will be able to be paid off and they can show a viable financial plan into the future.

This is a very difficult process for such a large airline.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before my colleagues jump again to react to the airline industry, I would caution that we think about the way the airline industry responded to our last legislative action. Within hours, Mr. Chairman, within hours of the passage of that airline bailout, USAirways fired hundreds and hundreds of its employees. Not only did they do that, they fired and closed reservation centers of their most senior, most experienced reservationists because they could save more money that way. And then they did not give them the opportunity to be rehired at other locations. They went out and the reservation centers that needed additional employees, they hired people "off the

street," because they could hire them at a lower wage.

This is the airline that charges customers seven times what other airlines serving the same two cities charge. This is the same airline that has average employee costs of \$87,000. This is the same airline that provides service in 37-seat prop jets when they could go out and purchase new regional jets that would provide dramatically better service, and they are asking people to fly in those 30- and 40-year-old planes because their contract with their pilots will not allow them to buy new regional jets. This is the same airline that came back to us and said we need your help on this bill, and they still have not got their loans filed.

It is no surprise that an airline this poorly managed would not have their paperwork done. So before we proceed to give them more help, let us remember what they did the last time we provided them with help. Lord knows what they will do to their employees and their customers this time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, many of us wait not just minutes but hours to come to the floor to speak, and this evening, after listening to this debate about only a slice of what is in this supplemental, I cannot help but observe that this distinguished body, this great House of Representatives, has somehow created a mess. And I think the mess, and I do not like using the word, it is not out of disrespect to any individual, but haste can make a mess.

I listened to my colleagues who serve on the committee who said we had something drawn up and then something happened at the Committee on Rules. There is a frustration on my side of the aisle that we cannot offer anything to amend this. That is wrong. For people that served in the minority for 40 years, my Republican colleagues know that is wrong.

My colleagues know, and we all know, what a credit card is. If someone took any one of our credit cards and put \$750 billion on that credit card without our knowing about it, we would be the first ones to dial up and say, something has gone wrong. I have taken votes when I was new here and my leadership said it is important for the country to raise the debt limit. But, no, no one is brave enough on the other side to take that straight vote up or down.

We are accountable to our people. And so now the Nation's debt goes higher. I should not, and none of my colleagues on the minority side should be lectured to say that what we say is political. We ran for this office because we love this country. We all do. But we are not doing right by her by hiding in a poorly drafted, jammed-through-a-committee supplemental.

This is not right. It is not becoming of this House and this body. All joking aside, my colleagues know when they go home how their constituents respect

them. How can anyone answer for raising this, incurring more debt, and not explaining it to the American people without even taking a vote.

I have heard over and over and over again the lectures. I do not need to be lectured, and no one here does about how much we love our country and want to defend her. That is not the issue. That is not the issue. So it is with deep regret that I stand up this evening with a great deal of frustration and an enormous amount of sadness.

We can debate our issues and hold our ground and still respect one another. But to do this, this is wrong. This is wrong. America, tonight, \$750 billion was placed on America's credit card and we could not stand up and debate and offer a better idea.

□ 2115

If you have more votes, you can out-vote us. But ideas are at the heart of this democracy. I believe my constituents would object to this, Republicans, independents, and Democrats, because it is not becoming of those we represent, it is not becoming of the process that we should follow in a democratic institution, and I want you to know that I object. I object. I object. I object.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I might for a moment revisit the issue of USAir. The Eighth District of North Carolina has a number of USAir employees. I want to reassure them in spite of some of the things that they may have heard, that I and others here are vitally interested, whether they are machinists, pilots, caterers or other people who work at USAir. We worked very, very closely with every aspect of USAir to make certain they had every possible chance to work with us.

My colleagues here on the floor heard earlier today a very specific colloquy between the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), very specific, about our ability, desire and capability of working with USAir to make sure that there is a proper outcome for those very valuable employees.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, when Republicans put the debt ceiling in this legislation, they politicized the process. When they put deeming the budget, the Republican budget, in this process, they politicized the process. So to be lectured to that we are politicizing the process, we are responding to what you have created on the floor which you control as the majority.

For those who might not understand the sometimes arcane rules of this institution, let me put what is going on here in very plain language. Republicans have already spent all of the surpluses we had well into the future and now they are trying to get a further credit line increase without even giving us a chance, those of us who represent 49 percent of all of the American people on this side of the aisle, to approve it in an up-or-down vote.

There are some of us here, and many Americans out there, who think that raising America's debt limit is irresponsible. Why are you hiding your efforts to increase America's debt? You are hiding behind it because you clearly must be ashamed of the mess that you have made of America's budget. They are hiding behind it because they do not want the American people to know that you are raising the ceiling on how much they will owe, and their children and their grandchildren. And why do they need this debt limit increase in the first place? Not because of the recession. After all, the Congressional Budget Office is projecting deficits long after the recession is supposed to be over. Not because of the war on terrorism, which we support. Because even if you add up every last additional dollar we are spending on the war abroad and here, it does not even come close to accounting for the debt increase Republicans are proposing. So why the huge increase in debt? The answer is obvious. Republican fiscal mismanagement.

Democrats support fiscally responsible tax cuts that are paid for. But this bill saddles our children and grandchildren with huge debts that will take generations to pay off, by taking funds from Social Security and Medicare that our seniors are, and baby boomers soon will be, relying on, by increasing the amount of interest Americans pay on this debt, which is nearly \$1 billion a day.

Huge debts, deficits as far as the eye can see. Social Security raided; higher interest rate payments; the Republican fiscal plan is a disaster. Republicans passed this budget. They cannot blame anyone but themselves for the fiscal mess we are now faced with. But today they want to pass the buck to working Americans to clean up their mess and they think they can pull the wool over the eyes of the American people while doing it. At least you should have the courage to stand up and vote for what you have done. At least they should have the courage to do this out in the open instead of by illusion.

We Democrats demand the chance to vote on and oppose your irresponsible debt limit increase, this reckless credit card spending binge that you are on. But if you will not give us the chance to vote against a debt limit increase, this reckless credit card spending, if you are determined to hide it from the American people in this bill, if you are determined to raise the debt of all Americans even without so much as a

single vote, then the shame is theirs, as are the consequences.

This is exactly what we Democrats said would happen if you passed your irresponsible budget. So I would say to my Republican colleagues, you who want to blame this fiscal mess on the recession, tell that to the laid-off workers whose unemployment benefits you held hostage for weeks. And do not try to blame it on the war on terrorism. You dare not use our fighting men and women as an excuse for the deficits you have created. If you want to know who is to blame for our return to deficits, merely look in the mirror. This is an abomination on the greatest democratic institution in the world that in the marketplace of ideas that we promote throughout the world we cannot have a vote up or down on the debt ceiling so that the American people will know how you are hocking their future generations for generations to come.

It is a shame. It is an abomination. That is why you will hear the anger throughout this evening as I think you will hear it from the American people in the days ahead.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today with great admiration for my colleagues across the aisle. That is because I admire what my family calls chutzpah, or nerve, some might say gall, but not me. An ordinary person watching tonight might think that the Republican leadership would be just a little bit sheepish about coming here today and proposing a supplemental budget that we really do not have the money to pay for without dipping into the Social Security trust fund, a trust fund that just a few short months ago was safely ensconced in a lockbox, a lockbox that, if I remember correctly, one after another of those same Republican leaders declared loudly and eloquently would never, ever be unlocked. Oh, no, we would never dip into the Social Security lockbox. And why? Because we had such a huge surplus, a surplus, if I can be rude enough to mention, was inherited from the Clinton administration, a surplus of \$5.6 trillion, a surplus so large that these leaders scoffed at those of us who warned that the future is too uncertain to throw trillions of dollars of tax giveaways to the richest of the rich.

I admire my Republican colleagues that despite the fact that \$5.6 trillion of surplus is gone, gone, that we are now facing a \$300 billion deficit this year, rather than being even the slightest bit embarrassed or apologetic, they are pressing aggressively ahead with a supplemental budget that, among some very worthwhile things, also takes money out of rural hospitals, expands the war in Colombia, ignores our housing and health care needs and is all paid for by raiding the Social Security trust fund. And I admire their arguments. It is war. How dare we be so unpatriotic as to bring up trivialities

such as Social Security or debt or even fiscal responsibility? We are just being political. Although it does occur to me that there just might be such a concept as economic patriotism, that at a time of new demands caused by war, caused by our efforts to end terrorism, that it might be just the perfect moment to reconsider such things as tax cuts for the richest. Their forcefulness, some might call it sanctimony, but I do not, is laudable.

And perhaps the cleverest of all, some would say too clever by half, but not me, is the way that the Republican leaders are disguising the way they want to come up with the money that we simply do not have. They want to borrow \$750 billion more money than the law currently allows, borrow even more money from Social Security and also the Medicare trust fund. But just asking for it would not look good. After all, so many of their Members sponsored a resolution to amend the Constitution making it especially hard to borrow more money, a resolution that proves how fiscally responsible they are.

Some of my Republican colleagues from Illinois, including the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) are proud cosponsors of this resolution. Perhaps they can explain the embarrassing truth that this supplemental appropriations bill is nothing more than a stealth maneuver to orchestrate a backdoor increase in the debt limit, the same as raising the credit card limit on a credit card, but I do not expect that they are embarrassed by this fiscal sleight of hand. I congratulate them for it. As I said, I admire chutzpah. But maybe, just maybe, their constituents, who not only talk about fiscal responsibility but who practice it every day balancing their checkbook, paying their credit card bills, saving for college and saving for a rainy day, might not be as admiring as I am of this squandering of the surplus, this raiding of the Social Security, this cynical effort to borrow more money without even taking a vote on it, without any apology. They might not appreciate, as I do, the chutzpah it takes to play with such finesse at this dangerous budget game.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when this bill was presented to the Committee on Appropriations, a committee on which I sit, the distinguished chairman of the committee sent a report to each member saying that one of the pluses of this legislation was that it was a clean bill designed to provide emergency funding to fund our war against terrorism and homeland defense. I applauded that approach. Unfortunately, because of the late-night, closed-door, secret plan effort of the Committee on Rules, this bill is no longer a clean bill. It has been sullied by partisan amendments that have absolutely nothing to do with funding our war on terrorism. I find it

somewhat ironic that some of the same people who say we should support this process tonight out of patriotism for our war against terrorism just happen to be exactly the same people who orchestrated the process of the Committee on Rules so that these controversial extraneous amendments would be forced on this legislation, thus slowing down the funding for our war on terrorism.

What is wrong with all of this? Let me count the ways. First, adding \$750 billion in deficit spending could certainly undermine the future of Social Security and Medicare. When you add that extra debt onto our already enormous \$6 trillion national debt and consider the enormous interest payment that taxpayers have to pay each year on that, we could in effect be putting at risk benefits for Medicare and Social Security recipients.

Second, \$750 billion in deficit spending will increase the cost for homeowners to buy a new home, for family businesses to build or expand their businesses, or for families to buy a car by increasing interest rates, a direct result of massive deficit spending. In fact, if we increase the mortgage rate, interest rate on a \$100,000 home in America, that family will have in effect their taxes increased by \$1,000 a year. That is what is wrong with this secret, late-night plan to raise our deficit spending by \$750 billion.

Let me count the additional ways that this is wrong. Third. This kind of deficit spending will lead to higher taxes for hard-working Americans. In fact, interest on the national debt today is one of the 5 largest expenditures of the Federal Government out of the thousands and thousands of programs we fund. In fact, last year on average every man, woman, child and infant in America was responsible for \$1,200 in taxes just to pay the interest on our present national debt, not to speak about the extra \$750 billion we are going to add to that debt.

□ 2130

In fact, if one assumes a 5 percent interest rate on this \$750 billion increase in deficit spending, that amounts to about \$37.5 billion a year in increased taxes on the American people, simply to pay the interest on that debt. That is what is wrong with this bill and this process.

Fourth, in increasing deficit spending by \$750 billion through this measure, we are going to make it harder to fund priority national programs such as national defense, veterans' health care and education.

Fifth, I think it is wrong to burden our children and grandchildren with a \$6.7 trillion national debt. We in this generation of Congress have no right to drown our grandchildren in a sea of national debt.

Sixth, by slowing down this bill with controversial, unrelated amendments, partisan amendments that have nothing to do with funding the war on ter-

rorism or homeland defense, we basically end up harming national defense, because we will force military training at bases such as mine, Fort Hood in my district, to be delayed or canceled in order to fund our war on terrorism, because we will not pass this bill as quickly as we could pass it had we not had these extraneous, late-night, secret amendments added to this bill.

Now, perhaps the handful of Republican district hospitals given special treatment at the cost of every other rural hospital in America stuck in this bill, maybe those hospitals have some unknown direct relation to fighting our war on terrorism and homeland defense. I certainly have not heard that explanation in this debate tonight.

Mr. Chairman, if increasing the national debt by \$750 billion, if adding that burden on our children and grandchildren, cannot pass the test of open debate and an honest vote, it does not deserve to be hidden in a bill purported to fund our war on terrorism. Shame on our House if we do that.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, a man for whom I have great respect, a colleague I enjoy working with, has described this bill as the emergency wartime supplemental. Indeed, much of the content of this bill does exactly as the chairman describes. Unfortunately, and I believe it is extraordinarily unfortunate, the chairman was unable to keep his bill relative to the emergency wartime supplemental purposes he speaks so convincingly about.

Once again we see critical legislation hijacked somewhere in the legislative process, in the bowels of the majority leadership somewhere, and turned into something quite different than what it initially purported to be.

There is a feature of this bill that I feel is extraordinarily unfortunate, and that is what I rise to point out tonight. Language in this bill sets the stage for a significant increase in the national debt. One year ago, 1 year ago tonight, we were not talking at all about raising the national debt, we were not talking about deficits; we were looking at a 10-year surplus of \$5.6 trillion. What we now know is the 10-year outlook has deteriorated \$4 trillion.

Mr. Chairman, we have presided over the worst reversal of financial fortune of the United States Treasury in the history of the country. We all ought to be alarmed. Those who voted for legislation contributing to this reversal ought to be ashamed.

But we all ought to realize, one to another, that something has got to be done. We wanted to have, at the time you were going to seek to raise the debt, because we know now the budget is in the red this year, running in the red to the tune potentially of \$140 billion, that is almost half a billion dollars more out the door in spending a day than we are bringing in, and you were going to ask us in participating in

raising the debt limit, we had a request for you, a very simple, very straightforward request: Show us your plan. Show us your plan to get us out of this debt. Show us your plan to get us back to the black. Reverse this run of red ink, this shame you have brought upon the fiscal policy of this country.

We deserve that, and the American people deserve that, a discussion about what was required by way of raising the debt limit, a discussion about a plan and a process to get us back to black, as simple as one, two, three: The majority passes their budget, we go into the red, debt limit increase required. But show us a plan to get out.

It is important, it is very important, that we work together to get back to the black as soon as possible. There is nothing Republican, there is nothing Democrat, about the demographics facing this country. Those demographics have a very harsh fact that we ought to think about every single day. Seventy-eight million Americans in the year 2010 will be within 10 years of turning 65. Within that next decade they will be on Medicare. Within that next decade they will be on Social Security. Should I be alive, I will be one of them, because we are the great baby-boom bulge, about to place a strain on entitlement spending like never before.

Obviously we know this is coming. We can see it in the age trends. We have got to prepare. There is no great mystery of fiscal policy to prepare for the hit we are about to take. We have got to pay down the debt. We have got to make sure the Social Security dollars coming in are held for the benefit of Social Security. We have got to prepare.

Instead, we are doing the worst thing we can do. If paying down the debt and making our country fiscally stronger is the best thing, we are doing the worst thing. We are taking Social Security revenue and we are spending it on other programs; we are taking dollars coming in from payroll taxes from the guys working hard every day, counting on that Social Security, and we are spending it on other programs. Rather than strengthening our fiscal position, we are back into borrowing and adding debt onto our country.

We have to stop this practice. Chickens have a way of coming home to roost, and unchecked debt means reduction in Social Security benefits.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support providing whatever funds the President needs to fight the war on terrorism. I do not think there is a Republican or a Democrat in this body that does not support the President in fighting this war on terrorism; all the more reason Congress should not be playing politics with this bill, a bill that supplies important funds for our fighting men and our fighting women.

Hiding a huge increase in the national debt limit and an assortment of other budget gimmicks to this bill

under the cover of darkness, literally in this case, is a political game. A \$750 billion increase in the national debt requires, for heaven's sake, an open and thoughtful debate. A \$750 billion increase in the national debt requires, surely, an up-or-down vote, not in secret. But we are not going to get either one of those offers this evening. And to this I say shame on the majority.

I know all of my constituents expect certain things, regardless of their party affiliation: Straight answers and a willingness to be held accountable for our actions. They know if they charged their credit cards to the limit, they have to pay down their balance or work out an arrangement with the credit card companies to get an increase in their credit limits. They most certainly cannot write a small note on the memo line of their checks to the credit card companies asking those same companies to "please raise our credit limits" and expect it to happen.

Why should Congress be any different? Why should Congress get to operate under a different set of rules? The short answer is that Congress is no different and should not be able to operate under a different set of rules.

Congress should be held accountable for this \$750 billion increase in the debt limit and the actions that have made this increase necessary. The days of surpluses are gone, and in a very short time the Social Security lockbox has been emptied and the days of deficits and borrowing money from the public to pay the government's bills are back. Yet the majority has no stomach for taking a step back, looking at the whole budget picture, figuring out how we got into this mess and how we are going to work to try to get out of this mess.

My colleague, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), and I each offered amendments that would have helped restore fiscal discipline to the Federal budget process. In fact, the Moore-Spratt amendment would have provided limited increases in the debt limit and required Congress and the President to develop a plan to balance the budget without counting Social Security.

My amendment would have imposed discipline and accountability in the budget process by extending and strengthening the spending limits and pay-go rules in the Budget Enforcement Act, something that we have been living under for the last several years, something that you all think is necessary, that you voted for. And yet you will not allow that amendment to be put in this spending measure. My amendment would have imposed discipline.

But both amendments were ruled out of order. Instead of an open debate on these amendments and what should be done with the government's maxed-out credit card, the majority hid a \$750 billion increase in the national debt in this important bill. That, I am afraid, is an action my constituents would find to be a little less than honest.

I have been told by my colleagues on this side of the aisle that if the Democrats would be in the majority this evening and would have been offering this bill here this evening, that you on the other side of the aisle would be yelling to the heavens against it, that we should not be increasing this debt limit. And I have no doubt, I have only been here for 2 years, I have no doubt that we have been guilty of what you are doing tonight.

So it is time to put away the foolishness of the past. It is time to admit the Democrats in the past have done the wrong thing, and it is time for you all to admit, I would hope, in the sense of doing the right thing, that we have the opportunity to vote up and down on this vote; that we are not doing it in the dead of night; that we do it in a way that is honest; that we not resort to the politics as usual; that we be bipartisan and straightforward with the American public; and that I think the American public would appreciate that.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to point out that under the protocols established by the majority leader, the Committee on Rules of this House, when it brought rules forward, was to allow committees that are authorizing committees if they notified the Committee on Rules of concerns they had that represented appropriation that was unauthorized on a bill of this sort, that they would be subject to a point of order. Unfortunately, that has not been done in a number of cases where things that are amounts of money that are not authorized are in fact being appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund.

We have worked very hard in this body over the last several Congresses to reestablish the concept of a Highway Trust Fund; to reestablish trust, put trust back in the Highway Trust Fund. And yet the legislation, unfortunately, would provide for funding some \$19.3 million for border enforcement activities; a very good program, but one that is not authorized from the trust fund. That will mean less money available for important transportation needs in our country. It is something that should be done out of our general revenue, not out of the Highway Trust Fund without an authorization.

The second thing I would like to point out is that the legislation does provide for some \$5 million for the Safety Permitting Program to come from the Highway Trust Fund. Again, the Safety Permitting Program is under the Hazardous Material Program. The HAZMAT Program is funded from general funds and is funded out of registration fees.

□ 2145

This is something that again will result in less money available for transportation needs in this country and will free up funds for other programs. I understand the problems that we have, but this is not a proper use of the highway trust fund.

In addition, there are over \$4 million being provided for background security checks, again out of the highway trust fund. This is not something that was contemplated, it has not been authorized, and it should not have been done; and I regret it. I want to call it to the attention of the Members as this legislation moves forward through the process, which I am confident it will do, so that we can, as we refine this legislation in conference and it comes back to the floor, maintain the principle of integrity of the transportation trust fund that we have all worked so hard, really all of us have worked so hard to establish.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am looking at the clock now and wondering what my constituents are doing on the west coast in Los Angeles, California; and I know that they are probably just finishing up their dinner, and maybe not dwelling on what we are doing here in the Congress. But I can tell my colleagues that the people in my district would be shocked. They would be alarmed to know that language has been inserted in this bill that is going to be voted on tonight to allow for a huge increase in the national debt limit, and I think it is irresponsible; and I know that many of them would feel that same way. Worst yet, it forces us to play Russian roulette with the livelihood of our Nation's seniors and the future of America's children. Social Security should provide just that: security. But by raising the debt limit today, we endanger our Nation's safety net which allows our senior citizens to live out their golden years with dignity and respect.

We are playing with the lives of our senior citizens, men and women who have worked hard for our Nation and deserve the full benefits of Social Security to help pay for their rent, their food, and their prescription drugs. We are playing with the lives of our baby boomers, who must not only help care for their senior citizen parents, but also have to plan for their impending retirements. What about those people?

We are playing with the lives of our young people who every day pay into Social Security, but which may not be there to provide for them when they need it.

Just last year, our Nation enjoyed one of the largest surpluses in American history, but then the Bush administration and the Republican leadership ran through what I call a reckless series of tax cuts designed to provide the most benefit to the richest 1 percent of Americans, many of whom are not seen on this floor tonight. By raising the debt limit, this administration continues to rob the working poor and middle class by stifling them with the additional debt. Raising the debt ceiling weakens Social Security for our current senior citizens and baby boomers like myself.

Look in the mirror. Look at the American future. Last August the

Treasury Secretary, Paul O'Neill, predicted that the United States would not reach into its debt ceiling until late 2003, but now that the Republican leadership has passed its huge tax breaks for the very wealthy, we are quickly being forced to juggle our Nation's accounting books. Raising the ceiling steals, literally steals hundreds of billions of dollars from the Social Security trust fund, from that fund which my parents rely on right now. It is a backwards Robin Hood policy, stealing from the poor and our Nation's seniors to give to the rich.

Mr. Chairman, every day Americans pay \$1 billion in interest on our national debt. That is about 16 cents for every dollar we pay into taxes. Raising the debt ceiling will do nothing to alleviate the problem; it just gets worse.

I am staunchly opposed to this plan. I support a responsible budget that makes needed investments in our national security, protects our Social Security, Medicare, and does not saddle our children and our grandchildren with enormous national debt.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of good things in this bill. It will provide appropriations to help us fight the war on terrorism. It will provide some good things for our veterans. All of these are things that we all support. But I have to tell my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, the way that the attempt is being made to deceive the American people in the dark of night to make it possible to add to the debt of our children and grandchildren, to steal the Social Security trust fund, to endanger the well-being of our senior citizens makes me want a dip of snuff, and I do not even use tobacco.

I grew up in a community where there were a lot of bootleggers. They look like paragons of virtue compared to this crowd. The great country music singer Merle Haggard wrote a song called "Rainbow Stew." I just want to paraphrase this. He said, "When a Member of Congress goes through the Capitol door and does what he says he will do, we will all be drinking that free Bubble-up and eating that rainbow stew."

Well, I am here to tell my colleagues we are getting fed a big pot of rainbow stew tonight.

If this is an emergency wartime appropriations bill, why does it have a stealth effort to raise the debt ceiling to put more debt on our children and grandchildren? Why does it do that? If that is what this is about, why do we not just have an appropriations bill? We do not need one of these chicken-hearted rules that allows for some kind of stealth effort to put more debt on our children and grandchildren, to threaten our senior citizens with losing their Social Security. Why would we want to do something like this? Why not have a vote up or down on whether or not to raise the debt ceiling?

Let us face reality. All the money is gone. It has all been spent. This time

last year we had money in the bank. We were paying off debt. I remember so well the Director of the Office of Management and Budget coming to the Blue Dogs and saying, our greatest fear is that we are going to have so much money that we are going to pay off all the debt and there will not be any U.S. Treasury bonds. Well, dear heart, you can rest easy tonight. There is going to be a U.S. Treasury bond available for as far as anybody can imagine, and our children and grandchildren are going to have to pay it off. That is not right.

I can tell my colleagues that they may do it just because they have more votes; but my colleagues are not going to do it without me coming to this well and raising the issue, and I am not going to go back home and face my children and grandchildren. I am not going to look at my three grandchildren, and they are to me just as dear as anything can possibly be, just like everybody's grandchildren are, and let them look at me 20 years from now, if I am still around, and say, Granddaddy, why did you not do something about that? Why did you let that happen? Why did you put this debt on us? Why did you destroy this country over the only reason you had that was to stay in power and reduce taxes on the wealthiest people in this country? Why did you do that?

When I have to face that question, I at least will be able to stand before them and say, I did everything I could do; but we were not in the majority. We did not have any control over that.

I ask my colleagues to think about what they are doing. Think about what they are doing. All we ask is for my Republican colleagues to sit down with us in this bipartisan spirit I have heard so much about, and if this is bipartisanship, I am a space scientist, and everybody who knows me knows that is not true.

We hear about bipartisanship, but yet we have this single-handed attempt to cram this down our throats. Let us sit down in a bipartisan way. Let us do an honest budget. Let us recognize what we are doing and not steal from our children, our grandchildren, and our senior citizens to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues not to pass this bill.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I really had not intended to speak tonight on the supplemental appropriation, but I have been locked out of my office due to my own inability to remember my keys, so I have had no recourse but to sit on the floor and actually listen to the debate, which is a very enlightening experience.

Now, I got elected in 1984. From 1985 in January when I got sworn in, to 1995 in January, when the first Republican majority took this House in over 40 years, there was one balanced budget

presented to the House of Representatives to vote on. One, in the first 10 years that I was a Member of this body serving in the minority, and that was the budget that President Reagan supported. I think it got 13 votes, and I voted for it. There was a reception down at the White House and President Reagan asked all of the folks that were willing to vote for a balanced budget to come down, and I believe there were 13 of us. I think all 13 were Republicans, but it is possible that there were one or two Democrats, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) and perhaps the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM). I would have to go back and look at that.

So the first point I want to make about that is that when my good friends who are in the minority tonight were in the majority, they did not present any balanced budgets for the American people; they did not present any balanced budgets on the House floor. Now, when the Republicans got into the majority, we did. In fact, I remember when President Clinton was in office, we had a partial government shutdown because the Republicans were insisting that there be a balanced budget; and at least in that first year, President Clinton said, balanced budgets do not count. We do not need a balanced budget. He later changed his position, and we got balanced budgets; and I will say for the record that both Republicans and Democrats voted for those balanced budgets.

Now we are at a point in our Nation's history where we have had a recession, we have to fight the war on terrorism, we have had to present some budgets that are unbalanced. But let us think about that. There are actually two parts to a Federal budget. There is the discretionary spending budget, and this year that budget is about \$769 billion, \$759 billion, somewhere in that range; and then there is an entitlement portion of the budget, and that entitlement portion of the budget is over \$1 trillion. Then there is interest on the national debt, and that portion of the budget is over \$200 billion.

Now, I have brought to the floor, in the time that I have been a Member of this House, budget process reform bills to change the way we do budgeting, and I had good support from the Democrats in those efforts, trying to change the budget process itself. But under the system that we are operating under today, we cannot do anything about the entitlement part of the budget; we can only do something about the discretionary part of the budget.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has moved heaven and Earth to hold the line on discretionary spending. I am told that the increase from last year to this year in the budget resolution, in the budget the appropriators are working on, is 1 percent, 1 percent.

□ 2200

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget that is sitting at the back

of the room, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), presented a budget on the floor that has held the line on discretionary spending. So we are going through the budget process under rules that I think need to be fixed. I want to fix them. I talked to the Speaker of the House yesterday about fixing them.

But under this budget resolution, the budget resolution that we are operating under, we cannot do anything about entitlements. We can only do something about discretionary spending. This supplemental spending bill that is before us this evening is somewhere between \$27.1 billion and a little over \$29 billion in supplemental discretionary spending. That is a good number, and we should vote for that and then work together on a bipartisan basis to reform the budget process later on so that we can do something about the larger issue.

Mr. Chairman, let us keep in mind that there is politics and there is policy. The policy embedded in this supplemental appropriation bill is a good policy. We should vote for it.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time in order to discuss the schedule for the rest of the evening and, indeed, the rest of the week with the Members of this body.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by apologizing to all the Members of this body. It had been my hope and my expectation that we would be able to complete our work for the week and our work on this bill this evening.

Given that expectation, which seemed reasonable at the time, it was me who advised so many of you to go ahead and make your travel plans so that you could return to your district work periods in your respective districts across the country as early as possible tomorrow. We are all anxious to get home to be with our families, to be with our constituents, and to take up that important work we have scheduled in our districts.

However, it seems that there are a large number of Members of the body that do not have that desire to get home, and have decided they would like to prolong this debate and discuss any number of matters. We could go on through the evening. We could work all night. But, Mr. Chairman, there would be nothing productive, worthwhile, or contributing to the well-being of this Nation if we spent our time in that way.

Far better, I would think, for us to go ahead and complete our work for the evening, rise from the committee, and then resume our work tomorrow. It being a Thursday, we will not be able to resume our work before 10 a.m. I can only make my commitment to the Members of the body that I and the other Members of the leadership, I am sure, on both sides of the aisle will do everything we can to work out whatever agreements might be possible so that we might be able to complete our

work at a reasonable time tomorrow, so that people might be able to reschedule their planes and their travel arrangements, and perhaps make it home by even possibly Friday for their district work period.

The distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), is a man of an extraordinary high ability and good heart, as is the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). I have every confidence that given the encouragement we might give these two gentlemen, we might find them capable of coming in tomorrow and working out an agreement between themselves and others who have amendments that might pend so that we can accommodate to the desire of the Members to complete this work.

I must say, however, that failure to arrive at these kinds of agreements would result in our staying through Friday, through Saturday, if necessary. I would hope that is not necessary. I know we all have family and constituents that we long to see. But this is about funding the war on terrorism and the security of this Nation. I am sure there is nobody in this body that wants to go home without completing this bill.

Mr. Chairman, while I will ask the Chairman of the Committee to rise from our work this evening and resume it in the morning, it is, again, as I said before, with my most sincere apology to all of the Members on both sides of the aisle who made travel plans based on my assurances that they will have to reschedule them, and it is my sincere hope and belief that we will be able to tell Members a timetable in the morning that will make it possible for them to reschedule in a manner that will be, let's say, accommodating to Members and their families and their travel plans.

I hope Members have a special evening. Let me just say as a final note, the Colorado Avalanche is winning tonight, so all is not lost.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4775) making supplemental appropriations for further recovery from and response to terrorist attacks on the United States for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMUNICATION FROM HONORABLE RICHARD K. ARMEY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu-

nication from the Honorable RICHARD K. ARMEY, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2002.

Hon. DENNIS J. HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House, that I have determined that the subpoena for documents and testimony issued to me by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia is not material and relevant, and may be inconsistent with the privileges and rights of the House. Accordingly, I have instructed the Office of General Counsel to object to and to move to quash the subpoena.

Sincerely,

RICHARD K. ARMEY,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM HONORABLE TOM DELAY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable TOM DELAY, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2002.

Hon. DENNIS J. HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House, that I have determined that the subpoena for documents and testimony issued to me by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia is not material and relevant, and may be inconsistent with the privileges and rights of the House. Accordingly, I have instructed the Office of General Counsel to object to and to move to quash the subpoena.

Sincerely,

TOM DELAY,
Member of Congress.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION NEEDED TO DETERMINE FACTS

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, evidence continues to mount that we suffered a major, major failure of intelligence prior to September 11.

Our colleague, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, writes in this morning's Washington Post that asking and urging and demanding answers by various agencies, the Federal Government failing to understand the enormity of the danger facing the United States is an obligation shared by all elected officials.

We were told in Newsweek earlier this week that even after the President asked, What is going on here, his intelligence advisors were unable to tease out the facts or decipher the information.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we need an independent commission. We need an independent commission to determine the facts.