



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 23, 2002

No. 68

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Lord God without beginning or end, before whom we are all to appear to be judged, be merciful to Your servants today.

As our Nation approaches Memorial Day, fill the hearts of Americans with gratitude for all of those who gave their lives in defense of freedom and to protect this Nation. May our memory of the distant past and more recent events encourage the men and women in military service now.

To memorialize is to bring to consciousness again the names and faces of those who have gone, but are not forgotten, because of their noble lives and ultimate sacrifice. This year we include in our prayer all of those who died in the attacks of September 11 and especially those who, since then, have shed life's blood in the fight against terrorism.

Strengthen with Your loving compassion all of the families still traumatized by their loss. Renew this Nation in an intelligent patriotism which unfurls new dimensions of equal justice and hope for the poor as we wave the flag of freedom before the world, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SCHIFF led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4592. An act to name the chapel located in the national cemetery in Los Angeles, California, as the "Bob Hope Veterans Chapel".

H.R. 4608. An act to name the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical and Regional Office Center in Wichita, Kansas, as the "Robert J. Dole Department of Veterans Affairs Medical and Regional Office Center".

H.R. 4782. An act to extend the authority of the Export-Import Bank until June 14, 2002.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 327. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, for the purpose of facilitating compliance by small businesses with certain Federal paperwork requirements and to establish a task force to examine the feasibility of streamlining paperwork requirements applicable to small businesses.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1644. An act to further the protection and recognition of veterans' memorials, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 103-227, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, reappoints the following individuals to the National Skill Standards Board:

Upon the recommendation of the Republican Leader—

Earline N. Ashley, of Mississippi, Representative of Human Resources;

Ronald K. Robinson, of Mississippi, Representative of Labor.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain 1 minutes at the end of business today.

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

The SPEAKER. 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 further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4775.

□ 1004

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 further 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. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, May 22, 2002, the bill had been read through page 5, line 5.

The Clerk will read.

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.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H2947

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 99, noes 289, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 197]

AYES—99

Ackerman Hoeffel Pelosi
Allen Holt Peterson (MN)
Andrews Honda Pomeroy
Baird Inslee Price (NC)
Baldwin Jackson-Lee
Barrett (TX)
Berkley Jefferson
Berman John
Berry Jones (OH)
Bishop Kaptur
Blumenauer Kilpatrick
Bonior Kind (WI)
Boucher Kleczka
Brady (PA) Larsen (WA)
Brown (OH) Larson (CT)
Capps Lee
Capuano Lowey
Cardin Lynch
Clayton Maloney (NY)
Clyburn Matsui
Conyers McCarthy (NY)
DeFazio McDermott
Delahunt McGovern
Dingell McNulty
Doggett Meehan
Evans Miller, George
Filner Mink
Ford Napolitano
Frank Neal
Gephardt Oberstar
Harman Obey
Hastings (FL) Olver
Hill Pallone
Hilliard Pascrell

NOES—289

Abercrombie Cunningham
Aderholt Davis (CA)
Akin Davis (FL)
Army Davis, Jo Ann
Baca Davis, Tom
Bachus Deal
Baker DeGette
Ballenger DeLauro
Barcia DeLay
Barr DeMint
Bartlett Diaz-Balart
Bass Dicks
Bentsen Doolley
Bereuter Doolittle
Biggett Doyle
Billrakis Dreier
Blagojevich Duncan
Blunt Hoyer
Boehlert Edwards
Boehner Emerson
Bonilla Eshoo
Bono Etheridge
Boozman Everett
Borski Farr
Boswell Ferguson
Brady (TX) Flake
Brown (SC) Fletcher
Bryant Foley
Burr Forbes
Buyer Fossella
Callahan Frelinghuysen
Calvert Frost
Camp Gallegly
Cannon Ganske
Cantor Gekas
Capito Gibbons
Carson (IN) Gilchrest
Carson (OK) Gillmor
Castle Gilman
Chabot Gonzalez
Chambliss Goode
Clement Goodlatte
Coble Gordon
Collins Goss
Costello Graham
Coyne Granger
Cramer Graves
Crenshaw Green (TX)
Crowley Green (WI)
Cubin Greenwood
Culberson Grucci

Lewis (CA) Payne
Lewis (GA) Pence
Lewis (KY) Peterson (PA)
LoBiondo Petri
Lofgren Phelps
Lucas (KY) Pickering
Lucas (OK) Pitts
Luther Platts
Maloney (CT) Pombo
Manzullo Portman
Mascara Pryce (OH)
Matheson Putnam
McCarthy (MO) Quinn
McCollum Radanovich
McCrery Rahall
McHugh Ramstad
McInnis Regula
McIntyre Rehberg
McKeon Reyes
Meeks (NY) Reynolds
Menendez Riley
Mica Rivers
Millender Roemer
Blumendal Rogers (KY)
Miller, Dan Rogers (MI)
Miller, Gary Rohrabacher
Miller, Jeff Ros-Lehtinen
Mollohan Ross
Moore Roukema
Moran (KS) Royce
Moran (VA) Ryan (WI)
Morella Ryun (KS)
Myrick Sawyer
Nethercutt Saxton
Ney Schaffer
Northup Schrock
Norwood Scott
Nussle Sensenbrenner
Ortiz Serrano
Osborne Sessions
Ose Shadegg
Otter Shaw
Owens Shays
Oxley Sherman
Pastor Sherwood
Paul Shimkus

NOT VOTING—46

Baldacci Ehrlich
Barton Engel
Becerra English
Boyd Fattah
Brown (FL) Gutierrez
Burton Herger
Clay Hinchey
Combest Hinojosa
Condit Isakson
Cooksey Johnson, E. B.
Cox Leach
Crane Linder
Cummings Lipinski
Davis (IL) Markey
Deutsch McKinney
Ehlers Meek (FL)

□ 1027

Messrs. CROWLEY, DOOLITTLE, and ROGERS of Kentucky, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Messrs. SHAYS, GUTKNECHT, SIMMONS, and RAHALL changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 197 I was detained in reaching the House floor, and the vote was closed before I reached the floor. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably delayed on rollcall vote 197. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall vote 197.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for everyone to understand why we are here and what will be happening today.

We are going to be having a not very pleasant day because a lot of us are

concerned about the future economic health of the country. As we all know, after the huge deficits of the 1980s, we followed budget policies and economic policies in the 1990s that put us back into, at long last, a surplus condition. We paid off billions of dollars, and it was giving us a chance to strengthen Social Security so that it could withstand the pressures from the retirement of the baby boomers that will begin shortly.

That was all blown away last year by passage of the majority party's tax package that put in place over the next decade a series of additional tax actions largely aimed at the most wealthy taxpayers in the country which will drain the Treasury of untold numbers of billions and billions and billions of dollars.

□ 1030

And that is draining the Treasury dry. And it is a major reason why today, instead of running the surpluses that we were running for three years, we are now expected to have a deficit that might approach \$300 billion this year. And as a result of that, we again are facing a situation where Social Security and Medicare are being put at risk because of the short-sightedness of this body.

Now, the bill before us originally had nothing to do with that issue. It was a simple war supplemental. It was a responsible bill put together by both parties on the Committee on Appropriations, and most of us were willing to enthusiastically vote for it. But it has been changed by the rule adopted yesterday to now become the vehicle under which \$750 billion of new national debt will be sneaked in to public law, as this bill goes to the Senate and returns. That was the whole purpose of the rule that was adopted yesterday. That means in essence this bill will become the vehicle by which we raise the limits on the national credit card by \$700 billion.

In addition, they throw in some other nonessential items. They did a few favors for a few Members on their hospitals. They made a major change in the trade law that has no business in this bill.

Now, all of us want to go home. We want to go give our Memorial Day speeches, and we would like to leave here at a reasonable time. But we are prepared on this side of the aisle to do whatever has to be done in order to strike out from this bill all of the extraneous provisions, return this bill to the committee-passed vehicle that passed the committee on a bipartisan overwhelming basis.

We want to strip out the gimmicks that will increase the national debt. We want to strip out the other favors and get back to the original bill. If we can find a way to do that, we are happy to procedurally cooperate and finish this bill at a reasonable hour. If we cannot get that kind of agreement, we are willing to stay here all weekend. I

do not know about other Members, but I brought a change of clothes and several shirts; and I am willing to use them. I might even be willing to lend one around if someone needs one.

This is not funny business; there is serious stuff. We want to pass what has been described by people on both sides as a simple war supplemental. The bill that was produced by the Republican majority on the Committee on Appropriations is good enough for us. It ought to be good enough for the Republican leadership.

So I ask the majority leadership of this House to do the responsible thing, strip out the gimmicks, strip out the sneaky way of trying to raise the national debt, bring us back to the original core bill so we can go home and do what we want to do on this most holy of weekends.

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

Mr. Chairman, as usual the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I have agreed on a lot. And one agreement is we are going to stay here until we finish this bill, whatever it takes. And if it takes two or three changes of clothes, we will be here. We are going to finish this bill. You know why? Because this is an emergency defense supplemental at time of war. American soldiers are on the battlefield. American soldiers are dying, unfortunately. A family in West Virginia just two days ago lost a son, lost a husband, lost a father.

America is at war. We are not only fighting on the battlefields, we are fighting terrorist cells, headquarters, groups and organizations, whenever we can find them.

A lot of money that we are providing in this bill for the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard has already been spent. The Army, for example, has reached into their fourth quarter operational money, and they are using it now to fight the war. So what do they do in the last quarter of the year if we do not move this bill? We are going to move this bill to completion. It may only pass by one vote, but it is going to pass.

If you want to argue about the fact that some of the things that are in this bill do not really relate to the appropriations bill that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said he would support and that I support enthusiastically, I may agree with that. I may agree that there are some things on this bill that should not have been added. But the fact is the majority of this House worked its will, and that is what we are dealing with now.

And so, I think it would be well for us to move this bill quickly so we can prove to the world, friends, and enemies, that we are serious about fighting this war and eliminating the threat of terrorism. We can do that by joining with the President and providing this appropriation to the President of the United States as he prosecutes this

war. So let us get to it. If it is going to take all day today, if it is going to take late into the night, if it is going to take all day tomorrow, late tomorrow, if it is going to take Saturday or Sunday or Monday or Tuesday, be my guest. Take whatever time you wish. I am very patient, and I will be here right to the bitter end. But we really ought to let common sense prevail.

Let us move this important wartime defense emergency supplemental bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not think we really are that far apart. As the dean of the New York delegation, I cannot thank this House enough for responding to the strike that the terrorists made against our great city and, therefore, our great country. And God knows I do not run from any defense of this great Republic that has meant so much to so many, not only here but the dependency that we have in the free world. We stand united in telling the President of the United States that now, especially during Memorial Day, please depend on the support of the American people as expressed by their representatives in the House of Representatives.

So let that flag fly high today, and let all of us salute it by saying, make no mistake about it. The work of the Committee on Appropriations, the bringing together of the diversity, but coming out ahead is one of the most magnificent feelings of bipartisanship and certainly support of the President of the United States in our collective war against terrorism.

What we are talking about today is why would we jeopardize the fine work of this committee by including provisions that have nothing to do with our patriotism, nothing to do with the war, and nothing to do with our support of the President that has guided us this far. Are we prepared to say that in this bill that is filled with doing the right thing that we can determine which hospitals and which Republican districts should get help? Is a child that is sick in one area more important than another child because of the political persuasion of their Representative? Should we really be dealing in international treaties? Should we really be saying that we are going to provide for increasing the ability of the country to borrow money in this bill?

What we are saying is, and what we are leading with, do not take this as a threat, we are asking you to please consider giving us an opportunity, not just to go home, to go home united with a message saying that we support the President and let terrorists know that we are not Republicans and Democrats in this House. We are Americans and we stand together. And we want that message to go out.

So we are not here to decide treaties. We are not here to decide budgets. We are not here to decide which hospitals we are going to support. We are here as Americans who support this war effort. We are here to support the work that

has been done by the Committee on Appropriations, and we just do not think other issues should cloud it.

So we are going to talk today not about anything else except our agreement. And for those people who want to talk about taking this bill and distorting the direction which it should go, let them come to the floor and tell us why their hospitals are more important than this war effort. Let them come to the floor and say why we should not have hearings in the Committee on Ways and Means on the debt ceiling. Let them come to the floor and determine why we have to pay off a Member for a vote on a bill because he has an interest in a trade bill. Let them come to the floor because they are the ones that are stopping us from supporting the President of the United States now.

So when you say "as long as it takes," at the end of the day we are going to end up together because we are patriots together. And nobody that debates the process should be charged with being less American than anyone else on this floor.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of this committee. It has not been just this bill, it has been most bills that he has tried to do the right thing by the Members of the House of Representatives and tried to do the right thing by Americans. But it is the Committee on Rules, long after we are gone that would be the only committee we need in this House, if the leadership can just, whether it is Republican or Democrat, just go to the Committee on Rules and start to legislate. That is a bad road for us to travel, especially at a time when we are at war.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, rarely do I come to the well of the House to address the House, but I wanted to say a few words to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), personally. I think the gentleman knows full well that I dislike that rule vote every bit as much as he does. I am not certain, but perhaps it is the worst vote I have ever made around this place. But when the chairman of my committee, a man of great patience, is providing leadership for my committee, the gentleman knows very well where I will be.

The underlying bill before us today involves a supplemental to fund the war on terrorism. Now, when we are not in the leadership, we find ourselves in interesting circumstances. The leadership has to do certain things to get the work of governing done. If you look at the history of my service in the House, among other things, from time to time I found myself among those who voted for raising the debt limit when the other side of the aisle put us in the position of having to approve debt limit increases or close down the government. I voted from time to time for debt limit increases. I did not like doing that, but sometimes you have got to govern around here.

Now, having said all of that, and separate from our leadership, there is absolutely no doubt that one of the more thrilling moments that I have ever experienced was in this House after the President spoke to us all—the Senate, the House, the entire Cabinet and the Supreme Court were present. He brought us all together after September 11th, reflecting the spirit of America that said we are at war for the first time in a generation, several generations.

□ 1045

Our country, our very way of life is being threatened. We are at war. The President struck a note that was the American people's note. They want us together, not in partisan division.

My colleagues will remember that moment—TOM DASCHLE stepping into the well of the House with the President—When they hugged each other, not just in friendship and respect, but because they were reflecting that American spirit. Our people want us together. This Bill is the mechanism for funding this war on terrorism. We will either play a partisan game all day in where the other side which was leading us in my first 15 years in the House to a multiple, multiple trillion-dollar debt, wants to roll a partisan drum that says, Oh, there's more debt out there as a result of that rule yesterday.

Debt? Give me a break, friends. Everybody around here seems to want to spend money when it is available to spend. But we are at war. This bill is a wartime supplemental, something that most of the Members of this House have never experienced. Most of you have never served at a time of war. I have not. The reality is that this is a time for us to come together, to reflect the American will that says we will be together, we will not be in partisan divide.

We will hear this today. We will see who drags back the work of the House. This supplemental should have been off the floor last week, the week before, if it had not been for silly games. My colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), knows full well that is the case. I appreciate his support.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, since he has used my name?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin. I am always proud to use his name.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman. He is my good friend. He is a good Member of the House.

Let me simply say that what the gentleman says about the need to be together on the war is absolutely correct. And we have been. And this committee has been. We were together on the first \$40 billion supplemental that passed immediately after September 11. We were together on the additional supplemental funding that we provided at the end of the year which boosted the antiterrorism spending even over the objection of the White House. And we were together on this bill.

Where we are not going to be together is if the majority party leadership insists on making us enablers for economic policy that is going to weaken the economic future of this country, and that is what we are doing by this debt ceiling increase. That is what we are divided on, not the need to support our troops or the war effort.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Let me suggest to my colleague that for the first 18 or so years of my time here I served in the minority. I say this is my eighth year in the House because I did not know what it was like to be in the majority. I must say that you all have learned a lot from the time when we were in the minority. Sometimes that is good. Sometimes that is bad. But the fact is, I did not realize a difference until suddenly a revolution took place here. With that revolution came new responsibility.

This majority is going to pass the bill that funds the war on terrorism, no matter how long it takes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the war effort. We all rise today in support of the war effort. In fact, as the debate I think has made clear over the last several hours, this issue today is not really about the war effort. The very simple, very clear question that is presented today is whether it is appropriate under the guise of a very necessary, a very important war measure, the supplemental appropriations bill, we should append to that imperative measure another part that would raise the national debt by \$750 billion, whether we should append that issue to this moving train, whether that is appropriate for this House.

Today, the House takes a very significant step in raising the Nation's debt by \$750 billion. This is no minor matter. This is no trivial resolution without impact. This is our retirement funds. This is our Social Security. This is our future. One might expect that given the gravity of that issue that we would have a full debate and a vote up or down on the decision to raise the debt by three-quarters of a trillion dollars. But that is not what we have here today. What we have is, under the popular cover of a supplemental war effort, a measure hidden in this bill to plunge this country further into debt. This begs one question: Where have all the fiscal conservatives gone? Where have the budget hawks gone that were dedicated to a balanced budget?

I hear from my colleagues in the majority party, they say, Well, our party was the one that balanced the budget to begin with. The argument seems to be, So we will be the party that unbalances the budget. Can it be the policy of the majority party that a balanced budget and eliminating the national debt is really very, very important under one President but not so important under the next? Surely it cannot be the policy of the majority party that under one President, debt is

all right and under one President debt is not all right. We should not give this administration, we should not give any administration, a \$750 billion blank check to increase the national debt.

We hear from the majority party, Well, it is necessary when you are in the majority to lead. I ask, is this leadership? To take a war supplemental and hide within its contents raising the debt by three-quarters of a trillion, is that leadership? I would think leading the House would mean placing issues squarely before the House, having a full and frank debate on that, and having the courage of the conviction to vote it up or down.

This does not happen because there is a concern about whether a majority would vote to raise the debt. I recognize that concern. And, in fact, we cannot let this country go into default. But there is an alternative. We do not have to raise the debt by three-quarters of a trillion dollars. We could raise the debt in a small amount and require the administration to work with this body to come up with a balanced budget plan, not tomorrow but for the intermediate future, instead of where we are today, which is that we have no balanced budget next year or the year after or the year after that. We have no balanced budget for the next 10 years, and that is simply unacceptable.

But no. Instead, we are going to get cute. We are going to append this debt increase to a very popular measure. And why is this cute? Well, because it puts the minority party in the position of having to vote against the war effort. It is a two-fer. For the majority party, they can say, We didn't vote to raise the debt. And they can say, The minority party doesn't support the war effort.

This country deserves better than cute. It deserves an up-or-down vote and debate on whether this country should be plunged further into debt. Who is going to take the responsibility for raising this debt? Is it this Congress? Are you prepared to take that responsibility? Where were you on the night we mortgaged our children's future? So let us not shift civil service funds into noninterest-bearing accounts. Let us not hide this issue in a wartime supplemental. I urge my colleagues across the aisle to work with us. It does not have to be this way. If we put a war supplemental on the floor today, which we could do, it would pass unanimously. This House would vote unanimously.

And so let us do that. Let us pass this supplemental unanimously. It would be good for this country. Let us raise the debt by a small increment. Let us demand a balanced budget from our administration, and let us work with them to accomplish this. We recognize that you control the House and we do not. We recognize that you can railroad this thing through the House and we cannot stop it. But that is not why you came here to serve. That is not befitting of your fiscal policy, nor ours.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work together and balance this budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, last night when we started the general debate, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who has done an excellent job in bringing this bill out of the committee, described this bill as a "must-pass" bill. I think that really is something that we all agree with. We want to move forward in terms of supporting our war on terrorism. But the fact it is a must-pass bill is because this debt limit increase has been sneaked in. Let us face it, that is why we are here today talking about this issue.

I am a member of the Blue Dog Coalition. The Blue Dogs have been talking about this issue of a request from the administration to raise the debt limit by \$750 billion for a number of weeks now. What we have said is, let us not give Congress a blank check. Let us not give that big of a blank check when there is no plan for how we are ever going to get out of this pattern of deficit spending.

I come out of the private sector. I am a freshman Congressman. I used to work in the energy business, and I used to have to finance projects. I would have to go to the bank, and I would have to borrow money. When you borrow money, you have got to give the bank a plan for how you are going to pay it back. That is how it works for all of us, whether you are getting a car loan, a home mortgage, or borrowing for your business. You have got to have a plan. We have no plan. We have a \$750 billion request from the administration and no plan for how we are going to get out of this.

I understand that we are running a deficit right now, that we have a war on terrorism and homeland security concerns, that our economy is in recession. I understand that we need to take action. The Blue Dogs as a group have produced legislation calling for a clean vote on a debt ceiling increase, not \$750 billion mind you, but a clean vote to provide that increase, to prevent our government from facing any problems where they default on their obligations. But part and parcel with that is the request that we work together, both sides of the aisle and the administration, to come up with a plan, a plan to balance our budget, because that is what people expect us to do. They expect us to come together, work together; and they expect us to take the tough votes. They do not expect us to come and sneak in some legislation in the context of a must-pass bill that we all support the effort to pay for our war on terrorism; they do not expect us to sneak in a debt-limit increase at the last second. That is not why my constituents elected me. I do not think that is why most constituents vote for their Members of Congress.

I am new to this body. I have not been around here for a long time. But

I have to say, I am just surprised. I am surprised that we would take something as important as increasing the debt limit and sneak this in in some innocuous language in an emergency wartime supplemental bill. It just does not seem to be appropriate. It does not seem to be right. I call on all of our colleagues to take a step back, to take a commonsense approach here and recognize that we have our job to do today, which is pass an emergency wartime supplemental appropriations bill. Let us stand by the good work that the Committee on Appropriations has produced. That is what we ought to do. We ought to stand by that. It was a bipartisan agreement.

But as far as this debt limit increase, let us have a healthy debate, let us work through the committee process, let us all talk about it. I think we can reach consensus on that as well. Maybe not \$750 billion. In fact, I should not say maybe. I would say it would not be \$750 billion. But I would suggest that we could work together in that context. This is not the time and this is not the right vehicle to be doing this. That is why we are here, and that is why we are taking so much time here today.

I am really proud of the Blue Dog Coalition and the way they have stood up for this issue, because the notion of increasing debt is something that is going to create increasing tax burdens in the future. I look at my little boy who is 3 years old, and I do not want to force a big tax burden on him. But if we keep running up debt here, he is going to be paying higher taxes because he is going to have to pay the interest on that debt. That is the way we ought to be thinking about things. Let us get away from the short-term political view of looking out at the next election. Let us look at what that next generation is going to be facing in this country. The decisions we make here affect them so much. I think anytime we make public policy decisions, when we look through the eyes of the next generation, we make better decisions.

And so when we look at this debt limit issue, \$750 billion, that is a lot of money. We throw numbers around here all the time, but that is a lot of money. I am really concerned about the fact that that is not going to be the end. This issue is not going to go away. This issue is not going to go away as long as we do not come together and show some discipline and come up with a plan and get out of this pattern of deficit spending.

And so I call on my colleagues to work together in that context. I call on my colleagues to give us a clean supplemental appropriations bill to fund this wartime effort as the previous speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), had suggested. I think you would get unanimous support if we had that opportunity. That is where we ought to be today. We could finish this today and we could go home.

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

It has been said over and over: we all support the war effort. We all support the emergency supplemental appropriation for all the right reasons. We need to get New York City back on its feet to keep the commitment the President made, and we are going to do that. We need to support the war effort both at home and abroad. We need to give our military and our security agencies the support that they need.

There are some aspects of this bill that are disagreeable. Raising the debt ceiling seems to be the most contentious. But is there any doubt that the reason we are raising the debt ceiling was the terrorist attack on our country? Look at what happened to our revenues. Look at what happened to our economy after that event, after that attack. That attack put my State and much of the country into full recession. Revenues sunk. Revenue projections were thrown into disarray. We have to make a short-term adjustment. We have to do the responsible thing.

When I was a member of the minority party for 6 years, I voted to raise the debt ceiling. It was the responsible thing to do.

□ 1100

I did not like it, it was distasteful, but I did it.

Now, it is very easy to be irresponsible in the minority. In the minority you do not have to make the hard decisions. The majority does. We are trying to govern. So we have some difficult things here. They are not easy things to do. But the government has to govern, we have to do our job, and if we do not have enough revenues to run the government, we have to raise the debt ceiling.

Now, our party, in the brief time we have been in the majority, has dramatically reduced our deficits. We have not had to do this before. We have not had to raise the debt ceiling before because we are paying down on the debt. What intervened? In the midst of good governance there was an attack on our country, and the resultant recession and reduction in revenues has hurt us. We need to do this. It is not fun, but it has to be done.

What the debate today is really all about is political advantage. The minority party is blaming us for the recession, they are blaming us for the loss of revenues. I think their blame is misguided. But it is an opportunity for political advantage, so they are trying to take it.

Democratic members of the Committee on Appropriations have taken the unusual step of putting out press releases all around the country attacking Republican members for votes on this bill. Is that about substance? No, Mr. Chairman, it is all about politics. We are in the majority, they want to be in the majority, so they are using this as an opportunity.

The fact remains that we have to govern, we have to make hard decisions, and, when all the political

speeches are over, whether it ends tonight or tomorrow or over the weekend or whenever it is, this bill will pass. That is a fact. It will pass. We will have the votes to pass this.

There are a lot of Members here who want to be home for a very patriotic Memorial Day weekend. They want to be home with their families. They want to be home with their kids. But this job is about making sacrifices. We are prepared to make that sacrifice, to stay here through the weekend. But the fact remains, whenever we get to the final vote on this bill, it will pass.

I would submit if political advantage is being attempted, the only story coming out of Washington today or through the weekend is the sad and unfortunate story of Chandra Levy. That is what will dominate the press. It is a sad, sad story, but that is what people will be hearing about from Washington today and into the near future.

Mr. Chairman, this is about substance. This debate is about substance. It is about hard decisions. It is about governance.

So make your speeches, try to take your political advantage, but the fact remains when we finish the debate, whenever that is, we will pass this bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most painful experiences I had as a new Member of Congress was to go home to my district and bury the wartime dead. Early in my career we were engaged in the Bosnia conflict and I lost a bright young man to that war and mourned with the family that loved him. We went to a church on a country road and we sang all that we could sing and we prayed all that we could pray, wishing that we were not there, but realizing that he was a patriot who had died for his country.

Today as I stand here, tears come to my eyes, because as we leave here this weekend, whatever time it may be, we go home to one of the most significant, the most challenging Memorial Day ceremonies that any of us will ever experience, for the Nation in the last year was under attack. How many of us shed tears, not only for ourselves, our families, worrying of their safety, but for our brothers and sisters who lost their lives in the great State of New York, and now we mourn for those who serve us around the world.

What I can say to you on this day is that I stand here not politicizing this issue. I stand here with great and heavy heart. I do acknowledge and I appreciate the appropriators. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the work you have done. You did put out a wartime supplemental, that no matter how much we might have pained about the resources, we knew it had to be done, and I thank the gentleman for that.

But having been to Afghanistan just a few weeks ago and spending my time with fresh-faced boys and girls, barely older or even younger than my 22-year-

old, I know this is not foolishness that we are dealing with today. That is why I had hoped that we could face this down the way it should be faced down, and that we who believe as Americans could come together and take the tomfoolery away. Let us vote up and down a war supplemental, a vote to give resources to the men and women who, as I speak today, are facing danger.

But, you see, Mr. Chairman, I am in the minority, and I have lived as a minority, and I recognize that even though we are being lectured as being irresponsible, we are actually today doing an act of integrity. For when I got elected in 1994, I came to do the people's business of the 18th Congressional District. But because this Democratic Caucus had the courage to take a vote in 1993, they lost majority after 40 years. They did not lose it on politics. They sacrificed the majority by voting to be able to save Social Security. Out of that, we were washed out of this House as the majority. We take our lumps.

But what we are saying today is that even as we face a wartime tragedy, you, the Americans, have asked us to face our responsibility. A picture is worth 1,000 words. Just last year we had a \$5 trillion surplus, my friends, to give us the ability to fight terrorism hand-in-hand with the President. But now, because of a Republican tax cut, we are now in a condition where we barely have any money in the bank.

So when we stand here and talk about a \$750 billion credit card debit on your account, we are speaking about saving this Nation, about saving Social Security. Those who are on it, like my parents, like my relatives who gathered with me on the graduation of my daughter, 70-plus and older, who have worked all of their lives, who have but Social Security, as we fight the war, we must recognize that Social Security cannot be violated.

What we are saying to this body, to the Republican majority, is to be responsible. If you are going to increase the debt ceiling, let us have an up-or-down vote, a debate, so the American people will know that \$750 billion is basically going to wipe us out.

When we begin to talk about Social Security, for those who this morning got up and got on a train to go to work, or maybe they got on a bus, or maybe they walked, or maybe they carpooled, with their trust in America, that there was going to be something in their account, they did not expect today, while we are here, that we would have the ability, because of this tax cut, Mr. Chairman, to raid Social Security \$1.8 trillion.

This is not a game, Mr. Chairman, as I close; it is an act of integrity. Clean up the bill and we will vote for it.

The wartime supplemental is for all Americans, don't insult us by suggesting we are unpatriotic—rather we are accepting the lonely responsibility of fighting against this legislation that leaves no money to help our troops, fight terrorism, or save Social Security—that Mr. Speaker, constitutes the work of patriots.

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

Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues on the other side only spoke about defense and not the political rhetoric, "tax breaks for the rich," "Debt ceiling," which we support. Social Security, "stealing all the Social Security money." The rhetoric is political, and that is why we are here today. If they would do away with that and talk about the bill and the defense of this country, we would come together.

Mr. Chairman, I look at "tax breaks for the rich." My colleagues in the Democrat leadership have never seen a tax that they do not like. They fight against tax relief when it comes, and then they fight to try and justify why they did not vote for tax relief for working families.

In 1993 they controlled the House, the Senate and the White House, and then the majority leader said, "Oh, we are going to have a bill, we are going to have a tax bill that has tax relief for working families and the middle class." What did they end up doing? They increased the tax on the middle class. They increased the tax on Social Security. They stole every dime out of the Social Security trust fund to balance their budget. Was it a balanced budget? No. That budget was \$300 billion in deficit, and we were looking at approaching a \$5 trillion national debt. We paid \$1 billion a day on just the interest on the debt.

So Democrats are not only to blame for that, Republicans are, too. But the rhetoric going on here today, saying, well, Republicans are doing this, that and that, it is just not true. It is intellectually wrong.

Let me go through some things, reasons why we came together in the Committee on Appropriations, that I think is very, very important for us to realize.

The previous administration, I stood on this House floor and said to my colleagues that supported extending going into Somalia that it is going to cost money and it is going to cost lives. You have seen Blackhawk Down. You know why we lost those soldiers, because an administration changed the policy of going after General Adid and reduced the number of troops in Somalia at the same time, making our troops vulnerable. And when our very military asked for help, they were turned down. It cost the Secretary of Defense his job. Was he to blame? No. And what happened? We lost a lot of people.

Haiti could still be there for many more years. Go to Haiti sometime. It is one of the worst places you could ever go. Billions of dollars.

Then you look at the other 127 deployments, peacekeeping deployments, that put us over \$250 billion in the hole for defense. There are 14 ships, both Republican and Democrat districts. But there is even more for the national security of this country that cannot go anywhere because we had to take

money out of the O&M accounts, operation and maintenance accounts, and we have not been able to fix those ships and bring them up to mission capable. We are going below a 300-ship Navy, which is detrimental to the national security of this country.

The R&D accounts, the SU-27, a Russian-deployed fighter going to many, many different countries. Mr. Chairman, I have flown against Mig AIC, and our pilots died 95 percent of the time in our best airplanes, our F-14s, F-16s, F-18s, because the Russians have developed an AA-10, AA-11 and AA-12 missile. They have a helmet-mounted sight. Our kids died. We have never had that in America.

We are fighting a war overseas, billions of dollars. Billions of dollars going to New York, which I think is justified, to help them recuperate. We are fighting with billions of dollars here in the United States, trying to defend this country. My good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), fought brilliantly to actually increase homeland defense.

Do we want to raise the debt ceiling to help our military? Yes. Do we want to go through the political rhetoric of this bill? No.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have only the highest respect for the leadership that we have heard from on the other side of the aisle from the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida, the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from California, and I listened carefully to what they were saying.

For example, I agree with much of what the gentleman from New York had to say, but I sincerely believe he is wrong if he thinks that I or some of my colleagues here are seeking to avoid hard choices, for example, on the debt limit. It is not something that I seek to avoid. I am happy to have a debate on this floor on the budget on our fiscal situation dealing with these difficult, difficult choices that I know our friends on the Committee on Appropriations are dealing with on an ongoing basis.

□ 1115

Sadly, what we have here today, however, has little to do with fighting the war on terrorism or dealing with hard fiscal choices. If that were the case, we could have an honest debate and reach resolution quickly. If it were just about funding our war against terrorism, we could have that debate in minutes and have unanimity and be done with it. Sadly, the defense supplemental is only an excuse; it is a label. We are seeing, for instance, that the purpose of the bill and the rule under which it is presented to us is precisely a way to avoid having that debate, to avoid dealing directly and honestly with the debate limitation. But it goes far beyond fiscal policy. It goes far beyond the war on terrorism.

I have one other sad example that concerns me, as we see inserted in the supplemental appropriations bill a provision to grant the Department of Defense an exemption from environmental regulations to deal with responsibility for water consumption that occurs "outside a military installation and beyond the direct authority and control of the Department of Defense Secretary."

The reason this provision is in has nothing to do with fiscal responsibility, has nothing to do with the war against terrorism. It is simply to avoid environmental protection for the San Pedro River in Arizona, one of the richest biological reserves in all of North America that was designated by this Congress after deliberation by a committee of jurisdiction in 1988 as a national riparian conservation area. But this river, this resource is being dewatered as a result of the activities of the Department of Defense operation at the nearby Fort Huachuca.

The amendment in the bill we are debating today means that the fort's action in the future, adding activity, contracting out that will increase water consumption, can occur without any consideration to the extent to which they jeopardize the river, without any consideration of the alternatives. This has nothing to do with fiscal policy. This has nothing to do with the war against terrorism.

In addition to irreparably damaging an ecosystem in Arizona, it is an additional terrible precedent for the way that this House operates. Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have been dedicated to the proposition that the Federal Government should be a better partner with State and local governments, with the private sector, with individuals, to make communities more livable, to lead by example, not lots of rules and regulations and imposition of things that are difficult. Just step up and walk the talk.

But this is sad commentary, Mr. Chairman. The House does not legislate very often. It is hard for people to feel comfortable debating on the hard decisions. But this act does not solve America's problems. Stealth attacks on the environment are not a part of the war against terrorism. Stealth evasion of fiscal policy, the debt limit, and what we should be doing in the future, are not part of the war against terrorism and, most important, Mr. Chairman, having a bizarre provision under this rule that creates false conflicts on this floor are not, are not a part of the war against terrorism. The American people deserve better.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, we are here at the eve of Memorial Day, and as we approach this weekend and we approach Memorial

Day, we think about all of the symbols of the values of this country and all of the battles that have been waged on behalf of those values of democracy, of freedom; all of the sacrifice that has been given to this country on behalf of those values, on behalf of those freedoms. We all recognize our duty, as we have young men and women in harm's way in Afghanistan, in the Philippines, in Colombia, and so many troubled areas of the world where those values of democracy and freedom are not near and dear as they are here. We all understand our obligation to provide the resources to those individuals, to those troops, to those support organizations for those young men and women. That is what this supplemental is supposed to be about, to provide those resources so that there will be an unbroken chain of support on behalf of our troops.

We are all prepared to meet that challenge, as we have so many times in the Congress of the United States. We have met that challenge, along with our citizens, from small towns, from urban centers, from rural areas, because Americans understood what we were supposed to be about, that we were about defending democracy, that we were about defending freedom. They understood it as we engaged in the war on terror to repel the attack that was made on our country. They understood that their sons and daughters would be placed in harm's way. They understood that their neighbors, their friends would be placed in harm's way. But we all also understood America's role in the world.

Yet, we now find, we now find, as we will remember in speeches this weekend, in parades and ceremonies, the courage of these young men and women, the great symbols of the past, the Midways, the Pearl Harbors, the Antietams, the great symbols of this country, the pieces of history of this country, the sacrifice of this country, as we remember that and remember that courage, we will have to think back to today when the House of Representatives and the Republicans in the House decided they would not exhibit that courage. They would not exhibit the courage equal to that of the young men and women who are in harm's way, to those who sacrificed in the past.

The simple courage would be to stand up and cast your vote, to cast your vote, yes or no, to add \$750 billion to the debt limit, to cast your vote, yes or no, whether or not we want to invade the Social Security trust funds; to cast your vote, yes or no, whether or not you want to make it more difficult to take care of the baby boomers who are getting ready to retire; to cast your vote, yes or no, whether or not Medicare will be available for them to the extent that it is today. That is what we all said we would do when we ran for Congress.

But today, today courage is failing the Congress, the House of Representatives, the Republican majority. Today,

courage seeps out of their body as they try to disguise this vote, to camouflage this vote so that they will not be held accountable for the results. The results are a dramatic addition to the national debt of this country. The results are increasing liability of the Social Security trust fund, the vulnerability of the Social Security trust fund.

It was said by Alexander Hamilton on the explanation of representative government when he answered the question, he said, "Here, sir, the people govern." The people govern. And we govern through them and they govern through us.

What the Democrats are asking for is the opportunity to cast a vote, yes or no, up or down, on the most important issue confronting our economy and our country, and that is the debt of this Nation. My colleagues are not denying GEORGE MILLER a vote. My colleagues are not denying the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) a vote. They are denying the people of Tennessee and the people of California a vote who have strongly held views. That is why we have had great debates in this Congress in the past. That is why we had votes where a one-vote margin raised the taxes or lowered the taxes or got rid of the debt.

Mr. Chairman, we need to have the courage of our convictions. The Republican Party has to have the courage of its convictions. If you believe the debt limit should be raised, if you believe Social Security should be invaded, then have the courage of your convictions to stand up and do it. Our men and women in harm's way have their courage.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of talk about raising the national debt limit here; and I just want to point out, first of all, that I have in my hand the supplemental bill right here. It has nothing to do with raising the national debt. In fact, if my colleagues want to know what is in the bill, they can simply get the report portion and they can read the highlights on pages 1 and 2; and it outlines very nicely about how we are going to address the needs of our Department of Defense, of our Department of Transportation, Federal Emergency Management Agency, and so on, things that are very necessary at this point in time.

I think it is important that we point that out. It is not in the supplemental bill. Where all of this confusion is coming from from the other side came from the rule. Now, in the rule it says nothing about owing \$750 billion or borrowing \$750 billion, or robbing Social Security, or any environmental issues about a river in Oregon. What it does say, very simply, on page 3 in the rule, or the report on the rule, it says, section 1403 provides statutory assurance that the United States Government will take all necessary steps to guarantee the full faith and credit of the Government. That is all it says, full faith and credit of the government.

That is what this debate has boiled down to when we talk about the national debt.

Now, if we look at full faith and credit, what is the alternative? What would the others propose to do if we avoid the full faith and credit of the United States? Now, some of them have people in their districts, maybe even relatives, that actually have U.S. savings bonds. What if they wanted to go down and cash that U.S. saving bond, but we had no full faith and credit in the United States? What kind of chaos would occur from that? I think it is very important that we have full faith and credit in the United States.

Now, let us just review what happened to come to this phrase. It says full faith and credit of the United States Government. September 11 threw us into a big shock in our economy. We all know that it happened; we cannot deny it. If we listen to the debate that we have had, I think we pretty much agree that we have to do something to ensure our national security and our homeland security. I do not think there is any doubt about that. We may argue about how much we should, but I think the point remains that we want to do something to ensure that our national security and homeland security is safe. But because of September 11, the economy will generate in fiscal year 2002, starting last October and going until next September 30, about \$200 billion less in Federal tax revenues. Well, that puts us in a problem. But to address the problem, we have already placed \$43 billion in additional funds to address the crisis in fiscal year 2002; \$43 billion. We are looking at taking care of more of those needs right now.

But we have heard how our economy was devastated, our Federal revenue was devastated by the tax cut that was passed last year. Well, during fiscal year 2002, there will be \$38 billion less in Federal tax revenue because of the tax package that was passed; \$38 billion less. Now, where did the numbers of \$750 billion come from?

Mr. Chairman, we have been hearing that there is \$750 billion that we are going to take out of Social Security; yet there is only \$38 billion less because of tax relief. Now, what did the Americans do when they got that money in their pocket? Well, they had a little extra money in their pocket, so they went out and they bought durable goods.

□ 1130

This month, durable goods orders are up. That is a good thing. It is helping our economy get generated. That will increase the amount of Federal revenue through increased tax dollars.

What else did they do? They bought new automobiles. I had an automobile dealer in Wichita, Kansas, which was the community that was hit the worst by the events of September 11. Wichita, Kansas, and the surrounding area, if we take the number of jobs lost because of

September 11 versus the total number of jobs in the community, percentage-wise, we were hit worse than any community in the Nation. Yet, the Ford dealer, the largest Ford dealer in that area, had a record month at the end of last year because there was a little extra money in people's pockets and they were going out and spending that money, helping generate revenue by increased tax dollars.

So that \$38 billion has gone towards new washing machines, towards new automobiles, towards new homes. It has made a significant difference in helping us recover from the events of September 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) has expired.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) be allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I will not object, but I would like to register a complaint.

The dilatory tactics we are seeing today are bad enough playing by the rules. To waive the rules to allow more dilatory tactics is not necessarily a good idea for this body.

Mr. Chairman, I will not object at this time, but if there are further requests for extensions of time beyond the normal rules and I am in this chair, I will object.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Kansas be kind enough to yield?

Mr. TIAHRT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

The gentleman suggested that there was really nothing in this bill which related to the addition of \$750 billion to the Nation's debt, and indicated that our problem was with the rule instead of the bill.

The problem is this, if the gentleman would continue to yield: The rule added section 1403 to this bill, and that section has the language to which the gentleman refers on the full faith and credit of the government.

That was not included so that we could send a message to ourselves; that was included because, under the rules of the House, that is what we have to do in order to make possible the addition of that \$750 billion by way of a Senate amendment. That means that when the bill comes back here, Members will be voting on this entire supplemental. They will be shielded from having to take the responsibility for that vote.

If the gentleman does not agree with that, he is the only one in the House who does not.

Mr. TIAHRT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the point is that we had a vote on whether this language should have been included when we voted the rule and approved the rule on the floor of the House.

When we approved the rule, we conducted, as our Founding Fathers had hoped, the democratic process in our republic form of government where we approved by a simple majority that this would be part of what we are addressing right now. It was part of the rule. That is where the vote was, so the gentleman had a vote, an up-or-down vote. We had an up-or-down vote on whether this was going to be part of that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, we did not have a vote on that.

Would the gentleman grant that under the rule, it is impossible for us to offer an amendment so that we can vote only on that issue? That was wrapped into other issues when the rule was adopted.

Mr. TIAHRT. Reclaiming my time, did the gentleman vote for the rule?

Mr. OBEY. No.

Mr. TIAHRT. There were other issues here. This may have been the driving force, but when most of us make up our decision, we try to weigh the good with the bad. The gentleman apparently chose that this was at least one of the straws on the camel's back that it was too much for him to vote for the rule.

I would suggest that the majority thought this was an important enough issue that we should directly address it by putting it in the rule.

Mr. OBEY. But the gentleman would grant that we did not ever have a vote specifically on that? He would agree with that?

Mr. TIAHRT. I would agree that we did not have a specific vote.

Mr. OBEY. Does the gentleman not think we should?

Mr. TIAHRT. When do we ever have a specific vote on something like that?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. The Chair would request that all Members use proper procedures in yielding time back and forth, and that Members address their remarks to the Chair.

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

Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of problems with this bill today, but I would like to focus, Mr. Chairman, on one major provision snuck in there, really, by the Republicans. Of course, that provision that I am talking about deals with the increase in the debt limit.

Now, this seems like a pretty technical and obscure term, but it really does deal with a fundamental issue that affects us all. It is actually pretty simple.

Now, the Republicans inherited a budget surplus which, of course, they squandered last year on their \$2 trillion tax cut benefiting primarily the

wealthiest people in this country. That is an unfortunate fact, but that is what occurred.

Now, because they have totally overspent their own budget, they must increase the government's debt. This is totally irresponsible and jeopardizes programs important to millions of Americans, programs like Social Security and Medicare, which our seniors and people with disabilities rely on. Every penny we take to increase the government debt must come from the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

Instead of taking money away from Medicare, we really should be adding to it, including a comprehensive prescription drug benefit. Instead of robbing Social Security, we should be shoring it up to ensure its solvency, so that our children and grandchildren will have these benefits.

Social Security is an essential social insurance program which keeps so many seniors, especially women and low-income individuals, out of poverty. It is unconscionable that the Republicans want to rob Social Security to really pay for this irresponsible tax cut last year.

I also think it is pretty hypocritical to ask for this debt increase. Last year, a bankruptcy bill, a very punitive bankruptcy bill, was rammed through that will hurt many hardworking people who could not pay their debts, often because of unexpected hardships, such as an illness or the loss of a job.

So now I do not believe that congressional Republicans have faced an unexpected hardship. They intentionally passed that \$2 trillion tax cut knowing that it would decimate our Federal budget. So now, instead of tightening their belts or repealing that irresponsible tax cut, they are just giving themselves more money. That is basically what this is.

How is it that they can put the screws on ordinary working people who cannot pay their debt, but just simply raid Social Security and Medicare when they cannot pay their own debt?

During debate on the bankruptcy bill last year, I remember very vividly the Republicans stated that those who cannot manage their debts were acting irresponsibly and should live within their means. So I think what we are doing today really is an example of the height of hypocrisy that we have seen in this body: There is one standard for ordinary people and another for congressional Republicans.

I think we all should practice what we preach. Instead of sneaking an increase in the debt into this emergency spending bill today, we should be repealing the reckless tax cut passed last year. We really cannot pass this on, or we should not pass this debt on to our children and our grandchildren. We should not raid the Social Security and Medicare trust funds. We must not also cut essential programs that people rely on, such as housing and education and health care. This bill does much more, and much of that.

So it is time, I think, for us to do the right thing. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this very dangerous debt increase today.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just felt the need to respond to the level of really demagoguery and intellectual bankruptcy that I have been hearing from my good friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle this morning and last night. I just feel the need to review some facts that every one of the Members knows have been conveniently left out of this discussion.

I will start with one, which is a simple fact that everyone knows, that if we had not passed any tax cut at all last year, we would still be running a deficit. They know that. They know for a fact that the cost of the war, the cost of rebuilding New York, the cost of increasing homeland security, as well as the cost of spending in other areas, is vastly greater than the revenue that was lost to the Treasury as a result of last year's tax cuts. Members know that.

They also know that, perhaps with the exception of defense spending, where many would still like to cut, not all but many would, that these folks want the Federal Government to spend much more money on non-defense, non-homeland security areas than we do. We just heard the previous speaker talk about inadequate spending in all kinds of other programs.

Members know also that each and every year, at least since I have been here, and that is only 4 years so far, but in each and every year when there has been an appropriation bill on this floor in which we are not in agreement, I cannot remember a single time in which these folks came down here and said, you know, you guys are spending too much. No, it was always the opposite. They have always come down here and said, they are not spending enough.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so I can correct his statement?

Mr. TOOMEY. Furthermore, Members know that if they had had their way last year, for instance, if they were in control of this Chamber and the rest of the Federal Government, I am sure there would have been no tax cut. I am sure that is true.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is filling in with misstatements.

The CHAIRMAN. All Members will suspend. The time is controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. I thank the Chairman.

I think it is a very safe bet that in the absence of that tax cut, the revenue that theoretically would have been collected, although that is theory, but that revenue would in all likelihood have been spent on any variety of government programs that those folks would like to spend more money on.

But thinking about this, I thought, well, maybe I am wrong.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield so I can correct that mistake with a fact?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, regular order.

Mr. OBEY. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) has the floor. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. TOOMEY. Now, I want to reflect on the possibility that maybe I am wrong. Maybe I am wrong about this.

Mr. OBEY. . . .
Mr. TOOMEY. Maybe there is a new consensus in the Democratic Party. Maybe there is a new conscience about deficits that was never exhibited during the decades in which the Democratic Party controlled the Federal Government and ran up massive deficits and accumulated a huge debt. There was no evidence of that conscience then, but maybe there is one now. Maybe there is a new sense of fiscal responsibility.

Since those folks are so upset about this deficit and the debt that is occurring, then what we ought to do, and frankly, what we all ought to do, myself and all the Republicans, what we ought to do is seriously consider the alternative budget that they have proposed, the alternative budget that those folks ran in the Committee on the Budget, the alternative budget that would have no deficits, that would accomplish all the goals that they have talked about.

But why is it that we do not consider that alternative budget? Well, they know the reason for that, too. It is because they do not have one. All the rhetoric, the demagoguery, the attacks occur, but there are no alternatives.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield so that I might—

Mr. TOOMEY. I sit on the Committee on the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) has the floor. He has indicated he does not wish to yield. Members should not interrupt other Members who have the floor. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, as a Member of the Committee on the Budget who sat through budget hearings and the budget markup and the debate on the budget, I think I know why there is no budget from the other side. That is, if they had to propose a budget, they probably would have proposed a budget with larger deficits than we have.

Oh, sure, there would have been no tax cut. In fact, some would like to have raised taxes by repealing what is coming in the way of further tax relief. Some do not want to do that. But the fact is, there would not be the future tax cuts. That money would have been spent, as was proposed by the Democrats on the Committee on the Budget during the markup. We would have a weaker economy as a result of a higher tax burden, and probably less revenue.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply argue that the lack of a serious alternative

really undermines every single argument that we have heard from our colleagues on the other side. A party that lacks the courage to propose any alternative really lacks the credibility to justify the attacks against the party that has taken the responsibility of governing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) has expired.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania might be given 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I object. The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

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

Mr. WYNN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting that apparently the tactic on the other side is going to be to have speakers get up and make erroneous statements that have nothing whatsoever to do with the truth or the facts, and then refuse to debate that issue by yielding time, and then further refuse to extend the time so that they might be challenged on their statements. That truly means there is no real debate left in this House.

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

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman would not facilitate it for me. Why should I facilitate for him what he would not facilitate for me?

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that I think the gentleman who just spoke was the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY). The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) is one of the sponsors of a constitutional amendment which requires a three-fifths vote of this House before the national debt could be raised by one dime. Yet, he has just stood here on this floor defending actions by the majority which, in essence, have enabled this House to slip through, eventually, a \$750 billion increase in the national debt without a single Member of the House ever having to stand up and actually vote directly on that issue.

That is why I challenge the gentleman's statements, because I have never seen a bigger example of different positions within a short period of time.

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

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman will not yield to me. I will return the same courtesy to the gentleman that he has returned to me.

□ 1145

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill and I want to talk today about fiscal responsibility versus fiscal irresponsibility.

Now, my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle would have you believe that this bill is just about the war effort and supporting homeland security. Let me tell you if that were true, we would have passed this bill last night. Democrats support the President's war against terrorism. Democrats support the war. Democrats support the weapons system that we need, and we certainly support homeland security since, believe it or not, we share the same homeland with my Republican colleagues.

No, this debate is about the fact that the Republicans have slipped into this bill a measure to raise the debt ceiling. Let me repeat: the Republicans want to raise the debt ceiling. They want an extension of credit on the Nation's credit card.

Now, what does that mean? This means that they want to raid the Social Security trust fund. They want to weaken Social Security for the baby boom generation. This also means that we will have an increase in long-term interest rates, which means that interest on home mortgages will increase.

Now, the question we really ought to ask is why do we want to raise the debt ceiling? Why do they want more credit? Now, they will tell you it is the war effort, and we all ought to be behind the war effort. Let me give you the facts. Only 10 percent of the deficit is due to the war effort; 43 percent of deficit is due to the big tax cuts that the Republicans passed. Again, they are saying we have got to have an extension of credit. It is like a man whose house has a leaky roof. He comes to the credit card company and says I need an extension of credit because my roof is leaking. He ignores the fact that he bought jewels, bought furs, bought new cars and took big vacations. That is why he maxed-out his credit card.

Now, they would also like you to believe that we are talking about the tax credit that most Americans got, \$300 for a single person, \$600 for a couple. That is not true. We are talking about the tax breaks that the Republicans gave the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans. How much do they make? The wealthiest 1 percent make over a million dollars a year; and yet this year they have got \$9,000 back in a tax break. Over the entire term of the tax break they will get \$54,000 in tax breaks, but yet they tell you the problem is the war.

The problem is not the war. The problem is the fact that we have given money to the very wealthy in this country. We should not let the Republicans hide behind the war effort to shield their irresponsibility. Democrats support our men at war. Democrats support our President and Democrats support our homeland. But we do not support fiscal irresponsibility.

If they wanted to raise the debt ceiling, why hide it in a bill to support the war? Why not have an open and clean debate? They do not want to do that. They would rather slip it in.

I say we should reject this bill, insist on a true war effort bill, and then insist on a clean debate on the debt ceiling because if they want to expand the credit line for the Nation's credit card, they at least ought to be up front and tell the American people why.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening carefully to the debate, and I feel slightly confused. I have heard my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and other Democrats talk about increasing the national debt. It seemed to me we are talking about increasing the national debt ceiling which is a measurement of the national debt but not the national debt. The national debt is increased by voting for appropriations which is done by the gentleman's party with great glee and delight, and so increasing the national debt is a function of appropriations and borrowing, and we are talking about the debt ceiling, which is a measurement only.

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

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply say that debt is not only rung up when you appropriate money, whether it is for war or for education. Debt is also added to if you pass tax cuts that are paid for with borrowed money; and that is what the majority party did to a fare-thee-well last year. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman's animosity towards tax cuts. It is profound and palpable.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

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

Mr. Chairman, I would observe that part of the reason I did not yield time before is because I was concerned that what did happen would happen, which is that rather than refute the basic premise of my argument, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) brings up extraneous issues. For instance, he did not refute that the Democratic Party has utterly abdicated its responsibility by not proposing a budget. Instead, he brings up the issue of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, which I do support, but which, unless the gentleman can correct me, unless I am mistaken, it includes an exception for time of war.

I would observe to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that it strikes me that we are engaged in a war, I believe. It also allows for an exception in a time of a national emergency. If we are not in a national emergency, then I do not know what this is.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Could the gentleman tell me, has the Congress declared war so it would in fact fit under the terms of that resolution?

Mr. TOOMEY. Under that logic the gentleman would suggest that Viet Nam was not a war, Korea was not a war, in the Persian Gulf we did not have a war, and today we are not at war. I would reject that categorically. It seems to me pretty clear that we are at war. We were at war in those other circumstances despite the fact that Congress did not declare it.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important bill that we have before us. It supports the troops and our brave men and women overseas. It supports homeland security. And I think all of us here in this Chamber support those efforts. And yet, we hear Members from the other side get up and say that we are making this issue political. Nothing could be further from the truth.

When this bill came before the Committee on Appropriations, it passed with a large overwhelming bipartisan majority; Democrats and Republicans working together to put out an appropriations bill to further our war effort and our homeland security effort. And it was only when the Committee on Rules intervened and devised this devious rule to join up this raising of the national debt and our war effort together that we had this serious problem before us. And it is our friends on the other side of the aisle that control that Committee on Rules that have made this a political process.

There are a large number of controversial riders in this bill which we should be able to vote on individually. There is an increase in our involvement in the civil war in Colombia. This bill requires Medicare provider reimbursement increases in parts of the country while ignoring others without a vote. This bill requires textiles to be dyed and finished in the United States without a vote. There are other important foreign policy issues. There are important health care issues. But we are demeaning this institution, this fine democratic institution, if we do not allow votes on these important national issues.

I am beginning to feel like Bill Murray in "Groundhog's Day." Every day I wake up expecting that the Republican leadership will want a lively debate on the extremely important public policy issues that we are asked to consider in this body. Unfortunately, when I get to work, it is always business as usual. No open debate; no democratic process.

The Republican leadership and this administration are attempting to conceal their efforts to raise the national debt by attaching it to a bipartisan appropriations bill. Instead of working to

undo the fiscal mess their budget created, they are pursuing a policy that would simply raid the Social Security trust fund to paper over their fiscal mismanagement.

According to the President's own numbers, the national debt will be roughly \$2.7 trillion greater than it was projected last year. \$1.9 trillion of that loss cannot be explained by the terrorist attacks or the economic downturn. It is the direct result of an irresponsible fiscal policy of this administration. Large deficits mean higher interest rates, and higher interest rates means millions of hard-working Americans will face what is essentially a tax increase. This increase falls hardest on the middle class and the working poor, those people who have the most debt. Sixteen cents out of every dollar, or roughly \$1 billion per day, goes to pay interest on the national debt. Since much of that interest is paid to foreign investors, American taxpayers send nearly \$100 billion out of the country each year.

Now, I remember when the Republicans accused Democrats of irresponsibility because Treasury Secretary Ruben wanted to raise the debt ceiling. Now, with President Clinton and the Democrats working hard, we have balanced the budget and our friends on the other side of the aisle are calling for a run of deficits into the future. Current projections put us 10 years out on deficits. And, again, the Democrats are being proactive in searching for ways to fix the problems created by this administration's fiscal policy.

The Democratic leadership has called for a bipartisan summit to discuss the Nation's financial problems and to work toward bipartisan solutions. I hope my Republican colleagues will join with us to seek out long-term solutions, not deceptive policies that will lead to more debt and less economic security. We should not allow fiscal mismanagement and the raiding of Social Security to slide through without a vote.

Let us all remember one year ago, this President and the Republicans on this floor told us that we could do it all. We could pay down the debt. We could protect Social Security and Medicare. We could have other urgent dollars to pay for needs. Now today we are no longer paying down the debt. Mr. Chairman, to my friends on the other side of the aisle, we are borrowing, borrowing from our grandchildren. Shame on you in this procedure.

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

Mr. Chairman, I find this an interesting political debate we are having now. And for my colleagues on the other side who are in the minority and the policies of tax and spend when they had 40 years of control, and so now they start going off on this filibuster-type debate on issues that are not really the critical issues of vote today.

Today we are talking about a war supplemental. I got elected in 1992. And I served my first 2 years in the minority in this institution. I was never in politics before I came to Congress, and I found it disappointing, actually, how partisan this institution was. And in 1993 the budget was basically a partisan issue. They had the largest tax increase in history in 1993 and every Republican voted against it. But as a minority, when John Kasich was chairman of the Committee on the Budget, we presented a budget in 1993 and 1994. We had an alternative budget. But now all the minority wants to do is complain. There is no alternative budget. All they would do is offer some amendments to our budget.

The other body, to get a conference report on the budget, which is really the crux of the whole problem we are facing right now, the other body has not produced a budget. The Senate has not produced a budget yet. And so we are in this position where we have to move forward with our appropriations bills; but without a budget we just have to go through this process that we are doing now with the deeming of the resolution and doing this on the supplemental.

Now that we are in the majority, I remember when I came into the majority in 1995, I had to vote for things that I did not want to vote for. I remember as a minority member I did not have to vote for a lot of the appropriations bills. I voted against the District of Columbia appropriations back in 1993 and 1994. Marion Barry was mayor. You all had to vote in favor of that. It was a tough vote as a member of the majority. It was a tough vote for me in 1995. And I think I did vote for the D.C. appropriation bill back then because we had the responsibility to govern. And so now that we are in the majority party to have to face some of these tough issues and increasing the debt limit is one.

□ 1200

Every year the Democrats were in the majority, they had to provide for increases in the debt limit. Either we had a vote or my understanding is they used the Gephardt rule and was part of the budget conference report that automatically had the increase in the debt ceiling.

So it was passed continually for the years when the Democrats were in control and we have had to do it every year to provide for it that way, too, because if we do not increase the debt ceiling, we are not going to send out Social Security checks. We are not going to the hospitals or the doctors for Medicare. We are not going to take care of our veterans. It is something that has to be done because it is the only way we can keep the government running.

We are talking about why we are into this fiscal crisis. I came in as a fiscal conservative. I was upset with the fiscal irresponsibility in Washington, and

so a key part of our Contract with America back in 1994 was balance the budget. The big fight we had in 1995 was balancing the budget over 7 years, and we did it in less than that, and the key is getting to a balanced budget.

I am disappointed we are not going to have a balanced budget now, but there are certain things that have come up, as the President talked about, that are causing this. One is a recession. Our revenues are down an estimated \$200 billion, and so we need to stimulate the economy and grow ourselves back out of it. That is how we got into a surplus, a large reason was; we grew ourselves out of it by the booming economy. So first of all, we have a recession.

Then the September 11 events, we are in a war. We had a \$40 billion emergency supplemental last year which I voted for. We are going to have another \$29 billion here today or tomorrow. So we have got another \$70 billion of emergency spending to take care of the war issue.

So what are our choices? We need to take care of our homeland security, we need to address the war, and we need to continue the priorities of biomedical research, of education, of the veterans and other issues we have to address here.

My solution to the whole problem today is we need a closed rule. This idea of a totally open rule is just going on and on and on. So I would encourage our leaders on our side of the aisle to go back to the Committee on Rules, come back with a closed rule, and say let us have all of the appropriate amendments, set up a time, we do this all the time on the Committee on Rules, and say let us go ahead and have a regular debate and regular order and not continue talking and talking and talking about basically the same thing because the other said, oh, we are fiscally irresponsible when after their 40 years of control is what got us into all the debt problem, and now we have a war and a recession, combined with a national emergency, and we are doing the responsible thing.

They did not vote for the rule. I am not sure what they are going to do with the final bill. I think we should take it to the Committee on Rules, come up with a new rule and end this filibuster.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the gentleman from Florida might be allowed to continue for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Objection is heard.

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

I yield time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, evidently what we have going on here is that we not only have faux legislation, we now also have faux debate. We are not hav-

ing debate here. We have got members of the other side giving speeches without being willing to engage in give-and-take.

I would simply like to say to my good friend from Florida, he is right. This place has been too partisan, but I would point out, we did not make this bill partisan. This was a bipartisan bill supported by both parties in the committee. It came out of the committee, and your leadership made it partisan by dragging in their partisan plan to raise the national debt by \$750 billion so they could pay for their tax cut plans to the detriment of Social Security and Medicare.

Secondly, with respect to the gentleman saying, "oh, this bill is going so slow, we have to have a rule, a closed rule", I would point out, this House has not met a single Friday this year. There is plenty of time for debate if this House works Monday through Friday. It has not been doing that, and it is the majority party that sets that schedule, not the minority party.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this debate today should be about the highest priority of the Congress and the Nation and, that is, national security. Instead, what we have heard from the other side is they will do whatever it takes to pass this bill. One of the questions that deserves to be answered today is at what cost? What limits are there to us doing whatever it takes to pass this bill? Are there any limits in decency, in fairness, in what this country and this Congress is supposed to stand for?

Nobody has attempted to rebut the fact that there is a special fix in this bill for 2 hospitals in the United States when hospitals all over the country are suffering, the people they are supposed to serve. No one has attempted to rebut the fact that we are rewriting a trade agreement with Caribbean nations that was balanced and strongly supported on a bipartisan basis.

There are few facts we agree on today. These are some of the ones we do agree on.

This should be about national security. It should not be about economic security and Social Security. Thank goodness on September 11 this country was strong economically to withstand the horrendous attack that occurred because we had balanced the budget and begun to pay down the debt. Nobody is rebutting the fact that what is happening today is we are going to raise the debt ceiling; the Federal Government is going to start borrowing money again. There is no dispute that that has the serious risk of raising long-term interest rates which threaten the prosperity of my State, Florida, and communities across the country.

The men and women in uniform that are protecting our country at home and abroad are not just fighting to protect the flag. They are not just fighting to protect a Nation. They are fighting to reflect certain principles that we all swore to uphold here, to have a strong

country, a strong economy, a national community, a strong system of Social Security and, most fundamentally of all, a democracy.

Well, we have a stand here, and that is, have an open and honest debate on the issues which we have been deprived of, not just Democrats but Republicans as well, under a rule that is forcing us to pass laws that would never survive a majority vote in this Congress.

Let me finally refer to the USAir situation. We are changing the rules in the middle of a system that was passed on a bipartisan basis that allows airlines to demonstrate they deserve a loan from the Federal Government. Nobody has tried to rebut the fact that what this bill is doing, just as the Senate is about to do, is to close the opportunity for a major carrier in my home, Florida, and the Southeast and the Northeast and other parts of the country, to borrow money to avoid a bankruptcy.

Have any of my colleagues seen airline bankruptcy? I have. I watched the Air Florida bankruptcy. It is an ugly thing. I will tell my colleagues who benefits. It is the bankruptcy lawyers. Ultimately this is not about USAir. It is about the passengers that depend on that airline in my home and around the country for competition, for reasonably low fares, for choices, and who will forgive us if we contribute to the bankruptcy of a major carrier in the Southeast?

The answer that is offered in response to this argument is let somebody else take care of it some other time. Well, excuse me, but who is ultimately accountable here? We are. The Senate Appropriations Committee has already passed a bill that does exactly what this bill does. It closes the funding window. USAir has said they are on the verge of preparing a loan application. They are at risk of filing bankruptcy. What are we doing about it? Exactly nothing.

Some of us called over to the Senate today to find out, is this going to get fixed in the Senate. The answer came back, no, it is not. Folks, this is our job. We are ultimately accountable. This is a real serious issue amid a lot of politics and speechmaking here.

This bill needs to be fixed. We need to restore the integrity of this loan application program. We need to worry about the people that depend upon this carrier and for traveling to do their business.

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

I may be missing something here, but I do not know what we are talking about. The fact is the country is running out of money because the economy is down and the military and terrorist, antiterrorist expenditures are up. We have to have more money. This is not unusual. It has happened before. It happened when my colleagues were in the majority. It is happening now. It happens in business. Someone sets out a plan, they like to feel the plan makes

sense, but all of a sudden they get into different circumstances.

Who could have forecast the drop in the economy? Who could have forecast the terrorists of 9/11? We could not. Things have got to change.

Should the rule have been better? Probably. Could we have had a different tax reduction program? Probably. Should we have had an up-and-down vote on this? That is a question. Should this \$750 billion be the figure? It might be, but that is not the fact.

General George Catlett Marshall was my hero, and what he said was, "There are 2 things in life you don't want to do. One is to get into the minute so you forget about the issue. Secondly, do not fight the problem. Find the solution."

We are fighting the problem. We need the money. The country needs the money. It is the only thing to do. Let us increase this debt ceiling.

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

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, we are approaching Memorial Day, and I think most of us would like to get home. I certainly have plans for the weekend, wanting to be home with my family and friends and with those that we are going to honor who have given so much to this country. But today, as many of my colleagues before me, I rise to support and thank our men and women in uniform who are serving our country and protecting our freedoms and our opportunity to come to this floor, all around the globe.

Like my colleagues, I strongly support a robust military, as do all Americans, I think, and certainly in this House on both sides of the aisle, but I am shocked that I have heard Members come to this floor and allude to someone on either side of the aisle who is not supportive of our military. We could correct that very quickly.

We have a bill before us. All we have to do is take the things out that should not be in it, that are not tied to our military, and the bill would have passed last evening.

I represent an awful lot of folks who either are stationed or have loved ones at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base or some who have served there and, Mr. Chairman, I support the President and the war on terrorism. I have been here for every vote, and I support a balanced budget. I came in 1997 and I want my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to understand, I was one who voted to make that last step to balance the budget. I came to this Congress to help do that, and I understand these are difficult times.

So that people will understand, I also served as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in my State legislature for 4 years, and so I understand what it is to slip something in a bill, but we do it in the light of day so people can see it and know what we are

doing. We do not go to a closed room after we have had an open debate by all the parties in the committees, and then bring it to the floor. That is not right. That is not fair to the American people. It is not fair to the American people.

I represent as many people on this floor as any Member on either side of the aisle, and yet because I do not serve on the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Rules I cannot make an amendment to this bill and present the issues that my people send me to Washington to defend and represent, and that is wrong. That is wrong in the people's House. It is absolutely wrong.

The reality is that we want to pass this piece of legislation. We want to fight terrorism. We want to get Osama bin Laden and the al Qaeda and all those agents of terror around the world. We are still here today, not because we disagree with the bill that is before us to get the job done on terrorism and support our men and women around the world. It is because of things that were put in that bill by the leadership.

The reality is that the leadership has chosen to make this political and controversial. We can have a vote on the debt ceiling later. I do not know where I would be on that. I might vote for it, because I want the government to keep going on, to pay our bills, but it is wrong to hide it. It is wrong to say to my mother and her Social Security check and all those who are paying it, well, you might have to take a cut later because we are going to spend the money for something else. It is wrong, wrong for the American people to be put in this position.

My colleagues devised this scheme. I did not know it could be done, but I guess I should learn something new every day, and I have learned something. Raising the debt limit through procedural tricks, I think, has serious implications for this Nation, not to mention it has dangerous consequences for my children and my grandchildren I hope I will have. It is wrong.

I have been to this floor arguing on education issues because I believe in them and I have worked through my whole career to tell children to tell the truth, to do the right thing, to be honest. I hope they are not watching this debate today. I would be ashamed if they saw what is happening.

We ought to be willing to put it on the table. Mr. Chairman, we can do better and we should.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in full support of our men and women in uniform whom are serving our country and protecting our freedom all over the globe today.

Like my Democratic colleagues, I support a strong and robust military "we are all Americans." Many of the folks I represent work or have loved ones who are stationed at Fort Bragg.

And Mr. Chairman, I support the President in the war on terrorism. I served in the U.S. Army during Vietnam.

Today, we are considering an emergency supplement appropriations bill that will help us continue our fight against Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida and other agents of terror. I have no doubt that this emergency supplemental would pass with a strong bipartisan majority if it were a clean bill. But, the reality is that the Republican majority loaded this bill down with provisions so controversial they won't have to debate them in the light of day.

The Republican majority has devised a scheme for raising the debt limit without the consent of this House.

What's more, this Republican scheme to raise the debt limit without debate or a vote places a unfair burden on the shoulders of our children. Our children and our grandchildren will be responsible for cleaning up the mess that the Republican majority is making today. That is not the American way, Mr. Chairman.

Raising the debt limit means that we must pay more money in interest of our national debt. That means we will not have the resources necessary to provide a comprehensive prescription drug benefit to our seniors, or build new schools for our children.

Just a year ago, we stood on this floor and tried to decide what to do with our national surplus. We had a surplus, and the Republican majority squandered it. And now they come to this floor and are playing politics with our united war on terrorism, the retirement security of our seniors, and the future of our children.

Mr. Chairman, we need a responsible, honest, and balanced budget. One that meets our obligations today so our children are not left with the tab.

I believe that when you hold a public office you hold a public trust. Part of that trust means respecting the institution that is this House. We should have an open debate on the debt limit and all the other issues that the majority tacked on this bill, at another time. The resolve on this side of the aisle is strong, and we'll stand up for what we know is right. The troops overseas, our seniors, and our children deserve no less.

Raising the debt limit through procedural tricks has serious implications for our Nation, not to mention dangerous consequences for our seniors and our children. Raising the debt limit means giving the government a credit card with a higher spending limit. It means that we will be spending more money from the Social Security and Medicare trust fund to pay for government initiatives.

Mr. Chairman, those funds are supposed to be off limits. They represent a promise that we made long ago with our seniors that they would not have to live out their golden years in poverty. By raising the debt limit we risk their futures and the retirement security of our working families.

□ 1215

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

I support our servicemen and women, law enforcement officials, State, Federal, and local officials working together to protect the American people. I support the funding for the billions of dollars in the supplemental appropriation. These dollars are needed to keep America safe, secure, and free from terrorism. But, Mr. Chairman, allowing this bill to come to the floor represents

an attack on the economic security of our Nation, raising the debt ceiling an additional \$750 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support strengthening our Nation's homeland security, as this bill intends to do. We need to keep America safe. But I will not support a fiscal attack raising the debt ceiling and exploiting the national debt. Mr. Chairman, I support fighting AIDS and infectious diseases around the world, but I will not support the Enron economics this bill represents by hiding language that will allow this generation and future generations to be burdened by expanding the national debt with no regard for full disclosure or fiscal discipline.

Mr. Chairman, I support the needed resources to fund programs. I have 10 higher-education institutions in my district, but I will not burden today's college students and tomorrow's with a \$750 billion expansion of the national debt limit set on top of their student loan burden. It is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that with all my heart we need to provide the funds needed to rebuild New York, but I also believe this body has a responsibility to the American people to be honest about what we are committing them to, an expansion of the national debt with no accountability by any Member of this body.

We need to protect America from terrorism. That is what this bill should be about. But, Mr. Chairman, do our servicemen and women need to have the national debt limit raised without a vote in order to fight the war on terrorism? I say no. Do our Federal agents, police officers, firefighters, and emergency personnel need to have the debt limit raised \$750 billion to protect America without a vote? I say no.

I am a first-term Member of Congress. I came to this body hearing the majority's mantra of bipartisanship. This bill, once again, demonstrates empty words and empty actions from the Republican majority, and the consequences are empty pockets for America's working families and a growing national debt for the American people and future generations.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Minnesota are angry that the national debt is going to grow. To the people back home this represents the majority party's lack of leadership, a total lack of fiscal discipline, and a complete lack of honesty.

It is dishonest for the Republican majority to question the patriotism of myself or any of my Democratic colleagues on a bill that is not honest with the American people. We, as a Nation, are fighting a war on terrorism. This bill, with its deceitful language, clearly shows the American people that it is only the Democratic minority fighting the battles against fiscal irresponsibility and against fat tax cuts, and it also is plundering the Social Security trust fund.

If my Republican colleagues want to raise the debt limit to pay for last

year's tax cuts, then let us vote on it, yea or nay. If my Republican colleagues want to add an additional \$750 billion of debt on the backs of the American people, have the courage to vote on it yea or nay. If my Republican colleagues want to be honest with the American people, honest with our servicemen and women fighting the war on terrorism and honest with yourselves about placing this Nation an additional three-quarters of a trillion dollars in debt, then let this body vote on it yea or nay.

I applaud my fellow colleagues on this side of the aisle, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for his leadership and his support of our national security and the retirement security for our seniors and the economic security of the American people. Today, I will stand with my Democratic colleagues until the majority party tells the truth to the American people about the consequences of their political policies and the costs that they will have for future generations of Americans.

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

Mr. Chairman, the last few speakers have spoken quite eloquently about the importance of the funding in this supplemental appropriation bill, strengthening our national security, investing in homeland security, investing in the technologies, the maintenance, the resources to support our men and women serving overseas. They have been unequivocal about their support for that funding, for that financing. But the last speaker was also unequivocal in making her point that she was vehemently opposed to borrowing to fund that investment in winning the war on terrorism and strengthening our homeland security.

I think therein lies the fundamental problem. That is maybe the disconnect that we are hearing and the complaint that we are hearing that this is somehow partisan. It is not partisan when you point out that if we are going to invest in this unprecedented war on terrorism, if we are to give the men and women of the armed services the resources they need, which we all understand that because of the economic recession we are going to have to borrow additional funds to make sure they have that support, then you cannot stand on the floor and say, well, I support everything in this bill, but I will not support borrowing to support our men and women fighting overseas.

This brings us back to the debate that began the year in the Committee on the Budget, when as previous speakers have pointed out, we brought a budget to the floor, we brought a budget through committee that met the priorities laid out by the President in his State of the Union Address: winning the war on terrorism, strengthening homeland security, and getting the economy moving again. The Democrats offered no alternative. And the simple reason is because the choices were simply not to fund the war on terrorism,

to raise taxes, which they are apparently not willing to do, or to cut other programs.

Those are the three choices we are faced with today as we recognize that due to the economic downturn we need to borrow some additional funds to win that war, to strengthen homeland security and keep the economy moving. They will talk about postponing taxes or tax relief 5 and 10 years down the road, and they will say it is only for the wealthiest of Americans. But the fact of the matter is we know we need the resources this year. They are not willing to raise taxes this year. We know we need to fund the war on terrorism this year. They claim they support all the funding in this bill, but they are not willing to borrow \$1 billion, \$2 billion, \$10 billion, much less raising the debt ceiling by the required amount to make sure we have all the resources we need in this time of crisis.

Those are the three choices. And I would yield the floor to anyone that will state whether they are willing to raise taxes this year, whether they are opposed to the defense and homeland security funding in this bill, or whether they are going to stand on the floor and say we are willing to dramatically cut other domestic programs so that we do not have to raise the debt ceiling. And I will pause.

Apparently there is no one willing to go on the record supporting one of those three options, the only three options available if we are not going to borrow funds to fight the war on terrorism.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUNUNU. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman forgot one other thing. We can rescind the tax cuts that have deprived us of \$60 billion in revenue since they were implemented, and I will vote to do that in a heartbeat.

Mr. SUNUNU. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is willing to rescind all the tax cuts that are in effect this year. That is effectively a tax increase for fiscal year 2002 and 2003.

I respect the gentleman for taking that stand, for increasing taxes in fiscal year 2002 and 2003, but that is exactly the wrong thing for our economy at this time in this place.

Finally, we have heard the opponents of this legislation say, all we want is a separate vote on raising this debt ceiling. That is all we ask for. But let me refer them to the rules and manuals of this House of Representatives. On page 806 of Jefferson's Manual, which sets the precedents for this House, they can clearly see that the rule put in place by the Democrat majority in 1979 clearly prevented this House from taking a stand-alone vote on raising the debt ceiling for over 20 years. And that rule was only rescinded under this majority.

Now, my Democratic colleagues are absolutely correct in saying we do not have a stand-alone vote on this issue today. But the fact of the matter is it was the Democrat majority that stood firm for well over 15 years preventing such a stand-alone vote from ever taking place. That is a very pointed fact.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the previous speaker and all other speakers would take the time to look at this. Our Nation is now \$5,984,677,357,213.86 in debt. In the past 12 months, since the President talked about this town being awash in money, it is awash in money, we have to have tax cuts because we do not know what to do with all this money, in the past 12 months since the passing of the President's budget and the President's tax cuts, because the Republican majority controlled both Houses when that happened, we have increased the debt by \$323,329,559,211.21.

Now, what is particularly troubling about this, and I see my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), and we both have daughters about the same age, they are both 23 years old, but on the day our daughters were born, our Nation was less than \$1 trillion in debt. We had gone all the way from the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, our First World War, the Second World War, we had gone through Korea and Vietnam. We had gone all the way until 1980, and through all of that our Nation only borrowed \$1 trillion. In the 22 or 23 years my daughter has been alive, we have borrowed an additional \$5 trillion.

The fact of the matter is that since the passage of the tax cuts, my colleagues have deprived the Nation of \$60 billion in revenue. My colleagues say this bill is just for defense; but on reading this bill, there is \$170,000 that is going to go to the Christian Church Homes of Kentucky. A very noble cause, but is it really worth borrowing and sticking my daughter with that bill for the rest of her life?

What is particularly bad about this is, just like when Americans borrow money and they have to pay interest on it, if we stop to think about it, the biggest expense of our Nation is not welfare, it is not food stamps, it is not highways or the military, it is interest on the national debt. We squander \$1 billion a day on interest on the national debt. That does not educate a child; it does not help a sick person or a senior citizen. It is just squandered.

For those World War II veterans, they must love to know the fact that a third of that goes to German and Japanese lending institutions.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, since he called my name?

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Under those circumstances, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting that the gentleman men-

tioned both our daughters, who recently graduated from college. I would find the gentleman's remarks to be a little more credible if he would at least acknowledge that during the time those girls were in college this Republican majority in the United States Congress has paid off \$500 billion in public debt during that time.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would tell the gentleman that that is a sham, and the sham is that the Republican Party paid down public debt. You stole it from the trust funds.

If we could get to the Social Security trust fund, if we could somehow open it up, the gentleman knows, as I do, that there is nothing there but an IOU for \$1,260 trillion. If we could get to the trust fund for Medicare, coming out of people's taxes, there is a line on their paychecks, the gentleman knows that we have stolen as a Nation \$263 billion from the Medicare trust fund. There is not a penny there.

□ 1230

Civil servants, border guards, customs people, FBI, the guys we are counting on to defend us right now, those cops out there who are guarding us right now, we have stolen from their retirement trust fund \$527 billion.

How about the troops? This is supposed to be for the troops. There is a military retirement trust fund. If you were to open it up, it says we owe you \$167 billion. And your answer is to borrow more money, \$750 billion more money? That is your answer?

It is absolutely hilarious because I come from a conservative State. For so long Republicans said, "We've got to balance the budget. Please let us govern. We've got to balance the budget. We've got to quit running up the debt." You are in the majority. We admit you were right. We have got to balance the budget. We have got to quit running up the debt. Now that you have finally convinced us, you are changing your story. You are saying that the answer is more debt. We have to borrow money so we can send Mississippi arts to Pennsylvania to the tune of \$150,000. Read the bill.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I appreciate my friend from Mississippi yielding to me for just a few seconds there.

The fact is that during the time his daughter and my daughter were in college, during the last 4 years, during a Republican majority in the House of Representatives, this Nation has paid off almost \$500 billion in public debt during that time. That is debt that the Nation was borrowing from the public through savings bonds, T bills and that sort of thing. We have reduced that amount during the time that our daughters were in college.

I would find my friend's argument a little more credible if that \$6 trillion in public debt that he was pointing to on that chart were not the very same \$6 trillion in national debt that his party

ran up during the time from 1980 to the time of the Republican takeover of the House of Representatives in 1994 and 1995. I would think that my colleagues from the Democrat side of the aisle would have a little more credibility as fiscal conservatives if that were not the figure that they themselves ran up while they were in charge of this entire town.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would have to say that I have been enjoying this debate all day today and I enjoyed this debate all evening last night, late into the evening.

I would like to make an appeal to the Members on both sides of the aisle. We have had a lot of debate on this bill. But I want to remind our colleagues, for those who did not have the great privilege of serving with a real statesman, that Morris Udall was an outstanding Member of this House. He had a famous statement that I have quoted on occasion, and I want to quote it again now. It went something like this: That everything that needs to be said has already been said. The problem is that not everyone has said it yet. But I think we are about at the point that everyone has said it.

So I wonder if I could just make an appeal to get to the amendment process? Why do we not start to deal with the amendments that are filed and let us proceed and get this done? If we want to have a major political debate on any kind of issue, I am sure we can find a parliamentary way to do that. But I think we have really beaten this one to death. Can we get on with the business of the Committee? Can we get on with the amendments and see if we cannot come to some closure on this bill?

Mr. WICKER. Reclaiming my time, let me just say this. There have been a lot of complaints, this morning, about the rule. I think it is no secret that I was not overly delighted about the procedure under which we are taking this bill up. But that debate was held last night. That vote was taken and that issue is behind us. We have before us now a national security, wartime appropriation, primarily for the troops. I think it is time that this House moved forward, as the Chairman has suggested. Let us take up the legitimate amendments that are before us. Let us move beyond the time-consuming dilatory tactics that we have seen so far and let us pass a bill for America.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman might be given 2 additional minutes so that we could explore the time agreement that the gentleman from Florida was just inquiring about.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman from Mississippi would like to

request that time, I would be willing to agree to that.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, the gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKER. I yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the committee has asked that we get to the amendment process so that the amendments can be offered that Members want to offer. Let me suggest something, if I could, because the problem is that under this rule, wildly extraneous matter has been added, as the gentleman knows, but we cannot reach that by amendment to strike it under the rule. So Members cannot really offer the amendments that need to be offered to correct the problem under the rule under which we are debating the bill.

I would ask the gentleman whether or not he could explore with his leadership something like the following: I think we could greatly shrink the debate time on this bill if we could get a unanimous-consent agreement under which the House would be able to consider the committee-reported bill, stripped of the extraneous add-ons. We would limit amendments to those printed in the RECORD or at the desk. We could limit the debate on those amendments to 30 minutes, retain the motion to recommit, and I would certainly be willing as part of that agreement to discuss greatly reducing and withdrawing a large number of amendments that are now at the desk or which we contemplate offering absent such agreement.

If the gentleman would at least take that offer to his leadership, that might help us to find a way to finish this bill in rational fashion.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for this offer. Once we begin to talk about a way to get out of this, I think then we can accomplish that. I would be more than willing to discuss this with the leadership on my side. As a matter of fact, we have discussed similar situations earlier. I do not have a conclusion that I can report to our colleagues in the House one way or the other, but I would be more than happy to discuss that with the leadership.

Mr. OBEY. I appreciate that. I think that that is probably the only way that we are going to avoid an extended debate which will be frustrating to both sides. I thank the gentleman.

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

It is a good time to be speaking because the spirit of the last exchange is something that I am very much in favor of. The sooner that we put the charade that this is an open rule behind us, the better off we will all be. Because yesterday we did debate the rule and some of us felt very strongly that it was not a fair rule and we ob-

jected very strenuously. My fellow colleague from Texas kept calling this an open rule when everyone knows that if you were to do as the normal appropriation process around here does, if you object to the spending in a particular appropriation bill, you may stand up under an open rule and strike it.

I want to make it very clear. I support the \$27.1 billion that the President requested in order to fund the war on terrorism. I and every Member on this side of the aisle support that. But we get the trivializing of this debate regarding that we are unpatriotic because we object to the process that we have been subjected to, not by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or the ranking member but by the leadership of this House that has added \$2.4 billion in extraneous spending and also has tried to hide an increase of the debt ceiling in this particular bill, which will be in it once we pass the bill, which is one of the reasons why I will oppose the bill very strongly.

It is very frustrating to me to stand on the floor and to have to object to things that I used to support my friends on the other side when they were in the minority and I voted with them on improving the budget process. Sometimes we won. We took the minority and added with some on this side and we actually won. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) yesterday spoke of that. I appreciate him giving credit to me for being a part of that. I give credit to him. I see the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, someone that I believe I could and would work with on this floor on the budget, but his leadership has precluded that at every turn.

Why all of a sudden did we decide to waive the rule that provides that extraneous matters should not be added to an emergency spending bill? We passed it in 1994 with 322 votes, of which all but 4 Republicans joined it. Yet yesterday all of you, 166 of you still here, voted to waive that rule. We can get out of here in 1 hour by agreeing by unanimous consent that we will appropriate the money for the war and strike all of the extraneous matters. It can pass by unanimous consent. The Senate can take it up. It can be on the President's desk by Saturday. Everyone in this body knows that can happen.

But why do we insist on spending more and then cooking the books on paying for it, which you have done in this resolution? And yet my friends on the other side that I used to vote with, and you used to vote with me, are going along with that because your leadership has said that is what we ought to do. I do not understand that. We can get out of here in a heartbeat and do what this is all about, fund the war on terrorism. You can do it by unanimous consent if the leadership will take the gentleman from Wisconsin's request and the gentleman from

Florida and the folks on his side of the aisle will go to their leadership and say, "Let's quit this charade."

To those that believe somehow you are going to hide the debt limit, this is what is so funny about us having this. If you believe in a heartbeat that the Senate is going to go along with a \$750 billion increase in the debt ceiling in a conference on this bill, you are living in a dream world. All the Blue Dogs have been asking now for the last several weeks, months, just have a clean up-and-down vote on the debt ceiling. Do not jeopardize the faith and good credit of the United States on a political argument that we are having today that you blame us and we blame you and who gives a hoot who is at fault. The fact is that it is happening and at fault in this body is the majority. Not the minority. We cannot do all the bad things you say that we are doing. We are in the minority. But we will gladly join with you in unanimous consent if you will listen to what the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Florida would like to do. We will do it in a heartbeat and we can go home for Memorial Day.

But please, please, let us stop insisting that this is a patriotic vote. The patriotic vote is a clean vote, not the one that you are asking us to vote on, not the one that you shoved the rule down our throat yesterday on a pure party line vote in which I know a large number of my colleagues on this side did not like to vote for that rule. You can undo it by unanimous consent. I hope you will go along with us in doing that.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, let me first make a comment and say that cloaking partisan amendments in the name of the war on terrorism is not patriotism, in my personal opinion.

Mr. Chairman, for citizens watching this debate late last night and today, I can understand why there could be some confusion about what this debate is all about, because much of what has been said has nothing to do with the issue at hand. So let me just go back to the basics.

Fact number one. The bill we are considering is entitled, and I quote, the 2002 Supplemental Appropriations Act for Further Recovery From and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States. That is the bill before us.

Fact number two. This bill came out of the Committee on Appropriations on which I serve and vote on a bipartisan basis. Why? Because we all want to support homeland defense and the war against terrorism.

Fact number three. On Tuesday night, the Committee on Rules under the direction of the Republican leadership of this House took a bipartisan

bill to fund our war on terrorism and made it a Christmas tree full of partisan ornaments, amendments that have absolutely nothing to do with the title or the subject of this bill.

□ 1245

That is fact number three.

Fact number four. What Democrats are objecting to on the floor today is adding extraneous, unrelated, partisan, controversial amendments to a bill that needs to be passed quickly so that we can efficiently and quickly fund our war on terrorism and needed important homeland defense measures.

Now, what we really are getting down to is one question, and that question is very simple and very direct. I have not heard an answer to this question so far. The question is, will the Republican leadership of this House allow us to strip out of this important bill to fund the war against terrorism those amendments that were partisan and had nothing to do with the title or subject of this bill? It is a simple question, and we Democrats, still, after 2 days of debate, await the answer to that question.

What I am sorry to say, Mr. Chairman, is what this is really all about is politics as usual. I understand politics. We all do. But I believe that politics as usual is not good enough when we are talking about funding a war on terrorism at a time when our Nation's security is at risk.

Now, what is politics as usual? Politics as usual is taking an important bill, a highway bill, an important natural disaster funding bill, knowing that the majority of Americans will want it passed, and then adding extraneous amendments that have nothing to do with that bill because perhaps those amendments may be partisan and could not pass on their own merit. That is exactly what happened on this bill.

I will yield the balance of my time if 1 Member of this House on the Republican side could tell me what the following amendments, added late at night on a partisan basis by the Committee on Rules, have to do with fighting our war on terrorism.

Amendment No. 1 that I referred to, section 1404, treatment of certain counties for purposes of reimbursement under the Medicare program.

I am not quite sure what that has to do with the war on terrorism. Let me continue quoting. "Effective for discharges occurring during fiscal year 2003, for purposes of making payments under subsections (d) and (j) of section 1886 of the Social Security Act to hospitals (A) in Lackawanna, Luzerne, Wyoming, Lycoming, and Columbia Counties, Pennsylvania, such counties are deemed to be located in the Newburgh, New York-Pennsylvania Metropolitan Statistical Area."

Is there a single Member of this House on this floor right now who would like to take the rest of my time and explain what that has to do with fighting the war on terrorism?

I guess not.

Maybe a Member could explain to me why the next part of the amendment has something to do with the title and subject of funding the war on terrorism. "(B) in Mercer County, Pennsylvania, such county is deemed to be located in Youngston-Warren, Ohio Metropolitan Statistical Area."

If there is any Member that can explain to me right now, what this has to do with fighting and funding the war on terrorism I will be happy to yield my time.

Mr. Chairman, I guess apparently no one wants to answer that question.

Well, let us go to amendment No. 3, 4, 5 and 6. Can any Member explain to me how they relate to funding our war against terrorism?

This process is about politics as usual. That is not good enough in fighting a war against terrorism.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is interesting, because to follow my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), and then for him to have followed the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), I have a very urban district in Houston, but whether it is central Texas with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) or West Texas with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), we are concerned about the procedure that is happening today, because every one of us have voted for funding for the war on terrorism literally since September 11. But the procedure that my Republican colleagues have put us in today in the majority is that what happened yesterday with the rule to the supplemental began to raid the Social Security trust fund. This is a dangerous thing that will return us to the days of deficit spending.

Mr. Chairman, my first term in Congress was 1993-1994, when our debt, being hidden by Social Security every year, increased \$250 billion. It is estimated that now our national debt not hidden by Social Security will be \$300 billion every year more. So what we are seeing is we are increasing the national charge card.

I have to admit, I am concerned, because whenever we increase our debt limit, like we would on our Visa cards, then sometimes we do at least pay the minimum balances. But we are not even paying the minimum balances. We are just increasing the debt.

My colleagues on the Republican side for my first term when they were in the minority talked to us so much about how bad it was, that we are taxing the future, we are taxing our grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Well, we are doing it today with this and the shoe is on their foot now. They are the ones doing that.

It is not for the war on terrorism. It is not for the war on terrorism. I would stand here today and vote to increase the debt ceiling on a clean vote, like I think a majority of the Democratic Caucus would, if you said we need to

increase the debt ceiling and devote that to the war on terrorism, devote that to the military that we need, to investigations we need to make sure our country is safe. That is not the case. That is not the case.

That is what is so frustrating. They are wrapping themselves up in the war on terrorism, yet they will not realize that last year when the economy was taking a downturn, we did not know how much, last year before September 11, we voted one of the biggest tax cuts in history. It took effect last year and will take effect over the next 10 years. Yet they want to make it even permanent after that. That is what is causing this debt ceiling to have to be increased. It is not the war on terrorism. The national debt again will be \$300 billion more than it was at the first of this year.

Now, I am just shocked, as a Democrat, who is supposed to be a big spender, to see what my Republican colleagues have done in the years they have been in the majority. This increase cannot be explained by the war against terrorism or even a downturn in the economy. The cost of the war and the downturn in the economy roughly are \$800 billion in the increase in the projected debt. Yet this leaves nearly \$1.9 trillion in more debt that is not accounted for. The only thing I can say is it is either increased domestic spending, some of which I support, or most of it is the tax cut voted on prior to September 11.

The new debt seriously inhibits our ability to provide a prescription drug benefit, to shore up our Social Security programs or invest in a number of other domestic priorities that we need to have. Instead of sneaking around to increase the debt ceiling, we should be discussing how we got here and what we need to do to avoid getting our Nation further in debt.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this back-door effort in mortgaging our children's future and find a meaningful solution to our budget woes. Lots of ways could correct this, but not to continue to charge up our national credit card.

We can do what the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) suggested, a unanimous consent request that we go back to the original bill and take away that rule vote last night that hid the increase in the national debt. Or we could do an up-and-down vote on increasing the national debt ceiling with devoting that increase to the war on terrorism to make sure our country is safe.

Again, I think we could go back to what we saw after September 11, a huge bipartisan majority saying yes, we want to defend our country, we want to defend our community, we want to defend those men and women in Afghanistan and literally all over the world now. We wanted to do that. We wanted to do it based on a tax cut last year passed prior to September 11. That is what is so frustrating. That is why you

are going to see Members of the Democratic Caucus from all walks of the party, from every philosophical point of view, who want to vote for an increase in the debt ceiling, for the war on terrorism, to protect our communities, but that is not what my Republican colleagues are allowing us to do.

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

Mr. Chairman, this process is wrong. What is occurring here, starting last night and throughout the course of the day and perhaps into tomorrow and this weekend, is wrong, because it is perpetrating just yet one more fraud upon the American people on an important policy issue, an important debate that we should have in this Chamber, and that is what type of economic policy are we going to be pursuing as a Nation that will have long-term broad implications for virtually every single American in this country?

Today, Mr. Chairman, we have visitors up in the gallery of the House. I see some seniors. I see middle-aged Americans. I see young children and students from around the country. The debate we are having today is an important one because it affects every single life in this Chamber today and every single life throughout the country. What is hidden is a fraud covered under the guise of an emergency supplemental bill under all the patriotic speeches we have been hearing over the course of the last 24 hours, support for troops, support for homeland security, we can stipulate right now that we are in support of the troops, we are in support of investment in homeland security. There is no issue, there is no wedge that divides Republicans and Democrats on that. But it is the extraneous provisions that have been attached to the supplemental bill that is wrong, and it is fraudulent, and it is being done for political purposes, for partisan motivation alone.

It is wrong to have provisions that adjust the Medicare reimbursement so it affects just a few hospitals in this country, excluding the host of other hospitals, including those in my district, that are suffering under inadequate reimbursement rates, but they are being added to the supplemental bill figuring it is something that is going to fly through mainly for political purposes.

But what has me mostly concerned about this supplemental is the important debate we should be having in this Congress and throughout the Nation about raising the debt in this country by over \$750 billion. When you talk to people about annual deficits and national debt and the impact it is going to have on the financial markets, people basically say "what?" But what this is about is the national credit card and adding \$750 billion more on the national credit card and the interest payments we are going to have to pay for years and years to come.

Now, they are fond on the other side of accusing Democrats of favoring tax-

and-spend provisions. But what they are pursuing is even worse in regards to economic policy. They are spend and borrow and borrow and borrow.

I would submit, what is more fair than to ask the current generation of Americans to contribute to the benefits and the programs that we have today through taxes that they should be paying for, or whether we should deliver the benefits of those programs, but delay the pain and burden of paying for them to future generations, to our children and to the next generation of children when these IOUs come due because of the large national debt that is being accumulated and the obligation that our kids are going to have to meet in future years. That is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I have 2 little boys at home. They are just 3 and 5, and hopefully within a couple of days I am going to be able to return and look them in the eyes. I want to be able to tell them we had the courage and we had the wisdom in this Congress to be thinking about their futures and the future of our country, rather than short-term political gain and what impact this might have on the next election cycle. But by hiding the increase in the national debt ceiling under the guise of a patriotic supplemental bill, we are delaying the day of reckoning and, unfortunately, that burden, that obligation and responsibility, will not be falling upon the current generation who is asking for the programs that need to be paid for, such as the investment in defense spending and homeland security. Instead, it is going to fall on the youngest and most vulnerable in our Nation today, our children and future generations. That is what is so wrong with this process right now.

I understand they do not want to debate the economic policies they passed last year and the fact we are back into annual structural deficits again. It is a replay of the 1980s all over again. But the difference today, Mr. Chairman, is this simple fact: We do not have the luxury of recovering from the failed economic policies of the past by turning the economy around and running surpluses again, because we have 77 million Americans all marching lock-step to their retirement in a few short years.

Now is the time to maintain fiscal discipline. Now is the time to pursue fiscal responsibility, to prepare our country and to prepare future generations to deal with the aging population, with this demographic time bomb that is about to go off. But, unfortunately, that is not what is being considered in this supplemental. Instead, they are trying to increase the debt ceiling, digging a deeper hole, creating a greater financial burden for future generations and our children, and that is what is wrong, and that is why 1 party at least has to stand up and tell the truth to the American people today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO
TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair would remind all Members that it is inappropriate to address or refer to our guests in the gallery.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the supplemental appropriations legislation. One of the most important responsibilities our Constitution gives Congress is to maintain a Navy and, among other essential funding provisions, that is what this bill is all about. This supplemental provides needed funding, procurement, operations and maintenance and personnel to allow the Navy to continue its successes.

□ 1300

Mr. Chairman, our Navy has performed magnificently in Afghanistan, and they deserve our support. However, I wish to express my concern about potential efforts to raise the debt limit to spend up our national credit card by \$750 billion. This took place during conference committee proceedings on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the debt limit of the United States is such an important issue that it deserves a full debate in the Congress and should not be relegated to only conference committee deliberations. It is so important that many of my colleagues, including those on the other side, are supporting efforts to make it harder for Congress to raise the debt limit.

Those outside Washington may wonder, why are we even concerned about the debt limit? There are at least two reasons why this is an important issue. First, the size of the debt affects interest rates. An increase in the debt will likely cause a rise in interest rates, which means working families paying higher monthly house payments, higher monthly car payments, and higher student loan payments. Second, we need to understand the context of a debt limit increase. The message it sends is families must live within a budget, but the government can continue to spend beyond its limits.

Mr. Chairman, just a year ago we had a surplus and today we have a deficit, and we cannot afford to continue our deficits. To be sure, we must, we must pay for the war on terrorism, but we must still have the mechanism to keep spending under control.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that when the circumstances arise, having a debate on raising the debt limit and having a stand-alone vote is a responsible action for Congress to take, but what is so irresponsible is to hide the debate from the American people.

Mr. Chairman, let us be straightforward; and let us consider, as many of my colleagues have suggested, what I would like to call the "grandkid test." A year ago last May I stood in the well of this Chamber and celebrated the birth of my first grandson; and I said then, when we talk about major issues of concern and consequence to our great country that we

think about whether it is in the best interests of our children and our grandchildren. On the supplemental, I say yes. The war on terrorism and supporting our military, absolutely. That is in support of my grandkid. But when I think about the unlimited credit card and the impact it has on interest rates, on Social Security and Medicare, well, that requires more notice to the American people.

So let us separate out these issues and subject our assessment of these additions to this good supplemental bill to the grandkid test, is it in that kid's best interests in the future.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to spend a few moments considering how we got here and where we go from here. To do that we have to talk for a bit about the debt and what the debt really is. To understand that, we really have to take a step back and look at our trust funds. There are about 50 or so trust funds, the biggest of which, of course, is Social Security, and then the next biggest one is civil service retirement, and then the Medicare trust fund, the transportation trust fund, and it goes on down. Those trust funds, most of them, are running surpluses and, over the years, those surpluses have accumulated until we now have, order of magnitude, about \$2 trillion in surpluses.

Now, by law, the only place that those surpluses can be invested are in nonnegotiable U.S. securities. So what that means, even if we limited our spending to current revenues, we would still be increasing our debt by the amount of the trust fund surpluses, because the only place they can be invested is in nonnegotiable U.S. securities. So until we change that and find something else to do with our trust funds, we will always have an increasing debt.

Now, I mentioned that the trust funds represent about a \$2 trillion debt, order of magnitude. The rest of the debt that we owe is what we call the public debt, or the Wall Street debt. That is the amount of money that we have borrowed from stocks and bonds and securities and so forth. That is a total debt then of roughly \$6 trillion.

Now, we have told the American people for the last couple of years or so that we were paying down the debt. That was truthful, and that was not truthful. What was truthful was that we were using monies from the Social Security lockbox and the Medicare lockbox, those are surpluses in those two accounts, to pay down the publicly held debt. But I just checked this morning with CBO, and there never was a year in which, in fact, the national debt, which is the sum of these two, \$2 trillion in the trust fund debt, \$4 trillion in the public debt, there never was a year in which the total of those two debts went down. I asked them, was there a moment in time when that debt went down, the national debt, which is the debt we

should have been talking about. Well, he said, probably so, because you see, our outlays are reasonably consistent month by month. But we have a big surge of money that comes in in April when Americans pay their taxes. So for April, there may have been, and he was not sure, he was going to check and call me back, for in April, May 2000, 2001, maybe 1999, there might have been a month when we, in fact, did reduce the debt.

But if we use an accrual method of accounting, and the government requires everybody with more than I think \$1 million revenue to use it, and we certainly have more than that in the government, to use accrual methods of accounting, so if we use accrual methods of accounting, there never was a moment in time during these past several years when, in fact, the national debt did not go up.

Now, the national debt is going up a bit faster now than it would have gone up, because we are in a war; and I hope there is nobody who is saying that we ought to spend less money on our military, because we are now not spending enough. I am not sure we have given our military enough money to fight this war. They went into this war with a spear that was very sharp at the tip, but very little in back of that. Readiness was down. I am concerned that we cannot give them enough money, and this in a time when there is an enormous wave of patriotism, enormous support for the military, that we are not going to get it done. So I hope there is no one who would suggest that we are not giving them enough money. I do not think we are giving them enough money.

I just wanted to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, where we are, that we never in fact have paid down the national debt. The debt that we were paying down was the public debt.

Now, that is very good for us, because paying down that public debt means that interest rates drop and we are paying roughly 2 percent less for everything we borrow now. But think of what we have done to do that. We are telling our children and our grandchildren we cannot operate our government on current revenues, so we are borrowing from your future. What you are going to have to do is not only run the government in your day on current revenues, you are going to have to pay back the money that we borrowed from your future, these trust fund dollars.

When I ran for Congress 10 years ago, I promised that I would conduct myself so that my children and grandchildren would not spit on my grave. I still intend to do that.

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill started as a bipartisan committee effort. It was done in order to fund the emergency needs for defense and homeland security. That is why it was so grating to sit here last night and again today

while many of our Republican members, including chairpersons and others who want to do the right thing, agree that the original bill was focused on emergencies, but that their leadership hijacked it and changed that bill, still all have the audacity to stand up here and wave the flag and insinuate that other people who want to talk about things that are extraneous to the bill are somehow unpatriotic. They shamelessly join in and make those insinuations, and somehow they want to know that they or their proxies are the ones who are changing the nature of this bill.

Every American knows and every Member of this House knows that Members on both sides of this aisle support and continue to support the security of this country and the protection of our troops. Shame on those who try to hide their shenanigans by implying otherwise. The question is, do they have no shame.

Late last night before the majority abandoned its attempt to move this bill in the dark, we witnessed the shameful spectacle of the Speaker of this House, and others, claim as political those who question the nondefense, nonhomeland security aspects of this bill. That was disgraceful, even for a majority that has made the disparagement of the democratic process an art form.

Let us review the situation again, Mr. Chairman. This committee did bipartisan work. It passed a defense and homeland security emergency spending bill. It went to the Committee on Rules where the majority of Republicans rewrote that bill. Essentially, they took it and they spread the American flag out; they put the Committee on Appropriation's work on it, and then they added things. They added violations to the Caribbean Basin initiative that just happens to have two of their Members, one from South Carolina, one from North Carolina, who took politically harmful votes earlier in the year to be helped in their upcoming elections.

They changed distribution of hospital funds. It just so happened that Members of the Republican Party with tough elections ended up with their hospitals getting more and hospitals around the Nation getting less so that could happen. They reported to put in a deeming in the budget amount that the leadership could not otherwise get through both bodies in this Congress and which forces the rest of the year every other place of education, transportation, housing and so on to be cut, and it raises the debt ceiling, hidden in this bill, tucked in there so that no Member of the majority party will have to stand up and be counted. They did this even though most of the people over there on that side of the aisle have signed a bill saying that it would take three-fifths of this body in an open vote to make such an increase in the debt ceiling.

It is the Speaker's job to represent and uphold the integrity of this House

and not to play partisan politics with our security needs. It looks like ours needs to be reminded of that. He took to the floor to participate in the shameful waving of the flag to mask political additions by the Republican majority to this bill.

The debt ceiling in America is America's credit card limit, the maximum that we can charge on our credit cards, if you will. The Republicans are rightfully embarrassed, as they should be, that they took a \$5.6 trillion surplus and in one year, they blew it out so that they need to raise the amount that this country can borrow.

Now, we as American families could understand that if they had to raise it to borrow to invest in the future needs of our families and this country. For instance, if they had to borrow for security reasons, but they do not, or for housing, but they do not, or for education, but they do not, or transportation, but they do not, or retirement. But these Republicans are not raising the credit limit of this country because they want to invest in those things; they are not borrowing for our security. There is plenty of money in there and both sides of the aisle would vote to have this country secure. They are not helping us secure housing needs. They are not educating our children with the money; in fact, they are cutting the education funding and leaving the children behind. They are not doing it for our retirement, because, in fact, as a result of this, they are going to have to spend the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

The Republicans are raising the debt of America because they gave our savings away to their wealthy neighbors. What American would take their credit card, increase the debt and use that money to give it to their wealthy neighbors at the expense of their children's education, their parents' retirement and prescription drugs, their communities' needs? But that is exactly what has been done here, and they have the audacity to stand up and call others who question nondefense needs and nonhomeland security needs as political.

The majority wrapped this bad act in the flag together with the bipartisan emergency security funding, and brought it here hoping Americans would be distracted by their waving of the flag. It is a disgrace.

When Webster comes out in the future with a pictorial dictionary, next to "bravery" it is going to have the photos of Americans who fought in Afghanistan, who helped in New York, and who paid their taxes to support the unity, freedoms and civil liberties of this country. Next to the words "political cowardice" it will need space enough to fit a group so large as to encompass the entire Republican caucus, chief among them the so-called moderates who voted for this crummy rule and wring their hands afterwards.

□ 1315

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

Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation and the language in it to increase the debt. I do have concerns about it, and I believe that my Democrat friends today have shown rare interest in fiscal restraint.

I am glad to see it. I know there are a lot of them, like my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), who is always on the target, and I am glad to see he has growing numbers there. We on the Republican side of the aisle welcome all the help we can get when it comes to fiscal conservatism.

What I want to say now is that the Treasury is not going to be able to finance the homeland security and the war on terrorism without addressing this issue.

We keep hearing we do not like the process. But if we go back in our book, which is the House rules and manual, on page 945, rule number 49, which was at one time known as the Gephardt rule, it says and I quote, "The vote by which the conference report on the concurrent resolution on the budget was agreed to in the House, or by which the concurrent resolution itself was adopted in the House if there is no conference report, shall be deemed to have been a vote in favor of such joint resolution," and that is concerning the debt ceiling, "upon final passage of the House of Representatives." This was the case for over 20 years as a mechanism designed by the Democrat party to address the issue of raising the debt ceiling.

Now, I want to say let us get off the process issue. This is a standard thing that the Committee on Rules has done. But I also heard the words of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) earlier today. I have to say to my Democrat friends, where was their plan? Where was their budget? When we had the budget debate, there was not one.

The words of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) said that it is a problem and they are just going to vote no on it. But as the burden of governing goes to the majority party, we have addressed a lot of debt reduction, \$453 billion in debt paid off; in 1998, \$451 billion; in 1999, \$89 billion; in 2000, \$223 billion; and in 2001, \$90 billion in debt reduction.

We are very serious about this. We have passed a budget this year that gets us back on this track. We are going to continue to do so.

Here is another chart about what our plans are about it. Here is \$3.7 billion, going up to \$3.2 billion by 2007. Meanwhile, back to the Democrat ranch: no budget, no submission. There was a plan that one of the leading Democrat senators said that goes into Social Security. That is something they always try to accuse us of, but here is a news article about how the Democrat plan in the Senate was planning to get into Social Security. The House plan was not,

because there was no plan, so they can kind of pick and choose issues here.

Is war free? Did anyone think on 9/11 that this was not going to cost us money? Can we really put a price on defending our freedom? Can we really say that, well, we did not mean it, and we do not like the procedural situation here today, so we are going to take a pass on it? I do not think that anybody in this House, Democrat or Republican, conservative or liberal, would ever want to do this.

Can we put a price tag on defending our freedom? This bill today helps us continue the war in central Asia until we win it. This bill today helps us to defend our homeland, which we need, and our airports, our ports, our EMS, our police officials back home. This bill helps fund that.

This bill also has \$5.7 billion for New York City. Now, I am sure if we all looked at it politically and said let New York take care of it on their own, nobody is necessarily going to lose the election because they did not vote for more spending for New York City. But the fact is, the attack was a national attack. Every Member in here, from Hawaii to Maine to Miami, all want to stand up and support, as fellow Americans, side by side, the rebuilding of New York City. This bill today allows us to do this.

War is not free. War is not pleasant. Financing war, financing anything, is not easy, but this is an approach. I support the bill and hope that we can move on from some of the partisan rhetoric that we have been hearing today.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think, given the words of the gentleman who preceded me in the well, there is substantial ground for agreement on homeland security, money for the National Guard; our troops, giving them what they need; the Coast Guard needs more funding; aviation security, I was a principal in writing that bill, and it is going to cost billions of dollars; and money for New York City.

There was tremendous agreement on the Committee on Appropriations. If that bill were brought to the floor, I would venture to say it would get a two-thirds vote. We would probably do it under suspension of the rules, or maybe better.

But that is not what is before us today. That is the problem. This is not an emergency supplemental, it is the early arrival of the Capitol Christmas tree. This bill has been larded down with billions not requested by the President, and extraneous provisions like raising the national debt limit.

In other areas, some of particular concern to my constituents, they have shorted the President's request. I will tell the Members what is an emergency to the people of my district. In addition to fighting the war on terrorism and defending our homeland, it is the fact that we have the highest unem-

ployment rate in the United States of America in my district. This bill shorts the President's request of \$550 million for national emergency grants under the Work Force Investment Act to provide unemployment training assistance by \$250 million.

That is going to be shuffled elsewhere. They ignored the President there. That is a real crisis, a real emergency to people in my district.

There are other things about this bill that are particularly outrageous: the increase in the debt limit, running up the credit card by spending Social Security trust funds.

What happened to the lockbox? That was a Republican invention. We voted on it 7 times in the House. I voted on it each of the 7 times. I supported the idea of a lockbox for Social Security. Where has it gone? They have blown the door off and pulled the money out.

This year, in this year's budget, \$150 billion of money that should be going in the lockbox, that should be there to pay for future generations of Social Security retirees, is going to be spent and replaced with IOUs with this year's projected \$307 billion budget. This merits an airing. This merits a debate on this floor.

If we are going to increase the debt of the United States of America by three-quarters of a trillion dollars, if we are going to run \$200 billion to \$300 billion-a-year deficits as far as the eye can see, half of that money coming out of Social Security, how are we going to pay for the retirement of the baby boom generation?

Will they be better off watching the money flow to the most wealthy Americans with the tax cuts, or would they be better off safeguarding their trust fund, paying down some of the national debt, making us more capable of carrying those burdens when that generation retires? That is a debate we should have. Let us have a debate over the policies that are leading to this request that we increase the debt ceiling of the United States by three-quarters of \$1 trillion: \$750 billion. It is \$750 billion, B, billion dollars. That is a lot of money, even here in Washington, D.C.

Can Members not have the courage of Ronald Reagan? He jammed through huge tax cuts and big spending increases with similar rosy projections. Two years later, he had the courage to admit he was wrong. In fact, we were running huge and growing deficits, and the tax cuts were too big to support. In fact, he rolled them back, very significantly working with a Democratic House and a Republican Senate.

Can Members not have that courage to admit that the \$5.6 trillion of rosy scenario, which has now evaporated, which allowed them to put through a tax cut, which is going to absorb about half of that money, that is not here anymore? We are in deficits. Should we borrow money from Social Security to finance tax cuts principally for the wealthiest Americans, or should we safeguard those funds?

We could have a wonderful policy debate here on the floor of the House about raising the debt limit, what is leading to it, and what we should do about it. But that is not going to be allowed. That is being rolled into this bill with little bitty sneaky language so it can come back.

Let us have a fair debate on that issue. Let us strip out all of the extraneous provisions of this bill. If they will do that, I will vote for it. I will support a unanimous consent request to just deem the bill adopted. Just strip out all the extraneous positions out of this bill, and I believe we could get every Democrat to support a motion similar to that.

We support the money that is going in there for the troops, the war on terrorism, the other essentials; but we do not support the Christmas-tree approach that this bill is taking, including avoiding any significant policy discussion about trading off tax cuts for increasing the debt in the United States and raiding the Social Security lockbox.

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

Mr. Chairman, the debate we have before us is about a supplemental spending bill, but it is not about supplemental spending for the war on terrorism, not this debate. When it comes to fighting terrorism, we are not going to be stinting about the cost. We want to win. We support our troops. We support our President. We are ready to vote for supplemental spending to win the war on terrorism. Let us make that clear.

But the leadership of this House, knowing that this supplemental would be widely supported, cleverly stuck on it provisions that are totally unrelated to the war on terrorism which we cannot and do not support. One provision in particular sticks in our craw. Members have heard us talk about it. It is seemingly innocuous, just a passing reference to "the debt of the United States." But this passing reference is a coy trick, too clever by half, particularly with a matter of such gravity as the national debt of the United States of America. Because what this bill would do without a direct vote, without open acknowledgment, what this bill would do is open the back door for an increase in the national debt of \$750 billion.

Now, we all know that the national debt ceiling will have to be raised by \$750 billion, and probably before it is all over with, even more. I voted for it before and I will vote for it again. But if we let it slip by, if we let it pass, buried in this bill, I will tell Members what we will be voting for: We will be voting for 2 more years of avoidance, 2 more years of dodging the issue, 2 more years of not dealing squarely with the problems of our budget, the deficit, and the debt that has put us so far in debt that we now need \$750 billion in debt ceiling increase.

Look at this chart. It is just a simple explanation of how far we have sunk in

the last 2 years with the administration's budget policies. This was what they projected here, that we would not need to come back for an increase in the debt ceiling for at least 8 years. That is what Secretary O'Neill told us as recently as last year when he testified before the House Committee on the Budget. It would be 2008 before he needs another debt ceiling increase.

Look at what has happened in 2 years. Look at the red line shooting up there. That is because of the budget that we have which is shown on this next chart. The numbers are too small, and it is too bad, but this chart shows graphically, literally and figuratively how far we have sunk.

Look at this bottom line here, the remaining on-budget surplus. We have gone from the first surplus in 30 years, not including Social Security and Medicare, to an expected deficit by our calculation this year of an on-budget deficit of \$314 billion, \$314 billion.

Look across this line and see what happens to the bottom line. It does not self-correct. It does not get any better. This year we expect \$314 billion. Next year it will be \$342 billion, without Social Security and without Medicare. The next year it will be \$248 billion, \$284 billion, and then \$238 billion.

Mr. Chairman, what we are avoiding, if we vote for this bill and approve a debt ceiling increase by the back door, is any confrontation with this dire fiscal situation we have on our hands that results from the Bush budget policies. That is the bottom line. That is what the debate is about.

We went to the Committee on Rules and said quite simply and openly, give us an amendment to this bill which would basically provide that before the debt ceiling is increased by more than \$250 billion, and we will let you have a \$250 billion increase, but before we add the additional amount, let us have in place, let us pass and put in place a budget resolution that would restore us to balance in 5 years, that would put us back on an on-budget surplus in 5 years.

Is that asking for too much? All that is asking for is what we all promised on the 7 occasions in the last 2 or 3 years when we brought to the floor bills we called lockbox bills. Remember those? Everybody got up here and forswore this practice of digging into the Social Security trust fund, digging into the Medicare trust fund and using those trust fund surpluses which are building up for now for ordinary operating purposes of the Federal Government. We all said that now we were in surplus and we are able to do it, we would not do it again.

Well, here we are, Mr. Chairman, back at that practice again as a result of the budgets we have adopted for the last 2 years. What we have tried to say, the amendment we tried to offer and get made in order, simply provided that before we raise the debt ceiling \$750 billion and preclude this issue from being considered again for at

least 2 years, bypass this debate, let us put in place a budget that will put us back in balance. That is what this debate is all about.

□ 1330

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

Mr. Chairman, last night I stood in this very same room with some of you here to argue against the raising of the debt ceiling and from bankrupting our Social Security system for our current senior citizens and future baby boomers like myself and others. I am dismayed that this afternoon I have to return and make the very same argument again, raising the debt ceiling especially in such a backhanded way that unfairly forces us to make choices, choices of priorities. Make no mistake about it, make no mistake about it, Democrats do support our troops. We do support the war on terrorism; but we cannot sit idly by while the Bush administration and the Republican leadership continue to chip away at the support beams of Social Security in the name of patriotism.

I ask, Is it patriotic to steal food and shelter from our seniors? Is it patriotic to force our seniors to choose between nutritious meals and their prescription drugs? Is it patriotic to ask our workers to pay into the Social Security system that may be dissolved before they have an opportunity to benefit from it, like myself?

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives has over 61 women Representatives here now. But the United States is comprised of over 140 million women. And of those women, there are many who will be adversely affected by the radical shift in Social Security. Today women represent about 60 percent of the Social Security recipients and 72 percent of those are beneficiaries aged 85 years and over. More than a quarter of these women depend on Social Security as their sole source of income.

And just like my district where there are many minority women, Latinas and women of Asian descent, they are at risk. Where are they going to go to help pay for their rent, to get their medicine, to take care of themselves? Because all they have is that check that comes maybe once a month. We cannot play with the lives of these women who have given so much to our country. Many are sole survivors now whose husbands have fought in our wars. We should not be forced to choose between democracy and the men and women who worked together to build this mighty country.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SOLIS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I could not help in listening to the gentlewoman's passionate plea about the status of women, just to share with the gentlewoman in my own district just a few weeks ago I went

around to different senior citizen sites and met with a lot of the women who are there now who rely upon Social Security. And one of the difficulties is that they do not have even now enough money to pay for prescription drugs, to be able to pay for their rent and expenses. And if we violate what the gentlewoman has said, the trust of the Social Security, by voting on this bill with an increase in the debt ceiling, the debt limit, we are now putting a heavy burden on these constituents' backs, Hispanic women, Asian women, Anglo women, African American women, elderly and those who are yet to come.

I want to congratulate the gentlewoman for focusing her remarks on women because I saw it firsthand. There are people who told me that I cannot pay for my own food because I do not have enough money to be able to enjoy a quality life.

I thank the gentlewoman for making this very vital point. That is why I am so indignant.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SOLIS. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I think when the gentlewoman brought up there are 61 women here representing the people of this Nation, I think that we should also remember those people who are on Social Security disability. My son was on Social Security disability, and it got us through some very, very hard times. There are millions and millions of people with disabilities that are counting on Social Security also, and I do not think we should forget them.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate again to the Members that we are talking about what is at stake here for millions and millions of people, senior citizens, even young folks that rely so heavily on this check. And what about those widows that now receive that payment? What are we telling them? What are we letting them know about our decisions here tonight?

I would ask we consider rethinking this whole plan because I am not in a position to go home this weekend, Memorial Weekend, to start giving speeches about how patriotic our government is and how much we are doing everything we can; and at the same time, the very people that I am going to be speaking to, most of whom are on Social Security, knowing that we will be taking away from the very folks that deserve to have this support.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been watching this debate for the most part of the morning, and I have to say it is shameful. And I think it is shameful when women use their gender to try to achieve political goals.

The fact is this bill is about the defense of our country, our national security and our homeland security. We

need to get this bill passed so that we can get the proper equipment, training and everything else that our troops need while they are there defending our freedom.

When these young men and women get up every day they button on their jackets. When they do that they are basically saying, I will die for you today to protect your freedom. And what this bill is about is getting the money and the resources that we need for homeland security and for the defense of our country.

We know that we are under threats from terrorism across this country. And to stand up here and refer to starving seniors, and taking drugs away from seniors and from young women, taking checks away, Social Security checks, they know this is not true. They know that is disingenuous; and Mr. Chairman, that is a debate that needs to take place on another day.

Everyone in this Congress on both sides of the aisle are committed to saving Social Security and seeing to it that all of the seniors and all of disabled people in this country have a living and have health care and have food. Now, let us cut with the dramatics and get down to the basics of what this is about. This is about defense and homeland security.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask that we cut down on the emotions, get to the facts and get on with the debate of this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, you know you are in dangerous, dangerous waters when you mess with questioning anybody's patriotism or dedication to our troops. You are in dangerous waters. So I speak today as a veteran. I speak today as a loyal American.

We support our Commander in Chief in the execution of the war. May no one think otherwise. But under the cover of war, do not politically pursue your goals. That is dangerous. American people are smarter than we give them credit for.

Mr. Chairman, this is my Social Security card. I do not need the poster here. This is my Social Security card. And I am not going to show you the number because it is nobody's business, by the way, which is another thing we will debate at another time.

This card, this Social Security card, has become a national credit card. Borrowing off my Social Security card will put us deeper in debt. The excruciating rates of credit companies, credit card companies in this country, will pale in comparison, in comparison to the interest rates every day growing and growing and growing on the Nation's debt. In fact, in the first minute I have spoken, a million dollars. You may choose to ignore this. I do not.

This is the most recent in a series of fiscally irresponsible acts by the majority that you have taken in the last 18 months. First, you push through an offensive tax cut that benefits primarily the very wealthy in this Nation.

It is back-loaded so as to hide the effects this will have on our budget. But the worst is yet to come in 2003, in 2004, in 2005 when those other rate cuts plug in.

Just last month you tried to make this permanent, ad infinitum. It was not bad enough to have a 10-year budget. You cannot predict the budget for 10 months. Now they want to raise the debt ceiling by \$750 billion.

Mr. Chairman, no one on our side of the aisle has questioned our authenticity. Let us get the record straight. We know what you are dealing with. You know what we are all dealing with. That is not the issue. Prior to this Republican tax cut, according to the Congressional Budget Office, all the Treasury debt held by the public could have been paid off by the year 2008. That is gone. That is serious business. You know that and I know that.

As a result of that tax cut pushed through, the Republicans by 2008, the baby boomers thought to retire, the government will owe \$3.49 trillion more than it owes at this very moment. Now, you may dismiss it under the cover of war again; but, again, you cannot borrow off my Social Security card. I do not want you to. The American people do not want you to either. Remember, that is not just the debt we have to worry about. There is also an interest on that debt. Fifteen cents out of every tax dollar we send to Washington automatically goes to paying the interest on the debt before we even sit down and try to respond to the basic needs of American people. That is unconscionable.

According to the President's own numbers, this year alone we will pay \$178 billion in interest on our debt; and the payment amounts go up every year. The effect on America's national debt is an additional \$396 billion. This is a direct result of what we did last spring in 2001. We will pay off almost \$400 billion in additional debt as a direct result of the majority's efforts to make this tax cut permanent.

The majority is always talking about responsibility. You are darn right. There is a values question. This is a values question. I value this card. And so do the American people.

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

Mr. Chairman, I, like all of us here, remember the first day I got here to Congress. I came here to represent my constituents like all of the Members did consistent with the national interest. And we know that over time we lose some of that. And, quite frankly, the leadership on both sides, in the interest of party unity, ask us to vote for rules that we know are wrong and are not in the best interest of our constituents and not in the best interest of our country. That happened yesterday on this floor.

We tried to make a fight of it, but you know in your heart that you are putting party politics above the interests of this country and the people here

when you come to the floor under this rule that disguises a raising of the debt limit of our country. This may be the most cynical rule in my 14 years here.

I honestly believe that this is the most cynical rule I have seen in 14 years I have been here. Members on both sides of the aisle I know are called on in the interest of party unity from time to time to vote for rules. That happened yesterday. It was wrong for our country. We know it was wrong when we hide this attempt to raise the national debt like we did.

□ 1345

As has been said many times, we will vote for unanimous consent today, right now, for every dime the President requested to fight this war, but when my colleagues come to the floor and say this is for the war effort, I have read through the bill.

Do my colleagues realize there is \$425,000 in here for a school district in this country for after-school activities? There is \$250,000 in here for after-school activities for another school district. There is \$250,000 to equip a community technology center in this bill. There is \$250,000 for a mental health agency for the planning and development of a facility. There is \$600,000 for a community enrichment corporation for construction of a facility; \$500,000 for an affordable housing program; \$100,000 for the renovation of a historic building; \$200,000 for construction of another facility; \$200,000 for facility improvements; \$600,000 for renovation of a facility; another \$200,000 for facility construction. It goes on and on.

It has nothing whatsoever to do with the defense of this country, with homeland security, with the troops or anything else. That is what we object to. We object to hiding stuff like this under the guise of the flag and patriotism. It is wrong, and I would just simply ask that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations again please go to his leadership and say, look, we will pass by unanimous consent every single nickel that the President has asked for the homeland defense of our Nation and for the troops, but do not bring this here and do not pad, under guise of raising the national debt, this cynical rule, the most cynical rule I have seen in 14 years here, and all of us know it.

Surely to goodness we can put partisan politics aside and do what we came here the first day we were sworn in, and that is represent our constituents consistent with this country's interest. That is what all, that is all we are asking our colleagues to do.

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

Mr. Chairman, while there is still civility and sanity on the floor, let me just come to the well and say that I have found some good in all 435 Members of the House, tried to get to know every one of my colleagues, tried to work with all of them from time to time on different issues, and I see a lot of good in this House.

There are no clean hands, though, completely spotless hands. There are a lot of good areas, but we all have our own little burdens to bear in terms of taking care of our districts from time to time or putting things in bills that do not belong or might not be germane, and so I think this is a time where we need to come together.

My colleagues may have noticed, yesterday I voted present on this rule. I did not like this rule. I am a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, and I frankly think the Committee on Rules went too far. I think rules ought to be more straightforward and a lot cleaner.

But I also watched the board as the rule vote was concluded, and the rule passed, and Winston Churchill once referred to our form of government as the worst form of government imaginable except for every other because it sometimes is sloppy. It sometimes may seem unfair, but majority rules, and the rule passed, and at some point we have got to resolve our differences and pass the bill and go home and honor those that have given so much, and maybe check in with our families a little during a weekend, which would be good.

I am in no hurry, but I think it is important that at some point we go ahead and say we fought the good fight, we stood for whatever we believed in on both sides and then we worked out a compromise and went home, even if it is not what my colleagues want. Make your case and then let us come together because I think we need to do this work. I think there are a lot of difficult issues that are out there, and I know there are a lot of people of good-will here.

So let us try to do this in a civil way, in a timely manner. State your case. But I have got news for my colleagues. The tax relief was important. We would be in a lot worse economic shape as a Nation today had we not passed that tax relief. So my colleagues can keep arguing that until they are blue in the face, but it was done and it needed to be done. It was the right thing to do, and now we have a whole other set of circumstances in front of us, including a wartime, antiterrorism effort that requires at some point in the coming hours that we meet together at the water's edge.

My friends on the Democratic side have seen me come to the well and defend legislation that they offered this year, but at some point in the coming hours, let us find a way to come together and pass this supplemental and go home and honor those that have given so much to our country.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GEPHARDT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEPHARDT:

In chapter 14 of title I, strike section 1403.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) rise?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment is subject to a point of order, but at this point, as a courtesy to the gentleman to allow him his 5 minutes, I will reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Chairman giving me the opportunity to explain my position on this amendment and on this point of order.

This bill is being considered under a rule that does not include language on the full faith and credit of the United States until the Committee rises, and then the language comes into the bill at a point too late for this body to consider that language or amendments to that language.

We think that it is in order and should be in order to make an amendment to that language, and we feel it so strongly because we know and believe that if that language persists in the bill, it will be used in a conference to bring about language lifting the debt ceiling, in other words, raising the debt limit for the United States, raising our credit card limit, which will come back in a conference report and be a fait accompli.

This is an important moment in the economic history of this country. We worked our way out of debt over a long period of time in the 1990s in a bipartisan way. The gentleman from Tennessee's comments were well taken. It was bipartisan. After the 1993 budget, we passed a budget in 1997 and worked our way out of debt, in fact, to the point where a year ago we were talking about surpluses.

My friends on the other side of the aisle a year ago insisted on a tax cut, half of which went to the wealthiest people in the country. We can argue it till the cows come home about that tax cut, but that tax cut, in our view, now constitutes at least half of the cause of the reason that we lost the surplus, and we now face huge deficits for as far as the eye can see.

I can certainly understand my colleagues' position. I do not agree with it on cutting taxes to that extent, but I understand that they wanted to do that. I understand that they wanted to articulate that to the American people, but when it comes time to pay the bill for that tax cut, they do not want to be seen. They do not want to have a vote. They do not want to have a discussion.

The reason it is important is that in effect what we are doing is we are raiding the Social Security and Medicare trust funds in order to pay for a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans. Let us be straight about it.

So you bet we want a debate. This is an important moment. I would vote for an increase in the debt ceiling to get us another month of time. I realize we

cannot fail to have an increase in the debt ceiling; I know that. When I was in the majority, I worked hard with these Members to get them to vote to increase the debt ceiling, and it was hard to do, but we did it because we have to do it. Of course, we have to do that, but what I want more than that is about a month on the debt ceiling so we can get to what we ought to be doing, and that is, having a budget summit, a budget conference, a budget meeting, with you and the administration and the Senate to come up with a new budget.

You can bet that every family who lost someone on 9/11 has had a budget meeting in their household. They have sat around the kitchen table working on a new budget for their family. Our American family had a tragedy on 9/11 that we are trying to respond to here today, and in all common sense, we should be sitting at a table with trust and respect for one another's viewpoint and adjust our budget for the change in circumstances that our country faces.

When you did the tax cut, we did not know about 9/11. We did not have a war going on in Afghanistan. We did not have all of these needs for homeland defense and homeland security. In the name of common sense, let us pass a debt ceiling today for one month. Let us sit down and have a budget summit. Let us find a budget that will save Social Security and Medicare. We are going to have the baby boomers coming in about 8 years to get their Social Security benefits. How in God's name are we going to take care of them if we have not adjusted the budget?

Now is the time to do it. I ask the chairman of this committee to allow this amendment, let us put in some new language on debt ceiling. Let us get to a budget summit for the American people. Let us save Social Security. Let us do what is right for the American people at this time of peril.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) insist upon his point of order?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the gentleman's amendment. Under the rule, section 1403 was adopted in the Committee of the Whole and the House. Page 52 of the House Practices states that an amendment that seeks to strike an amendment previously agreed to is not in order, and I insist on my point of order.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, it is very hard to follow such a moving appeal that demonstrates the importance and the urgency of permitting this amendment, but I think it is appropriate to reflect on the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves at present.

A very odd and strange rule has been imposed on the House.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman's comments are not related to the point of order.

Mr. DOGGETT. And should we not be permitted to offer the amendment and the point of order be sustained, Mr. Chairman, that would deny any opportunity under the rule for us to consider this critical issue of whether we want to raise the limit on the debt and invade Social Security.

The only alternative at that point would be for us to raise this issue by continuing to speak around the clock to defend Social Security and by appealing the ruling of the Chair who I believe has done a very fine job today, but that would be the only way if the point of order were sustained to get this critical issue of whether we want to raise the limit on the Social Security credit card, as it is being treated, my colleagues' Social Security card being treated as a credit card for expenditures on other issues.

□ 1400

We can avoid that problem. We can conclude our business, be home to honor those on Memorial Day who have served our country so well, by simply agreeing by unanimous consent to let this critical matter come up, do it now, do it on a bipartisan basis, cooperatively join to deal with this problem, get us a budget, preserve Social Security and do so in a collegial and appropriate way. Or alternatively we can challenge the ruling of the Chair, and we can stay here for a very long time.

Because it is clear that not just one or two people but all of us are committed to doing what is necessary to preserve Social Security for this unfair rate that is being proposed today.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, were the Chair to rule that the distinguished minority leader's amendment is non-germane, would in essence be for the Chair to determine that it is fair to operate under a set of rules under which the House can push into an unrelated bill the subject of the debt ceiling, but it is unfair to push it out again in order to get back to the bipartisan wartime supplemental which so many Members of the House today have been suggesting this bill is supposed to be.

We agree that that is what it is supposed to be. And so I would urge the Chair in the interest of fairness, since the majority party leadership brought this issue in in the first place, to rule that it is just as legitimate to take it out as it is to put it in.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas wish to be heard directly on the point of order?

Mr. STENHOLM. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I have taken the time to review, as best I could, the rules on which the Chair made the decision yesterday, in ruling in favor of the rule, that allowed this rather unusual procedure. I take it that our Parliamentarians and everyone in this body recognize the seriousness of making a precedent ruling. That is what this is, I believe.

I do not believe that we can research the rules of this House from the very beginning of this House and find a ruling made by the Chair that indicates an amendment is not deemed to be in play until it has been voted on in the Committee of the Whole. And this is where I make my appeal to the decision of the Chair.

It seems to me that in making that determination, that denies the opportunity to strike something that is not in the bill, was not in the rule, but was deemed to be passed after we vote in the Committee of the Whole. This is, at best, confusing; but it also, if the decision of the Chair holds that this type of parliamentary procedure shall become the precedent and the ruling of the House, that you might put into a rule language that says, in this case the debt ceiling, hidden in a rather innocuous way, will be considered passed after we vote on the bill; but until you vote on the bill it is never in play.

The minority leader has asked that it be stricken. The gentleman has quoted from the rules in saying it cannot be stricken because it is not in the bill. It was not in the rule. And it was not in the rule because it could not be in the rule until it was passed by the House, and the House has not acted as yet. That is rather confusing to this cotton farmer from Jones County.

I conclude my appeal on the ruling, Mr. Chairman. We are getting on very thin ice in this body when we use sleight of hand and attempting to hide the true intentions of what we do behind a rule, and now a ruling of the Chair that not once but twice has now been held that this will now be perfectly the order of the day. This is not the spirit in which we were all elected to this body, Mr. Chairman. This was not the spirit in which we were elected.

So I would respectfully ask that you reconsider your agreement with the point of order, because this is setting a precedent that I do not think either side will want to go, if you in fact should make that ruling. And I urge you, in fact I implore you, to not sustain the point of order, to allow this vote to proceed, to allow an up-and-down vote on the issue, the issue of whether the debt ceiling should be hidden in the way in which it was hidden.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak on the Chair's ruling, on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be heard.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, this phrase that includes the term "full

faith and credit of the United States" was first placed in the rule during the Committee on Rules hearing, and there was a vote taken in the Committee on Rules in the past which brought the rule to the floor. The reason we have a rule is so that we can conduct business in an orderly fashion and not repeat procedures over and over and over again. It is a way of avoiding delaying tactics so we can conduct the business of the House. If we repeatedly go through a process of trying to change something that has been voted on several times, it will cause us to back-track, not move forward.

The House cannot afford to be frozen in time on one particular item. We must address the item and move on. This particular item not only has been addressed in the Committee on Rules, where a vote occurred and it was successful, it then came to the floor where a debate followed. The second vote was taken by the full House, and it was accepted by a majority of the people in the House of Representatives.

Now, to move forward, we have come to the bill. It is now part of the bill. Hopefully, at some point in time today, we will have the opportunity to vote on the bill in its entirety, again addressing this issue with a "yes" or "no" vote.

So I would request that the Chair consider that in order to continue our orderly fashion of moving forward, rather than being frozen in time and repeating again and again a vote on a single issue, that we sustain what the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has brought forward and continue business as we have conducted it in the past.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to further be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I note one comment the previous speaker just made, that we should not return to issues upon which we have already voted. The problem is that we have not yet explicitly voted on this provision. This provision was never presented to us in a freestanding up-or-down situation. It was presented only in the rule, where it was encompassed in a package with a number of other items.

The Constitution says that no money may be expended except by vote of the Congress of the United States. And yet through this indirect sleight of hand, were the Chair to rule against the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri, it would mean that in essence we would have paved the way for raising the national debt by \$750 billion without ever having had an explicit vote on that.

So I think the gentleman is in error in suggesting that we have already voted on the specific proposal of the gentleman. In fact, we have not. That is the whole point. The House should.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida wish to be further heard on the point of order?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Further on my point of order, I would respectfully disagree with my friends on the minority side when they say that this would be a precedent-setting ruling. For on page 52 of the "Guide to the Rules, Precedents and Procedures of the House," using "Deschler's Precedents" as the basis, it simply says it is not in order to offer an amendment merely striking out an amendment previously agreed to. The rule previously agreed to the amendment that was offered on the subject that the gentlemen are concerned about.

So I think this is not a precedent-setting point of order. I believe that it is well established in precedence.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FRANK. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, this is not a narrow question of interpreting the rules; it is a fundamental question about democracy.

I am a great believer in the rules. I think Members ought to understand them, because properly applied they structure our debates so that two purposes are served: first, we come to decisions; second, equally important, the American people know what their elected representatives have said on these important questions. And the rules should be interpreted to serve both purposes.

Yes, there is precedent. But precedent is not confining and constraining and controlling. The vote of this House is. I have in the past voted against the majority of my colleagues on my side because I thought the Chair was correct in interpreting a rule and that my colleagues were trying to get a second bite at an apple or bring in something that was not germane. Obviously, this is germane. It was brought forward by the majority.

The question then is, should we set the policy that a very controversial, very important subject can be considered to have been decided when it is hidden in another issue? People have said we have already voted on it. I am sure that Members on the majority side, when asked on the trail, Did you vote for raising the debt limit?, will say, Oh no, I just voted for a rule. I just had to vote for a rule to advance the procedure. And that is a question of the rules.

The question is what should the rules be interpreted to mean? Should we set a new precedent, a precedent that says the harder the issue, the more obscurely we will have that vote? No one believed that the only issue was the vote on the rule. Indeed, we had Members, when we were debating, saying this is not just a vote on the debt limit or this or that; I have heard the debate, this is a vote to help our troops, a subject on which there is no dissent in this House.

You cannot argue when we are debating the rule that it is really about getting the money out for the troops and then later say, oh, but it was really a separate vote on the debt limit. No one really believes that. No one is prepared to argue that. So this is a question of the rules.

The question here is the spirit of the rules and how we should interpret them. We are talking again about democracy. And what troubles me is that we have had an increasing pattern of the rules being manipulated, and I think twisted away from their original intent. I do not think Thomas Jefferson ever thought that they should be used in this fashion. We have a chance to go back to that basic underlying spirit of the rules being there so people know what happened.

We have an increasing set of procedures, the purpose of which is to allow Members to conceal their position from the voters. That is what is at issue. Nothing could be more in conformity with our rules than to say an important issue ought to get a vote. And I do not understand this problem. We are not talking about something that ought to be considered extortionate.

The Members of the House of Representatives say let us vote on this important subject. What are you afraid of, I have to say to my friends on the majority side? If you think this is important, if you think it is so defensible, then why not have a vote on it? Why create a precedent? And let no one think this will be the only time this will happen. Let this go forward unchallenged and increasingly, the more difficult the issue, the less the American people will be allowed to know where their elected representatives stand.

So on behalf of the rules, on behalf of the essential function of creating a structure in which democracy goes forward, let us have this vote on this amendment. That is all we are asking. And if you have the votes, you vote it down. If you think this is an important thing to do, do it. But do not hide.

□ 1415

Do not hide and do not distort the rules of the House of Representatives and degrade democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. Does the gentleman from Missouri wish to be recognized?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief and this will wind up our debate on this. I just want to reiterate what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, because I think it is an extremely important point. If this is ruled against us, this will become another precedent for the House slipping a very important decision under the carpet, avoiding a vote, and doing something that I think the people want to know about, need to know about, and need to be included in, in terms of the debate.

I think raising the debt ceiling is a very important and necessary thing. I

know that we have all had the experience of putting things on credit cards. When you get the bill, it sometimes is a surprise and you have got to reorder your priorities to pay the bill. This is a case where the national credit card has been used, and now we are not even considering whether to pay the bill, we are just considering whether to call the credit card company and raise the limit on the card. If we can slip that in without a vote and a discussion, the next thing, we will be able to declare war by putting it in a rule and not having to vote on it, or some other major act of this government.

I plead with the chairman, I plead with the majority to allow us to vote for a 1-month increase in the debt ceiling, let us get a bipartisan budget that is good for our troops, good for our war against terrorism and good for these great United States of America.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. THOMAS. Before anyone thinks that this is a decision on a narrow, technical parliamentary discussion, I want you to understand what is at stake. My friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, said he could not believe that we would be doing this, or that Thomas Jefferson would not comprehend the fact that we were trying to run our business this way. The gentleman from Massachusetts had a popular politician at the time that Thomas Jefferson was a popular politician by the name of Elbridge Gerry. He created the gerrymander, to draw a district so bizarre that it was said, "It looks like a salamander." Let's call it a gerrymander." Why was it drawn that way? To retain political power. They would go to any lengths to retain political power.

If you take the logical argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts and say that we really ought to express ourselves on each and every item, that you should not hide something in a bill, can you imagine what the procedure would be on the floor of the House if each and every item had to be voted on? Because if you did not vote on it, then you are hiding it behind another item. And that when you are in this kind of a structure, i.e., moving a supplemental bill, by its very nature it is supplemental, it means we have picked up some pieces, we have had some things happen we were not aware of and we have had to put them together to respond to the real world. Not the desired world, the real world. And that their problem is they do not want to vote on this. They had a chance and they did. They voted "no" on the rule. But the majority prevailed. They now do not want to vote on this bill so it can go to conference and we can make an adjustment on the fundamental balance sheet of the United States because they do not want to vote on it when it comes back.

So I want everyone to understand, this is not a narrow parliamentary argument. This is simply a resurfacing of the fact that they do not run the place anymore and they do not like it. Because they used to do this routinely. And, guess what? Obviously by the reaction, it is quite true. Because what we are doing here is trying to deal with a situation no one had planned on. And what the friends on the other side of the aisle are concerned about is that we might actually be able to accomplish something. Because every move they make and every word they speak is planned to try to get them to return to power following the elections this fall.

Our job is to run the country as a responsible governing majority and we intend to do just that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Massachusetts further directly on the point of order for a brief time.

Mr. FRANK. Yes, very briefly.

The gentleman from California asked what it would be called, what it would be like if our point of order were to prevail. I will answer him. It would be called democracy. I ask that the majority not in the name of defending democracy throughout the world extinguish it here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida raises a point of order that the amendment proposes to strike an amendment previously agreed to.

The Committee is considering the bill under the terms of House Resolution 428. House Resolution 428 provides, in pertinent part, that "the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole." As indicated on page 240 of the House Rules and Manual, it is not in order to offer an amendment striking out an amendment previously agreed to. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri proposes to strike the language in section 1403 that, by the terms of the rule adopted by the House has been considered adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The Chair would also note that because House Resolution 428 provides that the amendments be considered as adopted, the text thereby inserted in the bill is not even read for amendment in the Committee of the Whole.

The point of order is therefore sustained.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I regretfully rise to appeal the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question on appeal is: Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Committee?

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 215, noes 203, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 198]

AYES—215

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

NOES—203

Abercrombie	Berman	Capps
Ackerman	Berry	Capuano
Allen	Bishop	Cardin
Andrews	Blagojevich	Carson (IN)
Baca	Blumenauer	Carson (OK)
Baird	Bonior	Clayton
Baldacci	Borski	Clement
Baldwin	Boswell	Clyburn
Barcia	Boucher	Conyers
Barrett	Boyd	Costello
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Coyne
Bentsen	Brown (FL)	Cramer
Berkley	Brown (OH)	Crowley

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

NOT VOTING—16

Burton	Jefferson	Rush
Clay	Linder	Thompson (MS)
Combust	Lipinski	Trafficant
Condit	Paul	Vitter
Deutsch	Quinn	
Gutierrez	Roukema	

□ 1443

Mrs. CAPPS and Ms. SANCHEZ changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Messrs. HEFLEY, LAHOOD, ENGLISH, KNOLLENBERG, BRADY of Texas and Ms. DUNN changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the Committee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

So the point of order was sustained.

□ 1445

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

Mr. Chairman, we are on the eve of Memorial Day, a day set aside each year beginning with the war of 1917-1918 to recognize and memorialize those who paid the ultimate price and those who served and, subsequently, those who fought in wars since that time. Mr. Chairman, we are today involved in war.

This bill before us is purported to be a supplemental for the battle against

terrorism, one that is purported to support the war against terrorists and to support those wonderful young men and young women in American uniforms. So I think it is proper to measure this legislation before us by giving it the soldier test by asking that soldier who might well be in Afghanistan being shot at or returning fire and in danger as to what help he needs from the Congress of the United States in a supplemental appropriation.

This bill has good things in it. It provides for new protective body armor for the servicemembers. It provides for Global Hawk and Predator unmanned aerial vehicles, which give invaluable intelligence. It provides for remote chemical and biological agent vapor detection systems. It provides for new radios for the F-15 fighter aircraft that have been so instrumental in providing close air support. It provides for CH-47 Chinook helicopters which move soldiers and equipment to the battlefield. It provides for Navy and Air Force JDAMS, that is, smart bombs; and most important, it provides for conventional ammunition for soldiers to use on the battlefield.

But let us further apply the soldier test. Unfortunately, this bill contains a number of items completely unrelated to prosecuting the war on terrorism. Included in this bill are matters that detract from our fundamental purpose of passing legislation, and it tarnishes what we should be doing here on the eve of Memorial Day. Among these provisions are raising the debt limit; a special interest provision requiring textiles to be dyed; a special interest provision providing for changes in reimbursement of Medicare for certain areas of our country; provisions deeming the House-passed budget resolution levels to be applicable to the appropriations bills; a provision relating to the fees charge by the Fish and Wildlife Service at Midway Atoll. Money for YMCA in the Seattle area. Money for low-performing schools in Pennsylvania. Money for American theater, arts and youth.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, what does that or any of these items have to do with fighting terrorism? They do not meet the soldier test.

Coming out of committee, this was a good bill which genuinely and properly provided many good things that are absolutely essential for those troops wearing the American uniform to be able to fight and to win the war on terrorism. Sadly, the inclusion of highly controversial extraneous provisions having nothing to do with our national security on this war have compromised our ability to do what is right for the American troops.

Mr. Chairman, the sole star of our effort today should be providing those young men and young women, our troops, our soldiers, with the equipment, with the systems, with the training that they need to defeat terrorism. That is where it starts, and that is where it ends. Sadly, this bill includes

the extraneous material that detracts from this wonderful purpose.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this legislation. I think it is extremely important that all of us get behind it, but I want to make a few comments first.

First of all, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who has been a tireless advocate for the firefighters and emergency responders of this country, and who led the effort to make sure that we got \$100 million initially to support the firefighter grant program.

Unfortunately, because of the actions of another committee and the Justice Department, money that was supposed to go to those firefighters was circumvented in the form of \$175 million to police grants through Justice. Now, I am not against the police, but we give the police departments locally \$5 billion a year; \$5 billion a year. And to have the Justice Department siphon off \$175 million, which would have gone to those 32,000 fire and EMS departments, to me, is outrageous.

I would ask the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), my friend and colleague, if he will commit to work with us to right that wrong when we get to conference.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I will respond to the gentleman as I did to an earlier inquiry similar to the gentleman's, and that is yes, the first responders include firefighters, police officers, emergency medical people, and all other types of folks who respond. Anyone that knows anything about September 11, 2001 understands the importance of first responders.

We had originally thought that the \$175 million the gentleman talks about should have gone to the Office of Homeland Security. The Administration determined that they did not want that money to go there, and so the gentleman knows why we moved the money to the Department of Justice.

But I agree with the gentleman. We have to make sure that all of the people that provide first response to a tragedy, a disaster, whether it be a terrorist attack or a flood or a hurricane or an earthquake, whatever it is, have to be supported. They are also our first line of defense for homeland security.

So I say to the gentleman, yes, we will work with him to do the very best we can to make whatever is needed to provide the first responders what they need.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I want to say one more thing to my colleagues on the other side. This is my

16th year in this body, and I know my colleagues are upset about this rule and about this process. I guess I have seen this before. It was my first term in Congress when Jim Wright was the Speaker, and to accomplish what the then majority wanted, he did something that only God could do. He declared it to be two separate days on one day to get a package through this body.

Now, all of my colleagues who were here back then ought to remember that famous day, because we were outraged. Only God could declare a new day. But Speaker Wright supported, and my good friend is shaking his head yes, Speaker Wright actually declared it to be two days in one day so that we could accomplish the will of the majority.

So I would say to my colleagues, this bill is important because of the need to support our troops and because of those priorities that we have for this country. Am I happy with everything in it? No. But I would ask my colleagues to get behind this. You have made your point. I hear you. I was just as frustrated back when Jim Wright declared it two days in one day as you are now that we are going to pass an increase in the debt ceiling without ever supposedly voting on it.

So I would say to my colleagues, let us get beyond this and work together. Let us get this done. Let us deal with the issues in conference, and let us move on so that we in fact can accomplish what we need to do, which is to pay for those costs associated with the war on terrorism.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have served 38 years in a legislative body, 26 here in this House; and I have never seen a gag rule as unfair as the one imposed here today. It is not just a gag on the minority in this House, but upon the American people.

I know that there are some Republicans who are embarrassed over this attempt to do by stealth what their leaders are afraid to do openly, to increase the limit on the national credit card.

Everyone in this great hall is patriotic and supports our military efforts, but there is also an economic patriotism among the American people we represent. We experienced that economic patriotism in the 1990s as we, in a bipartisan way, were balancing our Federal budget and paying off our national debt. The American people felt very good about that.

Today, because of the enormous tax cut of last year, we find ourselves reversing that progress and increasing the limit on our national credit card in a stealthy, unholy manner. This dips into Social Security and shatters the lockbox. We asked the majority leadership to remove the gag so that we could at least have a debate and a public vote on raising the national debt limit.

Let us return this bill to its original intent: to fight the war on terrorism which we all support.

We all support our troops, including my two sons who are captains in the United States Army. Let us strip out the gimmicks and the add-ons and pass a clean supplemental appropriations bill to fight the war on terrorism that threatens our Nation.

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

Mr. Chairman, the great author James Michener in his book "The Bridges at Toko Ri" described the scenario, when the hero in the book who had gone off to strike these very heavily protected bridges in North Korea and failed to return, he described the captain of the ship on that carrier contemplating the state of affairs of the United States Navy and the people who served there when that pilot failed to return, and he said, and I am paraphrasing, where does America get these people? These people that join the military at great inconvenience, great separation from their families, from their livelihoods; they put themselves in very dangerous and difficult positions for this country. If they are an aircraft carrier pilot, they end up flying off of this small aircraft carrier going off to bomb a heavily defended target thousands of miles away from the United States and then, after they have successfully completed that mission, if they return, they are trying to find that little postage stamp that is out there in the ocean and they try to make a landing on that very difficult night landing, perhaps.

Then he concluded, when he asked himself where do we get these people, where does America get these people? They come from our villages, our cities, our towns; and as long as these wonderful people keep coming to protect our freedom, we are going to be a great Nation.

□ 1500

A few months ago, we had solidarity. The Members of this Congress had solidarity with the people of our Armed Forces. It was something we had not seen since World War II. We were all together. We heard tremendous speeches from both the Democrat side and the Republican side, followed by legislative action. It was quick action, and the action resulted in the material and the tools that we need to get this job done flowing to the military very quickly.

We helped our Commander in Chief because he is the guy on the point of the spear, the 5-star general. We gave him the tools to get the job done. We have to get him more tools. That means we are low on ammunition, we are low on materiel, we are low on monies it takes to repair our ships and aircraft. We have to move those tools to our fighting forces.

Do Members know something about these great people? We all talk about them. We see them at the parades, at the military installations. Members

come back from CODELS, Democrats and Republicans, and the one thing we all agree on is that it is remarkable about these wonderful people who protect our freedom.

Do Members know something? They think that we are still going to act with the same solidarity and sense of purpose today that we had 8 months ago, because they are still acting with that same sense of solidarity and purpose. They are carrying out their mission.

Those special operations teams at 10,000 feet elevation up in the elements, getting beaten up by the elements and sniped at by the al Qaeda, they are carrying out their mission. The people on the aircraft carriers knocking those big jets off the decks, they are carrying out their missions. The people in Korea just south of that line, which is loaded with massive artillery and rocket power, which could devastate them if the balloon goes up, they are carrying out their mission.

We are not carrying out our mission. Our mission is to win this war. I know there are lots of things in this bill that particular Members do not like and do not agree with, but we have to regain our sense of mission and our sense of purpose. Let us regain that sense of mission and that sense of purpose, and let us bring back the solidarity that we had only a few months ago. Let us win this war.

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

Mr. Chairman, we now approach Memorial Day, a time to memorialize and honor those who have defended our country. It is appropriate that we also honor those who defend our country today at home and abroad by providing them with the resources they need to get the job done.

But as important as our military strength is, the strength of America also is found in its economic vitality. I fail to see how that economic vitality will be advanced by piling almost \$1 trillion of additional debt on top of the trillions of dollars in national debt, that we already have and doing so with no real budget plan in place.

Indeed, the only budget plan being contemplated is one that expects one deficit after another deficit after another deficit, piling up more and more national debt and threatening the vitality of our country and the future of our Social Security and Medicare system.

Guns and caviar: It sounds like a rock band, or a promotion for the National Rifle Association. But I maintain that "guns and caviar" is really an accurate description of the approach the administration and its House Republican allies are promoting this year. The guns are significantly higher military expenditures; and caviar, well, they have one tax break after another. They cannot find enough tax breaks for those at the top of the economic ladder.

The Republicans offer the elite and the multinational corporations in this

country an unequivocal message: You can have all the security you want at home or abroad, anywhere around this globe, and for you, it will not cost much of anything extra. It is free because they promote one tax break after another.

We have, with each passing day, one corporation after another renouncing its American citizenship and moving its mail box to Bermuda or somewhere else to avoid paying for any of these additional expenditures.

Republicans talk about containing federal spending, but they are proposing with this budget the largest increase over a 4-year period we have had since the 1960s. Yet to those at the top of the economic ladder, the Republicans turn a blind eye when they move offshore to avoid paying any of the cost of this, when they use the various tax dodges and tax breaks that have been created and proposed, and that they want even more of the same so that the elite tax dodgers can avoid paying their fair share.

So those at the top and the multinational corporations will not pay their fair share of a "guns-and-caviar" budget, how will it be paid? Well, this very bill is the purported Republican solution to that problem that they are offering. That solution is to take our Social Security cards, the ones we all carry in our pockets, the ones Americans have relied on for over 60 years, and make it their Republican national credit card, to use the future of Social Security as their way of paying for today's spending.

They are, through this bill, doing what some families sometimes find they have to do when they are overcome with debt: They are asking to raise the limit on the national credit card. In this case, it is our Social Security card and all the money being paid in by us and our employers for Social Security and Medicare. They want to raise the credit card or debt limit, but they do not have the courage to come out here and face the American people and do it in an honest and direct way. So they have, through combined procedure and recent rulings, we limited our right to even have a vote on their decision to take our Social Security card and use it as their credit card to pay for things they tell these multinational corporations they can dodge, avoid, and evade. But we are going to have to pay for today's spending right out of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

We have heard through the years 1 Republican leader after another tell us that they are really not too excited about Social Security. What better way to undermine our ability to provide Social Security and Medicare in coming decades than to incur mountains of national debt, as is proposed in a very secretive way by this piece of legislation.

Indeed, if we increase, the debt limit, by almost \$1 trillion, as is proposed, right out of Social Security and Medicare funds, that means more interest,

more debt, and less ability to meet our Social Security and Medicare obligations. It is wrong and it ought to be rejected today.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a Chamber where men and women of good will can come to share points of view that from time to time may be at odds.

Mr. Chairman, we recognize that an election is about 160 days away. While passions and tempers may run high, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would be able to refrain from the temptation of politics as usual.

Mr. Chairman, I hear derisive laughter from the other side. That is fine and perhaps altogether appropriate, given the exercise we have seen both last night and during the course of this legislative day.

But, Mr. Chairman, the American people understand that we are a nation at war; that the attacks of September 11 forever changed this country. The American people understand we should stand together, even though there are the pressures of the political calendar for some to come in and sloganeer and try to find sound bites and go back to business as usual.

Extraordinary times call for extraordinary measures. Our Commander in Chief has pointed that out repeatedly, that this is a new type of war. Again, even though we rejoice in philosophical differences of opinion, only the most cockeyed of revisionists would have us believe that in previous Congresses, under previous majorities, similar rules were not employed to achieve legislative results.

This becomes the question at the end of the day, Mr. Chairman, or whenever the parade of sound bites and speeches ends: Are we willing to stand and deliver, not as Republicans and Democrats, not in the spirit of one-upmanship, but with the nonpartisanship the American people demand when we are a nation at war; when, in the twinkling of an eye, every American can be called upon to become a citizen soldier, every American can confront the scourge of terror?

Disagreements? Sure, they will continue. They are part of a healthy and free society. They are part and parcel of the fabric of the American people. But, Mr. Chairman, it does the Committee of the Whole House a disservice to be locked in legislative combat and one-upmanship when the business of the people, and the very people my friends who have preceded me in the well talk about, the fighting men and women on the front lines, need material, need equipment.

The American Nation needs to move forward with technological advances for border security, for shipping security, for homeland security. It does not do the American people a service, it does not do this body a service, to become slaves to the minutiae of one-upmanship and what passes for statesmanship by sound bite.

Let us return to the work of the people, appropriate the funds needed for this war effort, discuss our differences in an open fashion in the campaign season, but not use this Chamber for the preening and the prodding and the endless parade of politics that ill serves us at this critical time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have followed this debate closely today and last night, and the preparations leading into it. I have noted the reference to years past. Those years past, I was not here. Since when did 2 wrongs ever make a right? So there are some things we acknowledge, but let us move on.

I have some things I want to share. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) prompted me to think about a couple of things.

First, I want to tell the Members that I am a veteran, as many of the Members are; not all of them. But I am a veteran. I have had the opportunity to face the enemy, as some of the other Members have. I am nobody special. I know that. But do not tell me or us that have served that we do not support the war on terrorism because of this bill. Give us a clean vote on that war on terrorism and we will vote for it in a heartbeat. Let us get real.

Let me tell the Members one of the things that was brought to my attention when the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) ran out of time. On this subject, some of my colleagues from my State certainly share my concern, and across the country.

In this bill there is a provision, I am told, regarding Medicare payments to certain hospitals. What on earth does that have to do with the war on terrorism? As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) was pointing out, there are several items in there. That one really caught my attention because in this country we have a situation of great disparity in Medicare payments to our citizens. We all get charged the same, we get taxed the same, but we do not get paid the same. That is really ironic. It is going on.

I have carried this question to the previous administration. I carried a copy of this chart and the bill that I am sponsoring, and others are involved in, to try to get some fairness. I have handed it to this President in his office, but nothing happens. Then we come along and see that certain areas are getting a little extra favor in this bill called war on terrorism. I do not understand how this can possibly be.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that if that is the right thing to do, we might open this up and I could suggest some other places across the country, some of my hospitals and doctors and caregivers, that would like to have a little fairness in the Medicare reimbursement rates.

□ 1515

It runs all the way from \$3,000 per capita in my State, up to the State at

the top it is over \$7,000; and the median for our country is almost \$500. But we all pay the same. We all pay the same.

Now, why are not we addressing this? Thirty-five States are below the line of the average; 15 are above. I congratulate those that are above, but what about our folks in the other States? And if you do not know where your State falls, you might want to come and see me and take a look and I will show you the chart. It is for real.

What does that have to do in all seriousness with a vote in the war on terrorism? So I am going to ask all of you to do not use that remark. It is very offensive to those of us would have served, that this is a vote on the war on terrorism. If you again want to limit this vote to that subject, count on me. I will be the first one to drop my card in. But there have been a number of things added to it that have nothing to do with that. It is not right. It is not fair, and it is not the way I have been told historically this House should operate. And I certainly do not want to defend what has happened in the past. Today is today. We are responsible. We are responsible for what is happening today. Let us do it right. We have the opportunity to do it.

Now, Memorial Day weekend is coming up. In my family it is a pretty special thing. People travel a long ways to consider those who have gone before us. It is very special. But I have sent word to my family that I likely will not be there because we are going to be doing this. And it is unfair and it is important, and I may have to stay and stay and stay. I am prepared to do that.

This week's action behind closed doors by the House Leadership and Rules Committee is the most cynical of political dealings. Many of us have been working diligently to bring Medicare Equity to our seniors and allow our health care professionals to provide quality care.

Our constituents pay the same Medicare taxes as any other citizens. Yet, we are penalized with unfair Medicare reimbursement rates. Our dedicated doctors, nurses and hospitals continually struggle to provide the quality care they always have. Each day the inequity is not corrected, this task becomes more difficult.

Now, we see the House Leadership and the Rules Committee, apparently well aware of this discrimination, but unwilling to address it, have found a way to collect a few extra votes by fixing the problem for a few selected areas. If it is important enough to fix for a few, isn't it important enough to fix it for all our seniors.

In a context outside of this chamber, these cynical tactics might just be considered a bribe. I am hopeful this is more than just a cynical political ploy and is just the first signal from the leadership that treating all seniors, all doctors, all nurses equally will be a priority from now on. Our seniors deserve fairness, not fixes for a chosen few.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot this afternoon, over the last 24 hours I guess, about what this debate is about

and what this supplemental appropriations is all about. And I think it is important that I explain this the way I had a friend say to me once. I was talking to him about some legal issue and he said, "Explain it to me like I am an eight year old."

So, Mr. Chairman, I am going to attempt to do that because it has been said that this bill is about taxes for the rich; it has been said that this bill is about Social Security. And it is about procedure and all that we have heard over the last 24 hours. Mr. Chairman, I just want to share with my colleagues in very simplistic terminology here what this bill is about. And I think we have to understand that this bill is about war. And I think when we understand that this bill is about war, then we have to ask ourselves is war free, and I think we all would have to admit that war is not free. There is a cost to fighting a war. There is a cost in giving our soldiers the resources to win, not the resources to play a good game.

We cannot expect our soldiers to go to Afghanistan or anywhere else in the world and fight with a switch or fight with a belt. They need the tools to win, ammunition. They need the proper equipment. Should we put a praise tag on defending our freedom? Freedom is not free. We all enjoy the freedoms here in the United States of America. There is a cost to living in a free country. This bill is about protecting the honor of over 2,800 people who lost their lives in New York City, the people that lost their lives in Pennsylvania, the people that lost their lives here in Virginia at the Pentagon.

Is war free? The United States Government shall take all steps necessary to guarantee full faith and credit of the government. There is a cost to doing that. We will not forget. This Congress should not forget. None of us should forget; the American people will not forget the events of September 11. The Republican Congress has not forgotten those who lost their lives in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania. There is a cost to that.

This is not about Social Security. This is not about taxes for the rich. Those are gadget plays. This is about fighting a war, the war against terrorism. And we said, and we are saying, in this legislation that, hey, there are some more needs that we did not fund when we did a funding bill before, a supplemental before. We need more tools. We need more dollars. The supplemental appropriations, the bill we are voting on sometime today, will address that. We will not forget. Congress will not stop working on behalf of those victims. We will continue to work with the President to make sure every resource at our command will be available to win the war. I do not understand that some would say, hey, once we get to \$1,000, let us do not spend any more. If you need 2,000 let us not spend any more. Let us let those soldiers defend themselves. Let us let them do what they have to do. Let us

not spend any more than \$1,000. Putting a cap on defending freedom, of fighting a war.

There is a cost to defending freedom. There is a cost to fighting a war. I just would remind us what September 11 was all about. That was an ugly picture. Nobody enjoyed that. We all will have to vote the way we see it. I do not say that anybody is anti-American or anti-war if you do not vote the way I vote. But I am just reminding my colleagues, you cannot have your cake and eat it too. You cannot have it both ways and say, I want to fight the war, but I do not want to pay for it; I want freedom, but I do not want to pay for it.

There is a cost to fighting a war, and we should make sure that we spend what we need to spend so that our soldiers, America's sons, America's daughters, America's grandsons and America's granddaughters, America's husbands and wives who have put their lives on the line for America's interests, for our freedoms, that we give them the resources to win. That is what this appropriations bill is about today.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) be allowed to discuss how we pay for our war against terrorism. I would like to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed 2 extra minutes to have an honest, respectful discussion about paying for the cost of our war against terrorism which he discussed.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you for recognizing me. I would like to thank the Committee on Appropriations for doing a fine job. But I have to say this, I am really sorry that when our children were in these Chambers they saw the most deceptive tactics being used. They saw people trying to paint us as unpatriotic. No one can question my patriotism. I have taught children overseas on Air Force bases. I represented this country as an ambassador; and I always stood tall because I represented America. How dare you question my patriotism.

What I am questioning you about is why did you take a good bill that we could all vote for and show our solidarity, to support our fighting men and women, to take care of those people that suffered losses during September 11, and throw in something that you know we could not support?

I will not abandon the trust my constituents put in me when they sent me here. And I came to this honorable House wanting to do the people's work in the sunlight, not in the darkness of these Chambers. How dare you put that position on all of us? I would like somebody over there who is part of this to answer my question. Why did you

take the bill that passed out of appropriations and throw all of this in, throw all of this into it knowing that we would break trust?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WATSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, this actually is something that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) put into law in 1979.

Ms. WATSON of California. I will not yield.

Mr. KINGSTON. I am just trying to answer your question.

Ms. WATSON of California. Well, answer my question, answer it.

Mr. KINGSTON. In 1979 the majority leader at that time, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) put in rule 49. It is on page 945 in the House Rules and Manual, and it has been done for over 2 decades, actually, until very recent years when the Republican Party quit the practice of it.

Including the debt ceiling question in an appropriations bill was done for many many years. So this was not something that was not invented. It has been part of the House doing business.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WATSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, it sounds as though the gentleman over here is trying to tell the right honorable gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that two wrongs make a right. I guess the gentleman just answered his own question.

The CHAIRMAN. All Members will suspend. The time is controlled by the gentlewoman from California. Members will follow proper parliamentary procedure in yielding to one another and not talking at the same time. The gentlewoman from California controls the time.

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I would always be happy to yield if I can get my question answered specifically.

You cannot take me back to 1970-something and answer my question. I want to know how that Committee on Rules slipped these provisions in a clean and clear bill to support our fighting forces. That bill would have gone off this floor in a snap. And so I am so disappointed that you are trying to Houdini me into telling me an answer that relates to something that happened way in the past.

I am talking about the bill in front of us that came out of the Committee on Appropriations. And I want to thank the people for acting with integrity and respect. And I might close in saying this, to the people who represent America, I was sent here to represent a constituency of Americans. I am going to do that job. I am not going to play games with it. I am not going to sell them out, not you when you get 65 and older, not our children, not our grandchildren. I will fight if it takes me the

rest of this weekend into Memorial Day because I believe that we have said to the people of America, you entrust us. You give us your trust, and you pay into Social Security. I want it there when you get ready to retire. I want you to be able to buy your pharmaceuticals that will help you live. I want to be able to say to our children, we are not mortgaging your future. I want to let you know we are not going to play games with the trust you put in us.

So let us do away with this bill. Let us go back and come back with the bill that came out of appropriations and you will get my vote.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the process that brought this bill to the floor. As America faces the twin challenges of terrorism and a weak economy, Americans more than ever need their elected leaders to demonstrate courage. Not much courage is required to do the easy things, like cut taxes. No, true courage is required to do the hard things, like balance the budget, and save for the retirement of today's workers, as well as their children.

Unfortunately, the process used here—to consider what was reported out of the appropriations committee as a bipartisan bill—demonstrates that courage is in short supply among the Republican leadership. Republicans know they can't balance the budget and continue to give tax breaks to the wealthiest individuals and corporations. They know their tax scheme puts the future of Social Security at risk. But rather than face that truth, they have decided to sneak a debt limit increase into this bill, avoiding a debate that will force them to defend their lack of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, what is the Republican leadership afraid of? If they believe that America should proceed down the path of deficit spending and more debt, they should permit a debate on a debt limit increase. Instead, they are trying to sneak this debt increase past the American people, and hope they won't notice.

Mr. Chairman, haven't we learned anything over the past year? I thought the events of the past year had taught us that when America's leaders put partisanship aside and work together, our nation can be a powerful force for good. Instead, the Republican leadership has gone out of its way to reject a solid, bipartisan bill with partisan sleight of hand. Mr. Chairman, please do not let this be the legacy that the 107th Congress leaves to the American people.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time a few minutes ago because I think it is very helpful to do that, but I also want to come back to this rule number 49 on page 945 in the House Rules manual that does show that this was something that actually the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) put into the rules and it was called the Gephardt rule as a nickname, but it did allow this to happen. For over 2 decades it was a pretty standard procedure.

I am a little shocked that my friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), says two wrongs do not make a right.

I am kind of glad to hear him saying that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) was wrong on something. But I just want to say, there is a reason why this is here and it is a precedent. It is not some deep sinister thing. And I understand why the gentleman does not like it. We all understand that, but I want to say this is not some midnight procedure. But we are in a genuine position here right now with troops on the ground in Central Asia, and as recently as in the last week a soldier was killed in Bagrahm. And we want to keep those soldiers well armed, well supplied. We want to keep the good intelligence there. We want them to know that we are solidly behind them; and this bill, as you know, does that.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I think the point we are trying to make is we do not want those soldiers used for your agenda. We do not want your agenda to be piggybacked and attached to your special interest.

□ 1530

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, let me reclaim my time and say proudly our agenda is to our support our soldiers. Our agenda is for a homeland security and our agenda is to rebuild New York City, and I am proud of that agenda, and as the distinguished gentleman knows, we have got to address the debt issue, the debt ceiling issue.

All this bill does is says that if the conference committee, between the Democrat-controlled Senate and the Republican-controlled House, gives the instructing on it, it would be allowed in conference, but what does happen is we continue to supply our soldiers in the field, because no one believes, and I know the gentleman and I believe strongly, war is not free. We have got to bite the bullet in this case.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I believe the war is not free and there must be shared sacrifice, and for us to have shared sacrifice we do not cut the top marginal rate on the wealthiest of Americans and put the bill on the future generations to pay for this bill.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, let me reclaim my time. We disagree with taxes. We understand that. Democrats a lot of time like lots of taxes. They like a punitive tax system. They like a tax system that does not reward incentives and does not help create jobs. We had a good debate about it. In fact, that was about a 6-month debate.

This debate today in this legislation is about supplying the troops to continue the war, \$15.77 billion. It is about homeland security, securing our airports, securing our ports.

I live in Savannah, Georgia. I would love my friend to come down and visit me sometime. Last year in Savannah, Georgia, we had 1 million containers come through the port, and only 1 percent were inspected. This bill allows us to inspect those containers. The airport, now everybody flies in this Chamber at some point in time. I want to know that when we get on the airplane that we are secure as possible. This bill allows that to happen.

I will say another thing that is in this bill is \$1.6 million, which I think the Democrat party would be interested in, that would allow our bicameral, bipartisan intelligence committees to continue to study 9/11, what went wrong, what went right, how can we do a better job; some very good stuff in there, reaching out to experts in the intelligence community. And I think these things have to go on.

Now, I know we disagree on the debt ceiling vehicle part, and as an appropriator, the gentleman knows that I am not 100 percent in favor of everything that is in this bill, as I know most of us are always in the position of accepting something they do not like in a bill, but for the name of the troops, for the name of homeland security, for the name of rebuilding New York City, I am willing to let this legislation move on, let the Senate hack away at it, if they can improve it. I know there is going to be differences on there, but let us get the process moving so we do not send a mixed signal to the troops.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The CHAIRMAN. Fifteen seconds.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, in an abundance of caution, why do we not do this. Why do we not just talk amongst us in the back of the room, unless the gentleman can get some time and yield it back and forth. I know we are going to have some philosophical things we cannot resolve in 15 seconds.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today, first of all, to applaud this bill for what it does for our troops. I am proud of what this bill does for the men and women in our armed services around the world. They should be proud of what we are doing in that part of the bill.

I was over in Afghanistan in early March in the first 3 days of Anaconda, and I have never been prouder of the men and women who are over there doing their best to make sure that this country remains protected and strong. They know, they know that their performance, that our security depends on their performance. They are motivated. They are doing a good job, and this

bill, insofar as it provides them the resources they need, is a good bill.

I am not so sure that they can be proud of us. In fact, during this debate I have an image. It keeps coming back. I cannot help it. I think of the men and women I saw in Afghanistan, and I imagine them armed and ready behind a row of tanks, and behind them I see something else. I see the Republican majority hiding, trying not to be seen, trying not to allow a debate on the fundamental economic issues that are also wrapped up in this bill, not by the language in the bill but by what the bill does not do.

The debate that we need to have over the Federal budget is being hidden, and a debate on the debt limit is one of the very few opportunities we have or will have to have that debate, but it is being hidden, and there will be no clear vote on the debt limit if the majority has its way.

Now, why do we have to do this? We are being asked to raise the national debt limit because in just 1 year the Federal budget has fallen apart. Just 1 year ago we were looking at a \$5.6 trillion surplus, and what happened? The new administration took 5 months to do enormous damage to this budget, and when that tax bill was signed, the damage was done. The damage began.

Let us take a good look at what has happened. Just look at the question of how much of the Social Security surplus has had to be used over the last couple of decades. What we see happening here, the line on this chart moving down during the first Reagan-Bush era is the amount by which we were dipping into the Social Security surplus, and when President Clinton was elected, we were dipping into the Social Security and Medicare surpluses by over \$300 billion a year, and then we can see what happened.

As the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) said, on a bipartisan basis, we fought our way back. We fought our way back, and gradually the line came up, and just before this President Bush took office, we were using none of the Social Security surplus, not any of it, and then look what happened. We are right back down between \$300 and \$400 billion a year into the Social Security surplus. That is an outrage. That is unacceptable, but that is what this majority is preventing us from talking about.

Why is this important? Because we are now using Social Security dollars to fund our military, for general government expenses, and to pay for a tax cut for the wealthiest people in this country. Look at what is going on. We have a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans and they, according to the majority, must keep their tax cuts. The other side of the aisle wants to make that permanent.

In the meantime, we are going to use the dollars at 6.2 percent. All of our workers are earning less than \$80,000 pay; 6.2 percent is going to fund the tax cut and to the general government. That is irresponsible. That is reckless.

In other words, what we are doing, we are not calling for a sacrifice from the wealthiest Americans. We are not calling for sacrifice equally from all Americans. We are saying basically that the young men and women who are over there and are fighting for us now, and their parents, middle income people in this country, they are the ones who should bear the burden of being in the armed services, and they are the ones who should bear the financial burden, not just now, not just this year, not just next year, not just the year after that, but we are saying to our children they shall pay, they shall pay, too. We are not going to pay for this war as it goes along. They will pay, our children, our grandchildren, at a trillion extra dollars alone.

This is failed policy, and to pass it without a vote is outrageous and unacceptable.

Mr. WATKINS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this particular legislation, and I thought I would speak from this side of the well of the House. I do that, Mr. Chairman, because for 20 years I have served in this House, and 14 of those years was as a Democrat. For 14 years as a Democrat, I served in the majority.

I love this House. It has been some of the best years of my entire life. I think about the things that can be done, that can be accomplished, and there were a lot of good things that happened.

One of the things that always disturbed me during those years when I came here is that it seemed like we could never balance the budget. It always bothered me, because I was a businessman. I always felt like my personal budget needed to be balanced. I felt like our budget for my business should be balanced, and I always thought for our future, for our children, for our family, for our grandchildren, we should try to work within a balanced budget. But it always bothered me because it was kind of like a gotcha.

I remember full well in the majority we had a big majority. We did very much, but on the Republican side, we had a lot of individuals trying to get to the majority, and I remember so many times we talked about how irresponsible it was that on the Republican side they were attacking, and we would say, well, we are the majority, we had to try to govern, we had to make tough decisions, and sometimes that was raising the debt ceiling because of past debt. For 40 years, we had huge deficits. There is enough blame to go around to everyone, Democrats and Republicans, and that always bothered me. We should not feel like we walk on hallowed ground, whatever political party we are, because we do have that responsibility.

Fourteen years passed, and I was in the majority, and I decided to go home. For 6 years I stepped out. For 6 years,

I was an Independent, but I returned 6 years ago as a Republican. I came back as a Republican because I wanted to do some unfinished things, and I am so proud of this body, Democrat and Republican, because we balanced the budget.

Thank goodness we were holding the line on a lot of the budget costs, but also we had a flourishing economy, and that growth in that economy allowed us to move forward. That growth started before the last administration, and the economic downturn started in September of the last administration, if my colleagues look back at the economic indicators, and today, after 6 years as a Republican, I hear the same things being said on that side of the aisle today as we said or had heard from Republicans back then, but I believe when we said it is irresponsible what is happening.

Let me say to the American people, we know what is happening. We all know. One political party is trying to get one leg up on the other. One is trying to get back into power that is out of power. There are some that want to be chairman and not be chairman.

I submit to my colleagues the American thing to do is to move on this legislation, pass this legislation. Let us move forward as Americans in a bipartisan way because the clock will be ticking on their time the next time and we all need to be trying to do what we can to be responsible and deliver this package to move our country forward.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in full support of our troops in the field. They are risking their lives on behalf of the American people and the global community. On the eve of Memorial Day, we honor the dedication of our men and women in uniform, on whom our Nation has always depended and on whom we are depending today to rid the world of the scourge of terrorism.

We must and we will provide the resources needed to support these troops and to shore up our homeland security.

We also must protect our Nation's economic integrity and strength. America can be strong militarily without being weak economically. Yet it is that link, that essential link between military and economic strength, that the Republican budget threatens to break today.

Mr. Chairman, I reject the proposition that our war on terrorism requires or excuses fiscal irresponsibility. And I emphatically reject the notion that those of us who raise critical fiscal issues are somehow being unpatriotic or are not supporting our Nation's cause. That is a scurrilous charge, unworthy of this body.

Mr. Chairman, many of us bear the scars of hard-won budget discipline by which we finally overcame the fiscal follies of the 1980s.

□ 1545

I remember well the decisive turning point, the budget vote of 1993. That deficit reduction bill was passed without a single Republican vote. I remember well the jeers on this House floor as our Republican friends waved good-bye, good-bye to the courageous Members who had risked their seats by casting that vote. I will never forget that. I will never forget how hard won that budget discipline was after 12 long years.

But the fiscal turnaround was real, it was genuine, and we made steady progress during the 1990s in reducing the deficit and finally achieving a unified budget surplus, and then at last a surplus in the non-Social Security budget. This chart tells the story: steadily reducing deficits, and finally, in the non-Social Security budget, a surplus. Over a three-year period we actually paid down the national debt to the tune of over \$400 billion.

Now the reversal has come, a reversal confirmed and accelerated by this Republican budget. No more surplus: 43 percent of the ten-year surplus consumed by the Republican tax cut mainly benefiting the wealthiest Americans. Back into deficit spending. Back into diverting Social Security and Medicare revenues from their intended purpose. No more debt reduction. No more preparation for the day when the baby boomers retire and this Nation must redeem Social Security's promises.

And now, as if to add insult to injury, the Republican leadership of this House has injected into this supplemental appropriations bill a stealth provision to increase the debt limit as a way of sparing Republican Members an embarrassing up-or-down vote on the debt limit and as a way of masking the consequences of their budgetary shenanigans. It is the most cynical kind of partisan tactic. It tarnishes with a deceptive and irresponsible maneuver an appropriations bill that in fact is necessary to carry out our antiterrorism offensive and to strengthen our homeland security.

Mr. Chairman, we can fight terrorism without jeopardizing Social Security. We can build our Nation's defenses without abandoning fiscal responsibility. But in order to do that, we must have an honest, responsible, balanced and bipartisan budget; and we call upon our Republican friends to work cooperatively to bring such a budget into being.

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

Mr. Chairman, the process that we are involved in here, I think, is most regrettable; and the message being sent is a terrible message. We are involved in a conflict that I think is every bit as serious as any conflict that this country has ever been involved in, particularly when you consider the issues involved and the potential use of weapons of mass destruction in this war.

As I listen to speaker after speaker from the other side get up and pro-

claim their support for this war effort that is under way, I am reminded of a debate technique. It involves the word but. I am all for supporting this war, but. And I think that is a very regrettable message that this body is sending, hearing those speeches over and over and over again.

In the war on terrorism, the most important thing we can do is to stay together and stay strong. I recently was paid a visit by an Israeli general who recently retired. His name was Effi Eitam. General Eitam was the general who commanded the Israeli forces in southern Lebanon for the last several years that they were engaged in the southern part of that country. And he told me that on the day that the political leadership in Israel decided to withdraw from southern Lebanon, he called the Prime Minister and he said, Sir, with all due respect, I resign. He said, I did not retire, I resigned. I resigned because the worst thing you can do in the war against terrorism is to show indecision and weakness.

This debate is about indecision and weakness, and it is the wrong message to send. We have U.S. troops in the field as well, and the U.S. troops deserve to know that the political leadership on both sides of the aisle stand squarely behind them.

Now, I am in my 18th year in this House; and until 1994, needless to say, I was in the minority. I heard my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), talk about the day the Democrat Speaker declared two days in one so we could get a package through. It happened year after year after year when the Democrat Party was in the majority.

The U.S. troops that we have deployed in various parts of the world deserve my commitment, and they deserve my colleagues' commitment. And I think the debate where we stand up and say I support the troops and I support all of these things that are in this bill, I support \$7.2 billion for ongoing military operational costs, I support \$4.3 billion for personnel costs, I support \$500 million for high-priority munitions, I support \$1.6 billion for intelligence and other classified activities, I support \$420 million for coalition support, but. There cannot be a but in this debate. We have to stand together, or we will be in the shape that Israel was in and is in after they showed a time of weakness and withdrew their activities, their troops from the southern part of Lebanon.

I also would point to the war on terrorism from another respect. When the two airplanes hit the Twin Towers, and when the third one hit the Pentagon, we got together and we showed what a determined country could do. We went to Afghanistan. We fought that war. We are still fighting that war. We were successful and have been successful because we are together. Today is a very regrettable day because we are no longer together.

Now, my colleagues can say that they do not like something in this be-

cause the rule provided for A, B, or C. I was here for many years as a member of the minority. I did not like everything that was in every appropriations bill. Far from it. But today we need to be together. And I ask my colleagues as Members of the U.S. House to come together with us, to pass this bill, and let us get it behind us, go home, and truly, together, together celebrate Memorial Day and those who have served our country so well over the decades before us.

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

I wish we could, Mr. Chairman, get to a position where we could move on to discuss some of the issues we in this bill; and particularly I would like to get to the amendment process so we can start debating them.

In particular, I have several amendments that I would like to have the opportunity to bring before this body about the assistance in this bill to Israel and to the Palestinian Authority, as well as another amendment that probably will be out of order, but with respect to assistance for Egypt as well.

To give my colleagues some idea of what I am talking about, I have noticed with great admiration today that the gentleman from Georgia has all of these beautiful charts, and I know a lot of my friends on the other side of the aisle also have all these beautiful charts. So I am in the process of getting some charts, too; and I want to point out on those charts the economic conditions in Israel, the United States, and Egypt to give them a reason why I am so adamant about including Egypt in this process, as we have for the last 30 years.

So I am anxious to get to that. I want to talk about unemployment in Egypt, in Israel, and in the United States. I want to look at the cost of living in all three countries to give the American people and my colleagues an opportunity to see what we are really talking about.

Now, I have an institutional knowledge of the history of assistance to the Middle East; and I want to bring out the fact that we have appropriated nearly \$100 billion to this process over the last 30 years and to show where maybe this extra \$200 million is necessary, maybe it is not. That will be up to the Members to decide. I am not lobbying Members to vote, I just want the opportunity to bring information before this body which will show glaringly that we are making a big mistake if we do not consider all of these factors rather than just a couple.

I want to discuss economic assistance to Arafat. A lot of people say, do not say Arafat. I want to discuss whether or not the Secretary of State or the President of the United States asked for this money. I want to know if Prime Minister Sharon asked for this money, because there have been indications that this is not the case. Neither

the Secretary of State nor the President asked for this money or new economic assistance for Israel. Secretary Powell did not.

I was in the committee hearing when we discussed this section of the bill. Secretary Powell did not mention that, and yet some are inferring that this is a request from the Secretary of State. It is my understanding that it is not. Maybe I am wrong and maybe some of my colleagues can bring up some information that will dispute what I think is fact.

So I am anxious to get on with this process, because I want to show some very glaring historical figures of money we have spent. Nearly 40 percent of every dime we have spent on foreign assistance in the past 20 years has been spent in the Middle East, and I want to show how we capped this spending and how all the Members of the House agreed with me that it was time to cap this percentage of spending in the Middle East.

I want to recollect with my colleagues the speech that Prime Minister Netanyahu made right in front of your podium, Mr. Chairman, talking about the fact that it was time for Israel to begin this process of weaning themselves off this dependency of American taxpayer dollars. I want to hear what the Democrats have to say about that, because they are saying that every dime we spend in this bill for this and that is adding to the deficit. They want to say that every dime we spend in this bill is taking money away from Social Security. I want to find out why this section of the bill is not being debated.

And I am sure that there are a lot of people on the other side of the aisle that will have a reasonable explanation why this particular area is different from the area that we are talking about for the war on terrorism. So it is going to be an interesting debate, and I look forward to the opportunity to come before my colleagues to vividly explain my position.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses" for emergency expenses resulting from the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, \$5,750,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES
SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES
MARSHALS SERVICE

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses" for emergency expenses resulting from the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent

that 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.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses" for emergency expenses resulting from the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, \$112,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That \$102,000,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes the 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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to this section of the bill. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. OBEY:
Page 6, line 12, after "2004" strike all through "Congress" on page 6, line 23.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot today about the need to pass this bill in order to support our troops in the field, and we have heard a lot about how we need to be tough in fighting terrorism. This amendment is the first of two amendments that I will try to offer, one to this section, the FBI, and another to the Department of Defense budget, which will do the following:

With respect to the FBI, in January, the FBI argued for additional funds for several critical activities to upgrade the security of their new computer system and to make certain that it is backed up and protected against loss in the event of terrorist attack.

□ 1600

The FBI also asked for funds to increase their access to foreign language translators and analysts, because the FBI and other intelligence agencies have huge amounts of paper lying around which they want to sift through for intelligence information but they cannot because they do not have the translators.

What this amendment does with respect to that item is to eliminate the line-item veto which this bill presently contains for the President. There is a clause on line 12 of page 6 which indicates that all of the amounts that we are appropriating to the FBI cannot be spent unless the President designates them all as an emergency. What we are trying to do is to eliminate that language, to make clear that we think that this money to the FBI is a high enough priority that it needs to be provided and should not be blocked by a decision by OMB.

We will also have, when we get to the next section of the bill, a companion

amendment. That amendment will add \$790 million to the amount that will be spent, not subject to an item veto, to assure that we do not have to demobilize nearly 20 percent of the Guard and Reserves who were called up after the events of September 11. Those Guard and Reserve forces are doing some fundamental work on behalf of this country. It is a poor policy decision that would require us for lack of money to demobilize 20 percent of those forces.

The President has said that we would spend whatever it takes in order to win the war on terrorism. Yet OMB has denied the request of the Department of Defense to appropriate all of the money needed so that they do not have to demobilize these forces. The Secretary of Defense issued an internal memorandum to his senior staff complaining about the high pace of operations on regular forces and saying it was creating a strain on those regular forces. Now we have fresh warnings that a reconstituted al Qaeda is planning an attack in the U.S. bigger than that that we saw on September 11. There is good reason to keep Guard and Reserve personnel on board as long as that is the situation.

I do not believe that we should continue to treat Guard and Reserve as second-class forces. They are an integral part of our military operations today. I think we need to act as such. These amendments are made possible because of the peculiar accounting practice associated with one provision in the bill. I do not particularly care for that accounting practice, but as long as it has been imposed upon us by OMB and by the senior House leadership, I think at least we ought to provide some constructive use for that language and for that provision.

I would say all of you who have been talking all day long about how we need to support the troops, about how we need to be tough on terrorism, you can back up your words with your vote by supporting this amendment and the next amendment that comes along shortly.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have no opposition to this amendment. It does not add any money to the bill. It does not take any money away from the bill. As the gentleman from Wisconsin said, it strikes the emergency designation for this section dealing with the FBI. When this bill was produced by the committee, we were at our top number. We could not spend any more money. In order to balance this bill, some of the requests were determined to be an emergency and others were offset. So we came out with a really good, clean bill. But now there have been some interesting budgetary changes, I am not exactly sure how they worked, but I understand there were some decisions made that changed the number of dollars available. Because of that, the gentleman from Wisconsin's amendment is perfectly in order and there is enough

money in this bill to provide this money without declaring it an emergency.

And so, Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to this amendment. Hopefully we can dispose of it and move on to the next item of business.

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

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

I want to explain one other reason that we need to adopt this amendment. We discovered, and we discussed with the Attorney General in the hearing, the fact that up until September 11, the Justice Department appeared insistent on downplaying the importance of antiterrorism activities.

This is a document which demonstrates the papers that were presented to the Attorney General shortly before the events of September 11. As it was discussed in our hearing, apparently what happened is that the FBI was trying to push to have a higher emphasis on terrorism. Newsweek magazine contains a story discussing the difference between former director of the FBI Louis Freeh and the Attorney General about the relative importance that should be placed on antiterrorist activities. The FBI made it quite clear that they wanted antiterrorism activities to be given a much greater emphasis than the Attorney General was comfortable in giving them.

This chart was a chart given to the Attorney General. He was asked to spell out for the agency staff what his priorities were. He was asked to designate what his priorities were for the department for the coming year. The objectives were listed; fighting violent crime, dealing with illegal drugs, combating terrorist activities by developing maximum intelligence and investigative capacity. The Attorney General declined to indicate that combating terrorism was one of his top priorities and instead insisted that other items be given top priority.

Anyone can make that judgment. I am not saying this today in order to criticize the Attorney General. But I think it does emphasize the need for the amendment, because the relationship of the Justice Department with the FBI shows that consistently the FBI has tried to get a tighter focus on terrorism and they have met considerable resistance in doing that from the Justice Department. So that is another reason why I am offering this amendment today, to make certain that OMB cannot exercise an item veto with respect to these appropriations to the FBI for counterterrorism activities. I think it is essential.

I am also frankly unhappy about the fact that the Attorney General apparently was willing to charter personal planes for himself at the same time that notices were not being given to the general public that there were security reasons that would lead people

to be concerned about flying commercial. I think all of this demonstrates a certain lack of judgment at the Department of Justice that in essence got in the way of the FBI's trying to get a tighter focus on terrorism. I think this amendment will help contribute to the ability of the FBI to do its job of putting terrorism at the top of the priority list.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say on the issue of Mr. Ashcroft, before 9/11 and after 9/11, the world changed tremendously. I think we have to look forward as to what we do. I was the author of the National Commission on Terrorism, the Bremmer Commission. It came up with their report in the year 2001. Many people believe that if those recommendations had been followed, many other things would not have happened. I think the world was not very interested in the issue of terrorism. I say that in defense of Attorney General Ashcroft, I think, as of 9/11.

But let me say, the gentleman has a good amendment. I agree that this funding is crucial to the FBI in its fight against terrorism. All of the funding under the discussion in this amendment directly supports the FBI efforts to upgrade and modernize this technology and better share its intelligence data. The reorganization that the FBI will soon be sending up moves heavily into this area, one, put terrorism at the top; two, deal with the technology which was a major problem in the Timothy McVeigh case. Also, to make sure that whatever data that the FBI has is shared with other agencies, such as the CIA and other government authorities.

The FBI is at a crucial period in their history and I think the Congress ought to do everything they can to help with regard to technology and with regard to upgrades. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin has a good amendment here. I urge its adoption.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

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

Mr. Chairman, I, like I believe every single colleague who has taken to the floor, wish to first begin by saying that I stand here today to support our troops fighting terrorism, not just abroad but certainly here at home, to support all our men and women in law enforcement civilly who are doing the

same, to support our medical personnel, our community activists who are doing their utmost to work with our law enforcement and military leaders to make America safer. We are committed, all of us, to once again make America safe and free from harm.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, my friends in the majority are using the battle against terrorism to pass what I believe is a dangerous and cynical provision that allows the Federal Government to break its own spending limit and raid hundreds of billions of dollars from the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

Mr. Chairman, America can be strong militarily without becoming weak economically. But our friends in the majority are hoping they can escape today's debate without leveling with the American public. The Nation is back into deficit in its budgets and now my friends in the majority plan to use Social Security and Medicare trust fund dollars to pay for other programs unrelated to national defense and to counterterrorism.

Mr. Chairman, I would not be surprised if many people, including Members on this floor or people in the American public who happen to be watching this debate, if they are confused, because as I sat through hours and I sit through hours of this debate, oftentimes you hear conflicting statements by colleagues. But, Mr. Chairman, there is one rule that I believe stands the test of time, and that is that sunshine is the strongest of all disinfectants, particularly when it comes to ensuring that the political and policymaking process is untainted.

□ 1615

The Republican leadership, with this bill today and with the White House, which has endorsed this legislation, are borrowing a page from Enron and using gimmicks and stealth to hide the true nature of their plans for America's future. They are attempting to keep the American people in the dark about our Nation's budget challenges and the growing national debt.

This resort to stealth and secrecy, to me, is tremendously chilling. It is chilling. With this bill, the administration is seeking to raise the debt limit with no strings attached. They have disclosed nothing about their plans to repair our damaged fiscal situation.

Today the American people have told the Federal Government, you are allowed to borrow \$5.95 trillion of taxpayer money, and today under this legislation, the administration and my colleagues in the majority are saying we want to raise that amount that we want to borrow. We want to pull this card out, the Federal credit card, and borrow even more.

We have already been told by Secretary of the Treasury O'Neill that he wants to borrow at least another \$750 billion more to increase that national debt, a national debt which will have

to be paid for exclusively, every single cent of that \$750 billion or more in increased debt, from Social Security or Medicare trust fund dollars.

I will say that one more time: Every single penny that would be used to increase the size of the debt and the deficit for this year would come directly out of only two pots, Social Security and Medicare trust fund dollars. Not only are we jeopardizing our seniors, not only are we jeopardizing those who need prescription drug coverage under Medicare, but we are jeopardizing all of our children. I do not intend to use the government's credit card and mortgage my children's future, but that is what we are being asked to do today. But it is being done under the cloak of national defense and antiterrorism.

Every single one of us, I believe, who has taken to this floor has said let us have a clean vote on the issue of antiterrorism and national defense, as this supplemental appropriations for the most part does, and rid it of the pork, and you have got a virtually unanimous vote in this House. But there is an insistence on also stealthily including through secrecy this allowance to increase the size of the national debt.

Now, this does not seem new. Just yesterday this House voted to allow secrecy to continue. It cannot happen. We have subpoenas on the Senate side saying, Mr. President, allow us to see what Enron had to do with the administration at its task force meetings on energy.

Let us stop the secrecy. Let us have a clean vote and not mortgage our children's future.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is a lot that the gentleman from California says that I agree with. We came here in the same year, in 1993. I have been working to try to hold down the increase in spending and thereby hold down the increase in the public debt. I hope that we can have a real debate on just how much debt do we want to leave our kids and our grandkids.

It is a mortgage, after all. I feel, like I am sure many of us, just like any family or any business, if you are going to go deeper into debt and borrow money, there should be some plan to start paying off that debt in the future, not just let it perpetually grow and grow and grow. Of course, that is what happened in the last 40 years in this Congress. Republicans came in and took the majority in 1995, and we came in with vim and vigor and tried to put pressure on the increase in spending.

I have heard some of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle suggest that it is the tax cut that is causing the deficit. Maybe that is true, if you say, look, we have no control over spending and we are just going to increase spending 2 and 3 and 4 times the rate of inflation.

But if we are doing what we should and having spending increases more

consistent with inflation in this country, then there would not be any problem of digging into the Social Security trust fund or any of the other trust funds.

Let me say that our current deficit is the result of an explosion of spending. Let me give you this example. In 1998, we passed and executed a plan designed to balance the budget in fiscal year 2002. That budget projected a fiscal year 2002 revenue of just under \$1.89 trillion. Actual revenues for this year are going to be slightly over. The CBO now projects \$2 trillion, or more than 5 percent above the projection. So revenues, even with the tax cuts, are coming in much stronger than we even anticipated for a balanced budget.

Even if you subtract out the cost of the war on terror and the increased money for defense and this supplemental today, we would still have a balanced budget, if it were not for the outrageous increase in spending that this Congress, the House and the Senate, and the President have passed over the last few years.

The growth in discretionary spending over that period has been explosive. Discretionary outlays will rise at an annual average rate of 7.4 percent between 1998 and 2003. The President's proposal for \$789 billion in discretionary spending in 2003 is a full \$124 billion, or 18 percent, more than the President Clinton projected for this year in his last budget.

The point is, it is spending. It is not tax cuts, it is not digging into Social Security, but it is the tremendous growth in spending that is our problem.

The \$35 billion in increased defense expenditures and \$6 billion in expanded homeland defense for fiscal year 2003 are not even half of the total increase since President Clinton left office. Yet we heard complaints that even these gigantic increases are not enough. We need to get serious about controlling spending and deciding how much debt we want to leave to our children and grandchildren.

I am proposing debt ceiling legislation that would do a better job of assessing the government's true liabilities. It would include the debt held by the public and the debt held by government trust funds, as does the current limit, but it would add to that all of the unfunded government liabilities coming due within 10 years. This is going to give us a better position in deciding just how much debt we want to leave to our kids and grandkids. But I say let us not demagogue the tax cuts, let us not demagogue the issue on Social Security and Medicare. Let us face the real problem, and that is the significant increase in spending.

So I would hope I am not hearing from the other side of the aisle as we go through the appropriation process criticizing that there is not enough money for this issue or that issue or this program or that program. This is war. Those programs should have mini-

mal increases or no increases, if we are going to win this war on terror and control spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
ENFORCEMENT AND BORDER AFFAIRS

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses, Enforcement and Border Affairs" for emergency expenses resulting from the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act, or in Public Law 107-117, for the Immigration and Naturalization Service's Entry Exit System may be obligated until the INS submits a plan for expenditure that (1) meets the capital planning and investment control review requirements established by the Office of Management and Budget, including OMB Circular A-11, part 3; (2) complies with the acquisition rules, requirements, guidelines, and systems acquisition management practices of the Federal Government; (3) is reviewed by the General Accounting Office; and (4) has been approved by the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That \$40,000,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes the 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.

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Justice Assistance" for grants, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by sections 819 and 821 of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 and section 1014 of the USA PATRIOT Act (Public Law 107-56) and for other counter-terrorism programs, including first responder training and equipment to respond to acts of terrorism, including incidents involving weapons of mass destruction or chemical or biological weapons, \$175,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND
RELATED AGENCIES
RELATED AGENCIES
OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE
REPRESENTATIVE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses" for emergency expenses for increased security requirements, \$1,100,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that 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 of the Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND
TECHNOLOGY
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND
SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Scientific and Technical Research and Services" for emergency expenses resulting from new homeland security activities and increased security requirements, \$4,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC
ADMINISTRATION
FISHERIES FINANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Funds provided under the heading, "Fisheries Finance Program Account" for the direct loan program authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, are available to subsidize gross obligations during fiscal year 2002 for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$5,000,000 for Individual Fishing Quota loans, and not to exceed \$19,000,000 for Traditional loans.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses" for emergency expenses resulting from new homeland security activities, \$400,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251 (b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
CARE OF THE BUILDING AND GROUNDS

For an additional amount for "Care of the Building and Grounds" for emergency expenses for the Supreme Court building, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND
OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses" for emergency expenses to enhance security and to provide for extraordinary costs related to terrorist trials, \$6,258,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That \$3,115,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes the 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 of the Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED
AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Diplomatic and Consular Programs" for emergency expenses for activities related to combating international terrorism, \$51,050,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Pro-*

vided, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE
PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs" for emergency expenses for activities related to combating international terrorism, \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That \$10,000,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes the 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.

EMBASSY SECURITY, CONSTRUCTION, AND
MAINTENANCE

For an additional amount for "Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance", for emergency expenses for activities related to combating international terrorism, \$200,516,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND
CONFERENCES
CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS

For an additional amount for "Contributions to International Organizations" for emergency expenses for activities related to combating international terrorism, \$7,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL
PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities" to make United States peacekeeping payments to the United Nations at a time of multilateral cooperation in the war on terrorism, \$43,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

RELATED AGENCY

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS
INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "International Broadcasting Operations" for emergency expenses for activities related to combating international terrorism, \$7,400,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

BROADCASTING CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

For an additional amount for "Broadcasting Capital Improvements" for emergency expenses for activities related to combating international terrorism, \$7,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,

That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that 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.

RELATED AGENCIES

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses" for additional staffing to respond to increased needs for enforcement and oversight of corporate finance, \$20,000,000 from fees collected in fiscal year 2002, to remain available until expended.

In addition, for an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses" for emergency expenses resulting from the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, \$9,300,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that 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.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Funds appropriated by this Act for the Broadcasting Board of Governors and the Department of State may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, as amended, and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414(a)(1)).

SEC. 202. Section 286(e)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1356(e)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking "is authorized to" and inserting "shall"; and

(2) by striking "authorization" and inserting "requirement".

SEC. 203. (a)(1) During fiscal year 2002 and each succeeding fiscal year, notwithstanding any provision of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to the contrary, in order to permit victims of crimes associated with the terrorist acts of September 11, 2001, to watch trial proceedings in the criminal case against Zacarias Moussaoui, the trial court in that case shall order, subject to paragraph (3) and subsection (b), closed circuit televising of the trial proceedings to convenient locations the trial court determines are reasonably necessary, for viewing by those victims.

(2)(A) As used in this section and subject to subparagraph (B), the term "victims of crimes associated with the terrorist acts of September 11, 2001" means individuals who—

(i) suffered direct physical harm as a result of the terrorist acts that occurred in New York, Pennsylvania and Virginia on September 11, 2001 (hereafter in this section "terrorist acts") and were present at the scene of the terrorist acts when they occurred, or immediately thereafter; or

(ii) are the spouse, legal guardian, parent, child, brother, or sister of, or who as determined by the court have a relationship of

similar significance to, an individual described in subparagraph (A)(i), if the latter individual is under 18 years of age, incompetent, incapacitated, has a serious injury, or disability that requires assistance of another person for mobility, or is deceased.

(B) The term defined in paragraph (A) shall not apply to an individual who participated or conspired in one or more of the terrorist acts.

(3) Nothing in this section shall be construed to eliminate or limit the district court's discretion to control the manner, circumstances, or availability of the broadcast where necessary to control the courtroom or protect the integrity of the trial proceedings or the safety of the trial participants. The district court's exercise of such discretion shall be entitled to substantial deference.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (a), the terms and restrictions of section 235(b), (c), (d) and (e) of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 10608(b), (c), (d), and (e)), shall apply to the televising of trial proceedings under this section.

SEC. 204. For purposes of section 201(a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (relating to Federal sources of supply, including lodging providers, airlines and other transportation providers), the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program shall be deemed an executive agency for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of 20 U.S.C. 5201, and the employees of and participants in the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program shall be eligible to have access to such sources of supply on the same basis as employees of an executive agency have such access.

CHAPTER 3

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Air Force", \$206,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army", \$226,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That \$119,000,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for \$119,000,000, 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.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", \$53,750,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That \$17,250,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for \$17,250,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emer-

gency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", \$60,500,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That \$19,500,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for \$19,500,000, 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.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", \$751,975,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003, of which \$420,000,000 may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for payments to Pakistan, Jordan, and other key cooperating nations for logistical and military support provided to United States military operations in connection with the Global War on Terrorism: *Provided*, That such payments may be made in such amounts as the Secretary may determine, in accordance with standard accounting practices and procedures, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and 15 days following notification to the appropriate Congressional committees: *Provided further*, That amounts for such payments shall be in addition to any other funds that may be available for such purpose: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That \$12,975,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for \$12,975,000, 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.

DEFENSE EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the "Defense Emergency Response Fund", \$12,693,972,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003, of which \$77,900,000 shall be available for enhancements to North American Air Defense Command capabilities: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer the funds provided in this paragraph only to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance; procurement; the Defense Health Program; and working capital funds: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the preceding proviso, \$100,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading are available for transfer to any other appropriations accounts of the Department of Defense, for certain classified activities, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds may be obligated to carry out projects not otherwise authorized by law: *Provided further*, That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of De-

fense: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That \$1,393,972,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for \$1,393,972,000 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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

Page 23, line 15, strike "\$1,393,972,000" and insert "\$603,972,000" and on line 17 strike "\$1,393,972,000" and insert "\$603,972,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arizona seek recognition?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, just simply to say that the majority is prepared to accept this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is to take away the President's line item veto authority of the money that this bill contains to fund full mobilization for the Guard and Reserve.

As I indicated earlier, we had been told that one of the things that held up the administration's request for a supplemental was the argument between OMB and DOD about whether or not full funding should be provided for the mobilization costs associated with Guard and Reserve forces after September 11. DOD lost the argument, and that meant that they did not get the money which would require 20 percent demobilization. That comes despite the fact that the Secretary of Defense on May 13 sent a memorandum to his senior staff reading as follows:

"We have had stop-loss in place for some months preventing people on active duty from leaving the service. In addition, we are extending the assignment of thousands and thousands of Guard and Reserves who have been called away from homes and normal employment to serve on active duty.

□ 1630

The entire force is facing the adverse results of the high pace OPTEMPO and PERSTEMPO."

We are past the point where the Department can, without an unbelievably compelling reason, make additional commitments. Yet if OMB were to be listened to, we would not have all of the funds necessary in this bill to provide for the continued use of Guard and Reserve forces in the post-September 11 activities that they are now engaged in.

Again, we have heard a lot of talk on this floor today about the need to support our troops. Well, this is a concrete way we can do it. This makes certain that every dime that this bill contains will actually be provided for those forces. I think it is the responsible thing to do, given the fact that we have been given fresh warnings that a reconstituted al Qaeda force is planning something even worse than they planned on September 11.

There is good reason to keep these forces active, given the strain that we have on regular forces, and I appreciate the fact that the gentleman has accepted the amendment on behalf of the committee and would support a vote.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thoroughly support this amendment, and I fully support the war against terrorism. I support the bill as reported from the Committee on Appropriations, and I rise to comment on one of the important deficiencies in this bill: funding for our National Guard and our Reserve personnel.

Since September 11, some 83,000 National Guardsmen and Reservists have been called to active duty to support the war on terrorism. These are citizen soldiers, every bit as important as the regular active duty personnel, and these servicemembers are serving around the globe in Afghanistan, Bosnia, Kosovo, Korea and elsewhere. They are helping to prosecute the war against terrorism. We have a duty to fully support them.

Unfortunately, this bill does not do that. The supplemental requested by the administration includes only \$4.1 billion for military personnel modernization and readiness. Because of the size of the National Guard and Reserve call-up, the duration of that call-up, and the use of stop-loss authorities to keep personnel on active duty once they have been mobilized, the bill on this personnel call-up comes to \$1.8 billion above the \$4.1 billion requested by the administration.

I commend the Committee on Appropriations for partially addressing the funding shortfall. The bill includes an additional \$790 million. That still leaves about \$1 billion that the Department of Defense will have to absorb in order to pay for those already incurred costs.

I do not know who is to blame, OMB or the Defense Department, but the failure to pay this bill will force unwise deactivation of personnel and harkens back to the days when the National Guard and Reserve were second-class citizens. We cannot and we must not let this happen.

Secretary Rumsfeld and President Bush have said they will do whatever it takes to pay for the war on terrorism. I only wish the budget reality matched that rhetoric.

Our military personnel, National Guard, Reserves, active duty, are being stretched thin with missions around

the globe. We have an obligation to provide the funding to make sure they can do the jobs we ask them to do. While I will vote for the bill, I hope we will be able to fully fund these must-pay expenses in conference so that the Department of Defense does not have to compromise other important programs for this war on terrorism.

Let me add, this debate is about the future of Social Security, as many have noted; but it is more than that. We are at war. It is not a war we sought; it is a war that was forced upon us. All of us agree that we need to defeat the terrorists who attacked us, most recently on September 11, and that the antiterrorism and homeland security funding in this supplemental appropriations bill is needed.

In prior wars, we have mobilized and sacrificed to defend freedom and defeat tyranny. I remember the day after Pearl Harbor. I was a boy. Thousands lined up at recruiting offices. Eventually, more than 15 million Americans served in uniform. Millions more worked in defense plants. There was rationing of critical materials needed for the war effort.

To win this war, we have asked a relatively small number of Americans to sacrifice, to endure hardship, or even to die in defense of our freedom. There is no draft; there is no rationing. In fact, the administration has even opposed recruiting more troops to ease the burden on those in the field, and Americans have been urged to live normally and spend more money to stimulate the economy.

So this debate is about a moral question: Who do we ask to sacrifice in time of shared national peril? At least in the War Between the States, the wealthy had to buy their way out of serving. In the War Against Terrorism, the majority proposes to pay the wealthy through a tax cut and send the bill for the war to our grandchildren.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Other Procurement, Army", \$79,200,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of

the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Aircraft Procurement, Navy", \$22,800,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps", \$262,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Other Procurement, Navy", \$2,500,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Procurement, Marine Corps", \$3,500,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force", \$129,500,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That \$36,500,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for \$36,500,000, 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.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force", \$115,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Other Procurement, Air Force", \$735,340,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for "Procurement, Defense-Wide", \$104,425,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004: *Provided*, That funds may be used to purchase vehicles required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles, but

not to exceed \$175,000 per vehicle: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That \$4,925,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for \$4,925,000, 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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

Page 27, line 1, strike the colon and all thereafter up to the period on page 27, line 11.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this is simply a technical correction to do the same thing for Intelligence that we just did for the Guard and Reserve.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, the majority has no objection to this amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army", \$8,200,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

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

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, as we get close to 5 o'clock and the dinner hour all across the east coast and back in my home State of Indiana, I want to talk about where we are overall on this piece of legislation.

If this legislation were a bill to support our troops, our brave and courageous men and women overseas, fighting terrorism, it would pass unanimously, right now. If this bill were simply a bill to protect our homeland from terrorists, it would pass right now, unanimously. Instead, we have a piece of legislation with an accompanying rule that denies the minority their rights and thwarts the majority of their principles.

Over the past I have talked at length about the Committee on Rules denying the minority party, the Democrats in this case, denying the minority party the ability on the defense authorization bill, denying the minority party on the Welfare Reform Act our opportunities to change and amend and modify legislation. That is wrong in a law-making body.

But today we have gone even a step further than denying the minority their precious rights of participating in this great system. We now have a rule that is tucked in and hidden into this bill that is not just about terrorism or homeland security, it is about the majority party, the Republicans borrowing \$750 billion of the taxpayers' money and not wanting to have a vote on it; not wanting to discuss it; not wanting, as Secretary O'Neill is advocating, to talk about the obligations and the faith of the government when we borrow money. That has been denied. That has been hidden.

As the father of four children, we often play games like kick the can. The Republicans, if they have kicked the can down the road on this one, that would be one thing; but they have played hide and seek. Hide and seek. Instead of letting Members vote the way they should vote on a difficult issue in the light of day in bringing this debt ceiling bill up, they have played hide and seek, and they have tucked it away in the bill and given everybody cover and ducked the debate.

They have also not only denied our minority party the right to debate that, they have thwarted the majority party on their principles. They have tucked into this bill, not to fight terrorism, not to protect our homeland security, not to help our troops win the war on terrorism, a trade provision that changes a law that this body passed by a vote of 234 to 163. This body, with the majority, voted on the Caribbean Basin Initiative to send certain products down there for dying. Now we have changed that with a little provision in the rule that is tucked into this bill to help pass another bill to help reward a Member of Congress. That has nothing to do with fighting terrorism, nothing to do with protecting the homeland.

That is what Democrats have a problem with today. We stand in this great Chamber and we look around this Chamber and we have great lawmakers here: Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration of Independence; Mason, who wrote the Bill of Rights; Moses, who thundered down the Ten Commandments from Mount Sinai. Yet, in this great body, we cannot debate these simple issues. And some people make this an issue of patriotism.

If this was defending our homeland, it would be a unanimous vote. If this was helping our troops overseas, it would be a unanimous vote. But, in fact, it is more complicated than that. Tucking provisions in bills, hiding amendments, providing no opportunity for the minority their rights, thwarting the majority their principles.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that in the future, we will have rules and bills that allow the great justice and freedom that we are fighting for overseas to take place in this great deliberative body.

□ 1645

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today because of my concern. I want to first of all compliment the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the committee for adding \$750 million on this issue of mobilization of the Guard and Reserve. I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), for his earlier statement.

As of yesterday, May 22, a total of 81,403 Guard and Reserve personnel were currently called up on active duty. The President's request for Guard and Reserve mobilization funding in this supplemental was so inadequate that DOD has begun planning to demobilize 14,500 Guard and Reserve personnel.

This funding reduction was imposed by OMB. It was not requested by the Department of Defense. In fact, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld on March 13 issued a memorandum which reads in part:

The entire force is facing the adverse results of high-paced OPTEMPO and PERSTEMPO. We are extending the assignment of thousands and thousands of Guard and Reserves who have been called away from homes and normal employment to serve on active duty. And finally, we are past the point where the Department can, without an unbelievably compelling reason, make additional commitments.

Despite the stresses Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld described so eloquently which are on the Armed Forces today, OMB would have us demobilize 14,500 guardsmen, increasing exponentially the burden on the active duty force.

The Committee on Appropriations, as I mentioned, added \$790 million to try and avert this disastrous demobilization. I understand the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) was accepted earlier.

I just raise this because when we look at a whole series of items in this supplemental and we see that OMB has intervened to reduce the funding for the Department of Energy, for the Department of Transportation, I mean, here are people coming in with their best estimates of what is needed to do this job, and the money is not winding up in the budget. This is after the President has pledged to all of us and to the American people that the money will not be an obstacle for Homeland Security.

Obviously, we have to be concerned about unnecessary or unwise spending. But in my mind, if we are talking about protecting our forces, if we are talking about having an adequate military force, and the Department of Defense is telling us that they may have to add to the active duty force, if we are going to have to add to the active duty force, why are we in the midst of a demobilization of our Guard and Reserve forces when they are doing an outstanding job?

I just think this is another example of this budget being not adequate to

deal with this problem. I worry about my good friend, Tom Ridge, who I think is trying to do a good job. He is hampered by not having an agency around him. I think that the legislation introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and others which creates a new, independent agency is also essential here. We also have to support the Coast Guard.

So I rise today in concern that we are not doing enough here on homeland security. We have gone through a disastrous attack on September 11. I hope it does not take another disastrous attack on the country, which many are today warning us of, before we get serious about creating an agency, about supporting the Guard and Reserve, and about doing what is necessary to make all of this work for our country.

We have a lot of catching up to do, because we have not focused on homeland security for years because we thought we were completely secure. Where we have done a great job in many other areas and have CINCs all around the world, we are in the midst of creating a CINC for the United States and for Canada and Alaska, the Northern Command.

I just want to join my colleagues here in raising these issues. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has talked about this. The Guard and Reserve play an incredibly important role in our country, and they are needed, I think, today. I just hate to see OMB continuing to intervene and somehow getting the support of the administration to undercut the decisions that Mr. Rumsfeld and the Department want to make.

We saw this last year on the supplemental, we saw it on the overall request for the 2003 budget. I just hope somebody down at the White House will bring them under control and support what the Department of Defense is asking for.

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

Mr. Chairman, the debate that we have been having the last day and a half is not about the troops or the commitment of this body to the war on terrorism. I think that is pretty clear, that every Member supports the troops, and that every Member wants to make sure that our troops have everything they need in the field in order to do the job that we have asked them to do for the American people.

But I think, rather, that this debate is about our commitment to being honest with the American people. The Republicans, unfortunately, want to cloud the debate on the issue of the national debt and the budget by hiding behind the war. I think that is a shame.

The Democrats do not seek to forestall the war effort. We simply think that the American people are entitled to the same open and honest debate about the future of our Nation's fiscal policy: How we will save Social Security; how we will pay for a prescription

drug program that both parties have said they want under Medicare; how we will pay down the national debt, instead of adding to the national debt, as the majority seeks to do through the sleight-of-hand in the rule for consideration of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen Members of the majority come down to the floor and admit that, yes, we need to raise the debt limit, and yes, the procedure for considering this bill will allow for that, possibly by as much as three-quarters of a trillion dollars. If that is so, then why not bring a bill down separately to raise the debt limit? Bring it down to the floor of the House and let us debate it out in the open in front of the American people, so we can tell them how we intend to pay off that debt and how we intend to balance the budget.

Ironically, it is the Republicans who do not want to do that. They want the American people to grant them an extension of credit of another \$750 billion without any discussion of repayment, without any discussion of restoring the fiscal responsibility, and thus the creditworthiness of the United States, in order to pay for that.

Is it not ironic, Mr. Chairman, that the same majority 8 years ago, when I was a freshman in this body, shut down the government, nearly caused a default on the Nation's debt, and threw the economy into chaos until the President would sit down with them and negotiate with Congress on a plan to balance the budget by 2002?

In fact, back in November of 1995, having shut down the government and failing to lift the debt limit, the Republicans put forth a proposal to allow for only a 1-month debt limit extension in order to bring the President to the table. Now they want \$750 billion and far more than a month, far more than what is necessary to give the troops what they need in the field today, tomorrow, a month from now, a year from now, and more than a year from now.

Today, with the Bush administration seeking three-quarters of \$1 trillion more in debt, the Republicans want a blank check with no explanation, no questions, no plans on how to balance the budget; none of that. How ironic that 7 years ago it was the same Republican majority that threatened default. Yet, now, having wanted to balance the budget by 2002, they have driven us back into deficits by 2002.

Instead of having the debate that we had a year ago over how much debt we could pay down, they want to raise the debt, but they do not want to talk about it anymore. They do not want to sit down with the White House anymore. They do not want to explain to the American people anymore how we are going to pay for increasing the public debt. That is wrong, and that is what we are upset about.

Bring the supplemental without the debt limit extension in it and we will vote it out, and we can be gone in half

an hour. Bring the debt limit extension down as a separate piece of legislation, so we can ask Members and we can ask the President the same questions they wanted to ask the prior President about how we are going to balance the budget again, and how we are going to pay down this debt, and how we are going to fix Social Security and provide for prescription drugs. That is all we want. In a democracy, that is what the American people ought to have.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is what is the problem with this bill. We are tired of seeing the red ink. We are tired of having excuses, and we are tired of seeing our colleagues on the other side with really no answers hide behind a war effort that all of us and all the American people support.

I would hope that we could resolve this impasse by stripping out the debt limit increase part of this bill, bringing it back as a separate bill, and let us get on with our business of providing the troops with what they need and providing the war effort and the American people with what they want. Let us get on with our business.

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, there is no division in this House, or I believe in this country today, over the question of whether we want to fully and vigorously support the war on terrorism. I join what I would believe to be a near unanimous or unanimous body in this House in favor of providing the funds to get that done.

There is a division within this House over the question of accountability. The lack of accountability is one of the real sad phenomena in American culture right now. It is even more sad that what we are doing in the House today is a continuation of that culture that says that it is okay not to be accountable.

The great political scandals of our time at State and Federal and local levels for both Republicans and Democrats are usually about the failure of elected officials to be held accountable.

We had a debate on this House floor within the last 2 weeks about holding welfare recipients accountable when they receive public funds, as I believe we should. There has been discussion in every corner of America about the lack of accountability of the executives of the Enron Corporation seemingly being able to take vast amounts of money from their shareholders, from their employees, from their pension funds, but not be held accountable.

The division between us today is about accountability on the question of raising the national debt, on the question of borrowing \$750 billion to run the government.

Mr. Chairman, I readily accept the proposition that there are different views as to whether or not we should do that. There are different views as to

how much we should borrow. There are different views as to how we should pay for the way that we run the government.

That is what we are here to do, is to debate those different views. But that is not what divides us today. What divides us today is an unwillingness of the majority to be accountable at all on this question, to put this question up for a vote.

Mr. Chairman, all across America today, Americans are voting on questions that come before community groups. Parent-teacher associations are voting this afternoon on whether to have a car wash or a cookie sale to raise money for the school library. Youth soccer leagues and civic groups and unions are going to vote tonight as to whether or not to spend their money to improve their association a certain way, or to elect someone to lead it. City councils and State legislatures are voting on questions of how to change their law and how to invest their resources.

Voting is what we do in governments and in community organizations around America. What is wrong with what is going on here today is we are not voting. The Members of the majority are refusing to be held accountable for a decision that they made in 2001.

In 2001, the majority rolled the dice on the U.S. economy and we all lost. In 2001, we were faced with the prospect of endless surpluses. The majority leader of the House came to this floor in March of 2001, during the debate over the tax cut, and I quote him as saying, "Over the next 10 years, taxpayers will be overcharged by a staggering \$5.6 trillion. Even after paying down the payable debt and funding all our priorities, Washington will still be awash in cash surpluses." So said the majority leader in March of 2001.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, he was wrong. Today we are not awash in a cash surplus, we are borrowing money to run the Federal Government. The majority does not want to deal with the consequences of their mistake. They do not want their Members to go home and say when we made the decision to drain the Federal Treasury of \$2 trillion in March of 2001, and we said there would be money to pay for all these other expenses, and we would be awash in cash surpluses, we dropped the ball. Now, as a result of it, we have to borrow money to run the government.

That would be the accountable thing to do. That is what the majority refuses to do. We are not asking the majority to adopt our view of what the budget should be. We are not asking the majority to cut spending or raise taxes or to come up with some formula we would come up with.

□ 1700

We are asking the majority, we are demanding that the majority be held accountable for their decisions the way city councils and unions and boards of directors are, hold them accountable.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am frankly saddened by the tone of this debate. The Republicans say that they are in charge here. They have the majority and they have a duty to pass the military supplemental to continue the war efforts in Afghanistan and against al Qaeda and other terrorist groups. We agree, we do have a responsibility to pass the supplemental; and the thing I am sad about is the majority knows we agree with it. We know we have to pass this supplemental, but what we object to is all of the other things that are tacked onto it because the majority does not have the courage to deal with them head-on, independently.

As the majority party, the Republicans also bear the responsibility for the health of our economy. And frankly, that is why the Republican majority claims that it passed last year the tax cuts which primarily benefit the wealthy. Well, that is fine. They thought that would help the economy. Guess what? They thought wrong. We did have some intervening events. We had a recession. We had the terrorist attacks of September 11, and the need for relief efforts and bioterrorism efforts in this country and we have the war against terrorism.

At that point, to exert leadership, what the majority party should do is say, the combination of our tax cuts for the wealthy and these crises have left us in a position where we have the largest 1-year increase in deficit spending in our Nation's history. But do they do that? No. Instead they shirk their duties of leadership, and they try to sneak language into this very important relief bill to increase the debt ceiling and to allow us to go even deeper in debt instead of working with the majority and the minority to find a way that we can readjust our budget so that we can deal with the very real economic issues.

Then the majority demagogues this issue by blaming it on the minority party by saying we are unpatriotic because we object to just slipping this increase of the debt ceiling into a bill that should pass and should pass unanimously.

I have got to say I, for one, am sick to death of being called unpatriotic. Is it unpatriotic to say that we should face our economic responsibilities as a Congress instead of shrinking into greater and greater debt? Is it unpatriotic to say that we should protect Social Security for the grandparents of the men and women who are fighting overseas against terrorism? I do not think so. Is it unpatriotic to want to deal with our changed economic circumstances as a result of the tax cuts, the recession and the terrorist attacks? I do not think it is unpatriotic. In fact, I think it is the height of patriotism, and that is why I object to this tactic.

Here is why this is such an important issue. As I said, we just had the largest 1-year plunge in our national deficit

spending. If we look at this chart, what it shows, we had some deficit spending throughout the 1970s. And when Ronald Reagan's tax cut went in in 1981, we were plunged even deeper into deficit spending which culminated in 1991. Finally, Congress had the guts to do something about it, and they passed legislation to make our economy strong.

As you can see in 2000, for the first time we were actually running surpluses. But once that tax cut for the wealthy was passed, and everything else happened, this year we have been plunged into the largest deficit spending in our Nation's history.

What you do not see on this chart is 2 years out. This goes through 2006. In 2008 the baby boomers will start to retire and when the baby boomers start to retire, the grandparents of our fighting men and women, we will have raided their Social Security and Medicare trust funds, and we will have an economic crisis in this country like you will not believe.

So here is what I think we should do. Let us strip the provision for the debt ceiling out of this bill. Let us pass this bill immediately. Let us pass this bill right now, and then let us come back and let us sit down and have an economic summit. Let us talk about what we can do about these tax cuts for the wealthy. Let us talk about how we are going to pay for a prescription drug benefit so our seniors are not having to choose between paying rent and paying for their medicines. Let us figure out how we are going to fund our economy.

In my personal household, if I went home and said to my husband, I know we have had some economic hard times lately; our roof has been leaking and the kids are sick, so I have decided to go to Saks Fifth Avenue and buy a new wardrobe, my husband would not be too happy. And the Nation should not be happy with this, with what this Congress is doing either.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think I need to clarify something here. I have heard a number of speakers say that we should not be considered unpatriotic because we have a difference of opinion here. I do not think anybody on my side of the aisle suggested that anybody in this House is unpatriotic. To the contrary, I appreciate all of the Members who came together with us after September 11 to provide the supplemental appropriations bill that the President used to get the war started. We appreciate that. We appreciate the way that we work together, and I know that we are going to continue to work together for what is in the best interest of America, what is in the best interest of our troops that are defending America, and what is in the best interest of those who are seeking out terrorism wherever it is in the interest of America. But what is happening here is there are those who are trying to change the direction of what this bill really is all about.

Now, this bill is about providing a defense emergency supplemental appropriations bill. That is the basic bill that we are talking about. And we need to get that money available quickly. Because of the war, the military services have used up money that they would use normally in their fourth quarter. We need to replace that money quickly. We need to replace the missiles and bombs that have been used. We need to replace the airplanes and helicopters that are worn out. We need to do all of these things because we are at war.

I want to say something else, Mr. Chairman. For those who are not old enough to remember Pearl Harbor, that was World War II for us, that was the war that we were fighting because we were attacked. But now count all the other wars after World War II, whether it was Korea, which was next; whether we are talking about Viet Nam, which was a terrible tragic experience for many of our people, especially the military; whether it was Granada; whether it was Panama; whether it was Haiti, Somalia, Rwanda, wherever it might be up to and including Desert Storm, we were fighting somebody else's war. Listen to that. We were fighting somebody else's war.

Today for the first time since World War II we are fighting our war. We were attacked. America was attacked. Our Pentagon, the headquarters of our national defense was attacked. The World Trade Center, the center of our economy was attacked. Thousands of our American people lost their lives in a sneaky terrorist attack. That is what this bill is about. And the attempts to change it into something else just do not fly. This is a national defense emergency bill and we need to get to it. We need to focus on what this bill really is about and how we need to respond quickly to get this bill passed and get it to the President so that, in fact, those funds that have already been spent can be replaced to fight the war and to seek out the terrorists.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Obey amendment that was adopted to the paragraph that spans pages 26 and 27 be modified by the form that I have placed at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

On page 27, line 1, strike "the entire amount" and insert "\$99,500,000"; and

On page 27, line 4, strike the colon and all thereafter up to the period on page 27, line 11.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to modifying the amendment after its adoption?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I only do so to allow time for the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to

give an explanation of exactly what this request is about.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I appreciate the gentleman doing that.

Mr. Chairman, this is simply a technical fix to the amendment on Intelligence, which was passed just a few moments ago and accepted by the committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to adopting the amendment in the modified form?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is readopted in the modified form.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman of Florida (Mr. YOUNG) I would say what he talked about sums up the beginning part of my statement in talking about the fact that we will commemorate Memorial Day this weekend, and the day when we come together to share a special salute to all of those who have paid the ultimate price for our country and to offer prayers of comfort to the family members left behind.

I think we would all agree this Memorial Day will be very different from the last. September 11 changed everything. And since that terrible day, we have all been forced to acknowledge for the first time since Pearl Harbor that the cruelties of war are closer to home than most of us have ever imagined. But I think we would all agree, as well, we will continue to fight terrorism head on, wherever it lives and wherever the perpetrators live and conspire to hurt innocent people, because we have no choice.

It is the only way to preserve our way of life, our freedoms and our liberties. It is the only way to truly honor the thousands who lost their lives on September 11 and the men and women who are currently serving in Afghanistan under very difficult conditions. This Memorial Day is for them.

I am reminded of a famous statement made by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who once said: "We too born to freedom are willing to fight to maintain freedom. We and all others who believe as deeply as we do, would rather die on our feet than live on our knees."

These are the words I will be speaking on Memorial Day. The American people are intelligent. They know we face many problems as we try to combat terrorism. We are prepared to bear their fair share of the burden. However, this bill does hide one of those burdens, a necessary, but politically unpopular, increase in the debt ceiling. The majority fears, I think, an honest debate on why the debt ceiling must be raised and what impact that action will have on Social Security and Medicare trust funds. So they hid it in an important

appropriations bill and hope that people will not learn of it until after it becomes law.

Today we face a fiscal crisis. The government may not be able to pay its bills unless it has the authority to borrow money. A year ago we had projected surpluses. Now we have projected deficits. How did we get to this point? A response to terrorism? Yes. An economic slump that reduced tax receipts? Yes. And especially an ill advised tax cut last year which wiped out our surplus. To keep our government operating, Treasury had to borrow from Federal retirement accounts twice this year. Now the majority will increase the debt ceiling so it can continue to borrow from our Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

On October 24, 2001, the House first debated a tax bill that could have helped pay for this war on terrorism, and I stood here and urged this Congress to act responsibly. For the benefit of my colleagues who were not present at the time, let me repeat one thing. I want to quote from 1917 when Congress was considering how to pay for World War I, Ways and Means Chairman Claude Kitchen said, and I quote, "Your children and mine had nothing to do with bringing on this war. It would be unjust and cruel and cowardly to shift upon them the burden."

Our leaders in World War I and World War II knew that we had to pay for those wars and we could not risk our economic security. Further raising the national debt in the long term makes us vulnerable, which is exactly what the terrorists want, and we cannot let that happen. Now is our time to step up to the plate and prove that we too can be a great generation. Rather than standing tall in the face of the enemy, in this body, we slink away from its duties.

□ 1715

The majority lacks the backbone to pay for the war honestly. Instead, we are passing on the burden to those who are fighting, to those who are fighting the war and to their children. They have to pay more for interest on the debt in the future.

Few of us oppose the objectives in this bill. Quite frankly, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the appropriations people and my colleagues have done good work. They have addressed defense and homeland security and veterans' health, and I do not have but a few problems with the specifics, but I could be persuaded to support it if the majority leadership had allowed an open debate on the debt and raids of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

Please do not accuse anybody of being weak on terrorism. Do not accuse anybody of not supporting our valiant forces abroad. I support our troops and families. Unlike some here, I also supported the troops when they responded

in 1999 to another commander in chief's directive, April 28, rollcall 103. Some of my colleagues ought to check that. My support for our troops does not depend upon who send sits in the Oval Office, and we need to be honest with the military forces.

I am disappointed and I hope that we can get this majority to reconsider its actions.

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

I will not consume the entire 5 minutes. I know the committee would like to resume its work. Indeed, I came down here earlier to speak and the committee was taking action so I left, went back to my office, and I saw again a lot of what I would describe as political rhetoric.

One of the reasons why I do not buy anything you all say is where is your budget? Where is your budget? Why did not you produce a budget 2 months ago, 3 months ago? Where is your budget? You do not have a budget. How are you going to pay for the war? The troops are in the field. We have raided all of the accounts. We have got to replenish those accounts.

That is what the gentleman from Florida is trying to do in this supplemental. He is trying to put money back in for ammunition. They are out in the field and they have no weapons. They have no ability to continue to fight. We are trying to give the troops what they want.

We put all this in our budget. Where is your budget, I ask you? And then you come to this floor over and over and say you want a straight up-and-down vote on the debt ceiling. Are you saying you will vote for that? I want to ask you all that question. Can I interpret that to mean, if we give you a straight up-and-down vote, you will vote for an increase in the debt ceiling? That is baloney.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. No, I will not yield.

Ms. PELOSI. You were asking a question. You were challenging.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. You guys have been talking for 8 hours straight.

The CHAIRMAN. All Members will suspend.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Eight hours straight you have been talking.

The CHAIRMAN. All Members will suspend.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Now I have another question.

The CHAIRMAN. All Members will suspend. The Chair would like to remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

The Chair would further like to remind all Members that once a Member has indicated he or she does not intend to yield, Members should not continue to interrupt.

The time is controlled by the gentleman from Florida. He may proceed.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would pose another question to

my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

The Social Security trust fund, they keep bringing that issue up. Are they trying to say to our troops in the field they consider it more important that we do not raise the debt ceiling, that we do not use the Social Security surplus moneys than put the ammunition in their guns, that we give them the fuel that they need?

We all know what is going on.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so I can answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. You can get your own time.

We all know that under Lyndon Johnson we went under a unified budget. The gentleman from Iowa got up earlier and talked about how he was not here. I was not here either, but the reason I am here, the reason I left my medical practice is year after year, \$200 billion being borrowed after you raided the Social Security trust fund. We all know we have a unified budget. We all know that.

I will tell you what I think this is all about. I think this is all about wanting to spend more money. That is the way I interpret it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the gentleman from Florida but in my own way, if I could, during my 5 minutes.

I just wanted to say I have been here for 14 years. I came in 1988, and before that I was in the State legislature and I was a city councilman, and I was actually shocked when I came down here to see how much deficit spending went on. When we were in the city council, we were in the State legislature, we could not do deficit spending. We had to have a balanced budget every year. That is the way we operate.

And I want to say I was almost, I was actually proud of the fact that in those first 6 or 8 years that I was here, that I would see Republican Members of the House, some Democrats, too, but a lot of Republicans who would come down on the floor almost every night during special orders, during one-minutes in the morning and talk about how they had a problem with the deficit and how deficit spending was a bad thing for the country. And I remember some Members had a digital clock that I know would talk about how the deficit kept rising every day, billions of dollars, trillions of dollars. I do not see that anymore on the Republican side of the aisle. I do not see my Republican colleagues coming down here and worrying about the fact that we are \$100 billion indebted, now maybe as much as \$300 billion in debt this fiscal year.

All of the sudden, the concern on the part of the Republican party for the budget and the deficit and fiscal responsibility has almost disappeared from the floor of the House of Representatives, and I cannot believe how irresponsible you have been in the way you have proceeded.

The gentleman from Florida talked about a budget. If the gentleman listened to what the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) said, he said we want to sit down with my colleagues. We know that the situation has changed because of the war against terrorism. We are all very patriotic. I am not going to get into that because there is not anybody here who would not be out there serving their country or helping their country. We are all patriotic. That is not the issue.

The fact of the matter is that the Republican leadership in this House is no longer listening to the concern about the deficit, and where we are going with deficit spending. The Democrats are saying one simple thing here today. You put this tax cut into effect, and that is a big part of the reason why now we are going into a deficit, and it is not acceptable to us.

It is not acceptable to the American people to keep spending and running up this credit card debt and something has got to be done about it, and you cannot just come here in the last minute and sneak in this language about the debt ceiling and act as if it is not there. It is there and the reason it is there is because you realized that in order to continue this deficit spending you had to pass some resolution or some action that raises the deficit, raises the debt, raises the amount of credit card debt, so to speak.

So all we are saying is sit down with us, talk to us about the budget, acknowledge that the budget that you presented a few months ago is not realistic anymore because of the increasing amount of debt, and also acknowledge that if you continue along this path of deficit spending that you are going to dip into the Social Security trust fund, that you are going to dip into Medicare. We are not going to be able to do the things we want to do with prescription drugs, that we are not going to be able to do the education programs that the President talks about are so important, none of these things are going to be possible, rather than sit here and talk about who is patriotic. There is not anybody here who is not patriotic. There is not a soul on the floor of this House of Representatives, man or woman, who would not be willing to vote for this bill and for the funding for the war effort.

That is not the issue. The issue is the fact that the Republican leadership has reneged and forgotten its responsibility with regard to the Nation's finances, and we cannot keep running up this credit card debt, because if we do, we are not going to be able to fund Social Security, we are not going to be able to fund Medicare. We are not going to be able to do the educational programs that the President is so proud of. He is proud of it, but where is the money? It is not going to be there.

So let us have the opportunity to basically go back to the drawing board. Bring back a clean bill. Forget about this sneaky language on the debt ceiling. Let us have an up-or-down vote.

We are talking about the debt ceiling. Do not crowd it out with all the talk of the war effort. That is not the issue. We are all willing to spend the money for the war. That is not the issue.

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

Mr. Chairman, I represent over 40,000 Army soldiers at Fort Hood, the largest Army installation in our country. I care deeply, as do all members of this House, about supporting our troops, be they at home, serving our Nation, or be they abroad, or be they today in Afghanistan, and that is exactly why I am so offended by this rule and this process and what has happened to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, for those who have been confused by this debate, let me simply list what has happened.

Fact number one. Under the able leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the Committee on Appropriations, on which I sit, passed out quickly a bipartisan bill to fund the war against terrorism and provide for essential emergency homeland defense funding.

Then on Tuesday night of this week, the Committee on Rules, directed by the leadership of this House, took a bipartisan bill that was literally flying through this House for the right reasons and turned it into a partisan bill by adding late at night, behind closed doors, amendments that had absolutely nothing to do with fighting our war on terrorism.

Let us look at what is actually in the bill, because I have heard a great deal of discussion about if you want to support our soldiers and troops in the field, vote for this bill. Earlier I offered to yield time. No one took me up on this. I would be glad to reiterate that offer. I will yield time right now if any Member of the Republican majority can explain to me how section 1404 of this bill actually helps fund our war against terrorism.

In case my colleagues do not know what that section says, let me read it: Treatment of certain counties for purposes of reimbursement under the Medicare program. Reclassification of certain Pennsylvania counties, in Lackawanna, Luzerne, Wyoming, Lycoming and Columbia Counties, Pennsylvania, such counties are deemed to be located in the Newburgh, New York-Pennsylvania Metropolitan Statistical area.

I am sure that is very interesting. It may be important to the people of that area. However, can any Member of this House right now use my time to explain what this has to do with funding our troops in Afghanistan? I did not think so.

Well, let us go on in the next paragraph. In Mercer County, Pennsylvania, I am sure there are good people that live in Mercer County, Pennsylvania. This county is now deemed in this bill to be located in Youngstown-Warren, Ohio Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Can anybody in this House explain to me how rewriting geographical maps in Pennsylvania has anything whatsoever to do with funding our war on terrorism? Let us go on.

Well, we also do a little geographic rewriting in Orange County, New York in the same section. We make Orange County and Dutchess County, New York, part of the large urban area of New York, New York, for Medicare purposes.

I do not quite understand how this amendment, which was never debated by our Committee on Appropriations, has anything to do with funding our war against terrorism.

I question whether the real goal of funding our war against terrorism perhaps has been undermined by a much less important goal of supporting the reelection of certain Members of this House.

Regarding section 1405, I would be glad to yield time if one Member of this House can tell me how the amendments to the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, dealing with knit fabrics and woven fabrics, has anything to do with funding our war against terrorism.

I notice, Mr. Chairman, once again nobody in this House has chosen to explain to me what that has to do with homeland defense or war against terrorism. I am not trying to discredit the importance of knit fabrics versus woven fabrics, but I am not really sure we ought to slow down the funding of homeland defense programs and funding our war against terrorism to get into a debate over the Caribbean initiative.

Mr. Chairman, this is politics as usual. The unrelated provision added by the Rules Committee, including a massive \$750 billion increase in the national debt ceiling, should be deleted from this bill so we can quickly fulfill our responsibility to provide emergency funding for our war against terrorism and for homeland defense.

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

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, what we do have is \$15.7 billion for DOD. That is \$1.7 billion over the President's request. If the gentleman is suggesting that supplemental appropriations bills that come to this floor should never be passed if they have anything extraneous, then he is suggesting something that is very unrealistic, and my recommendation is that if the gentleman looks through this, and we have got money, \$7.2 billion for ongoing military operational costs, \$4.3 billion for personnel costs, \$500 million.

Mr. EDWARDS. Absolutely. And reclaiming my time, that is exactly why the bill passed so quickly through the House before these extraneous partisan amendments were added late at night in a secret meeting of the Committee on Rules.

□ 1730

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, some of my colleagues on the other

side, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), who is standing back there, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and I think the majority of the Democrats are just as tough in fighting for the defense of this country as most of us.

I am a veteran, and I want to tell my colleagues something. Using our military as White House waiters, to me, is not patriotic. Putting them in harm's way, our rangers in Somalia, and not giving them the tools that they need, and we saw Black Hawk Down, is not. And I would tell my colleagues on the other side, I feel the same way about our Marines that were left in Lebanon that were hurt. To me, that was not patriotic either, and that was under a Republican administration.

It is not patriotic to me to cut veterans' COLAs and military COLAs for those families that fight for us and have to move all over the country. But yet in 1993, the Democrats controlled the White House, the House, and the Senate, and they did just that.

I heard my colleagues talk about, well, in 1993, we had a program, an economic stimulus package, and not a single Republican voted for it. Absolutely right. Why? Because in that bill they cut military COLAs. They cut veterans COLAs. Talk about Social Security, my colleagues increased the tax on Social Security. That is a fact. And all the leadership that is standing up here today and talking about raiding the Social Security trust fund, when the Democrats had control of both bodies and the White House, they raided every dime out of the Social Security trust fund and had a \$300 billion debt, plus increased spending.

We inherited nearly a \$5 trillion, a billion dollars a day on just nearly the interest. And has the debt gone up? Absolutely. It is kind of hard to pay off \$360 billion every year that accrues, and then interest on that.

Then I heard my colleagues say, well, under their leadership there was a surplus. Not one of President Clinton's economic plans passed this House with a Republican majority. Not one. And matter of fact, we restored the veterans' COLAs. We reinstated the military COLAs. President Clinton's gutting of veterans' health care we put back in. We increased it. And we increased the defense of this country, and I would say with bipartisan support with my colleagues on the committees.

But when we look at or talk about the Social Security trust fund, it took me months to collect, and I have a document that I am going to bring to the floor, it is about that thick, it is every single time the Democrat leadership voted to take and steal every dime out of the Social Security trust fund. So when my colleagues talk about it, be careful, because we will point out every single time the Democrats voted to steal the money out of the Social Security trust fund.

Now, was it bad? Not necessarily. Because our country is at war, and there

are debts to pay. But do not demagogue here for political reasons and say that we are raising the debt to raid the Social Security trust fund when, in fact, my Democrat colleagues stole the money. We came up with a lockbox. The gentleman in the other body, who I cannot mention on the floor, threatened to filibuster for a Social Security lockbox. We had to fight that.

We had to fight welfare reform on this floor with many of my colleagues. And I will say that there are many of the people on the other side of the aisle here that vote consistently against defense bills, that vote against intelligence bills, that bring amendments to the floor to gut military and intelligence every single year. To me, that is not very patriotic, my colleagues.

Our military today, our kids, are hurting. We are trying to make up over a \$250 billion deficit that was built up from 127 deployments: Haiti, Somalia, Bosnia. Billions of dollars. Kosovo. We flew 86 percent of the missions in Kosovo. We paid for 90 percent of that bill. That is wrong. Because who ends up paying for that? We were only keeping in 22 percent of our military under President Clinton because they were so abused in our equipment. We can do better. We can pass this bill, and we can fight for our military.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. All Members are reminded not to make improper references to the Senate during floor consideration.

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

Mr. Chairman, this weekend we will celebrate Memorial Day, a day to honor our Nation's war heroes. This holiday began during the Civil War, my colleagues, when the women, and many of them widows and daughters of those who fought in the Civil War, made a decision to decorate the graves of soldiers from both North and South, regardless of the side on which they fought, to decorate their graves. It was for many, many years, decades, known as Decoration Day. The act of reconciliation between the North and South that these women initiated is something that is carried on in a tradition to this day. Today, we call it Memorial Day, and it is something that we are very, very proud of.

Many young women are in harm's way today as we speak so that the democratic process can flourish in the world, certainly in our country, and to begin to emerge in Afghanistan.

As the senior Democrat on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I know full well, as I know we all know in the body, Democrat and Republican alike, that we must make the necessary investments to protect Americans in the Armed Forces and to protect our country. I do not think there is any doubt of that, and I do not think anyone questions the wholehearted commitment of every person in this body to do that.

We all agree, Mr. Chairman, that additional resources are needed to meet

our Nation's defense and homeland security needs. We all support that, Democrats and Republicans alike. I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, on which I am proud to serve, for his great leadership and the manner in which he conducts the work of our committee. And I want to also commend the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for working closely with Chairman Young. They both worked to bring this bipartisan product to the floor.

We had hoped that the priorities that were spelled out in the Committee on Appropriations to meet the necessities of force protection, homeland security, and helping to meet the needs of those who suffered as a result of September 11 would not be a matter of any controversy whatsoever. That is why it was so sad to see the leadership of the Republican Party in this House desecrate, desecrate this important piece of legislation which was committed to protecting our forces, protecting our homeland and helping those, as I said, affected by September 11. This is an act of desecration when we should be acting in a manner to honor those who serve us and those who have suffered.

We all support the President in the war on terrorism. We have been united with him, shoulder to shoulder, since September 11 to that end. But we do not support and cannot support the shameful tactics of the Republican majority to prevent debate and limit democracy. Instead of proposing a bill to meet our legitimate needs to fight terrorism in a fiscally responsible way, the Republican majority has sneaked the second largest increase in the debt limit in this Nation's history without a vote on any debate.

I wonder how they thought that they could get away with such a thing, or why they thought it was even appropriate. As the majority party in the House of Representatives, in the Capital of the United States, a model for the rest of the world, why did they think it would be a good idea and okay to sneak the second largest increase in the debt limit in history in a stealth manner, not even to be voted on on the floor, bypassing the democratic process?

And the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means shed some light on that earlier. He came to this floor and he said, in essence, how can we expect to vote on every single item, every single piece of legislative business? We do not have time. It would be ridiculous to think that we would have the time to vote on every single little item. Well, we think differently about protecting Social Security for America's seniors. We do indeed.

I did not know we thought as differently until I heard it expressed and Social Security trivialized as just another legislative item that we do not really have time to debate or to vote on separately. That was very enlight-

ening. And I think it probably points out the difference between the Democrats and the Republicans.

We think Social Security is important. We will vote to protect it. We would like to do so in a democratic way. And I am so sad and disappointed that the Republican majority would desecrate this important piece of legislation by undermining Social Security to give a tax break to the wealthiest Americans.

Mr. Chairman, the Republicans are hiding this plan from the American people. They are hoping to take the money and run, without letting the public know their intentions.

Make no mistake about it. They are voting today to authorize taking \$750 billion out of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds to pay for other programs.

When you review the Republican proposal, you have to wonder: what happened to all the budget deficit hawks on the Republican side? Have they become an endangered species? Indeed, I think they have become extinct.

Today, without telling anyone, those same Republicans are requesting the second largest increase in the debt limit in our Nation's history to continue their raid on Social Security and Medicare.

We must have an up or down vote on their stealth plan to mortgage our children's future.

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

Mr. Chairman, so much has been said on this floor about Social Security that I think somebody has to get up and get the record straight.

There have been errors made on both sides, but particularly on the minority side, when they refer to this bill in any way jeopardizing Social Security for our seniors. It is more and more of the same old thing: scare our seniors, scare our seniors.

Let me give an example which I think absolutely shows 100 percent that this particular bill in no way endangers Social Security. To begin with, we hear time and time again on this floor that the Republicans are raiding the Social Security trust fund. Mr. Chairman, there is no money in the Social Security trust fund. There are only Treasury bills.

The way the Social Security System works is the money that comes into Social Security that is not used to pay benefits goes into the general fund, which is called the surplus, and is replaced in the trust fund with Treasury bills. So anyone getting up and making this statement, it is a great statement to make from a political standpoint, but from a factual standpoint it simply is not true. It is not true.

I ask this question of my Democrat friends: In all of the years, the 40-some years they were in charge of this House, and they had deficit spending as far as the eye could see, and I have looked at the chart up there and it shows all the Presidencies that the Democrats keep putting up, during those periods of time, those were Democrat-controlled Congresses. In most of those cases, on both sides, the Senate and the House, those were Democrat-

But no President has ever spent one dime that was not specifically appropriated right here in the House of Representatives. That is a fact.

So when we start talking about the deficits and we start trying to recreate history, let us look at the real facts.

Now, the question comes up, in all of those years did the Democrats raid the Social Security trust fund? No. Did they spend the Social Security surplus? Yes. In part of this are we going to be looking to spend Social Security surplus? Probably so. But that does not in any way endanger Social Security. It simply delays the paying down of the national debt.

Now, when did we finally balance the budget in this House? We balanced the budget after the Republicans took control. That is a simple thing and we cannot rewrite the history. The history is very, very clear.

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

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

□ 1745

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for getting up and making this statement. I think the rhetoric here has been inaccurate on both sides of the aisle. A gentleman from California on your side of the aisle just got up a few minutes ago and said that Democrats were stealing the money out of the Social Security trust fund when the Democrats controlled the House. The gentleman from Florida, Mr. SHAW has explained this in a way that I think is accurate for the American people. I do not think any of us should be in the business of trying to misinform senior citizens. I do not think it works. I think senior citizens are smart enough to know that it is not accurate. We ought to be honest about how Social Security is funded amongst ourselves and in the debate on the floor. I commend the gentleman for his willingness to correct the record.

Mr. SHAW. I thank the gentleman for those comments. I again would like to repeat what Chairman YOUNG said and I think he said it so eloquently: We are fighting our war. We were attacked.

This is a time of emergency. If we have to spend some of the Social Security surplus, so be it, but we are not spending one dime of the Social Security trust fund. The Social Security trust fund is secure. The FICA taxes are going to be there to pay every benefit through 2017. The retirees and the disabled in this country have the first call on the Social Security money that comes into the trust fund. Let us get an even and balanced argument here. And for God's sake, why does every Member in this House, in this Chamber, not spend a little time and figure out and learn how the Social Security system works in this country and also recognize the fact that we are looking at a \$25 trillion deficit in Social Security if we do not move together in a bi-

partisan way to reform Social Security. My door is open. As soon as we get any cooperation or see any cooperation from the other side of the aisle, or the other side of this Capitol, we will move and we will save Social Security for our kids and our grandkids. That is important. That is key. But right now we have an emergency, we have been attacked, and this country must react and we must react in a bipartisan way.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the war supplemental.

Some do not remember history, but we do. The gentlewoman from California, for instance, Mr. Chairman, just stood up and said that Memorial Day began during the Civil War. It certainly did not. It actually was the product of an order issued by General John Logan on May 5, 1868. A minor mistake. One of the Democrat Members who spoke today actually came to the floor and said that Memorial Day was a day established in 1916 where we remember veterans in service of our country. An honest mistake, Mr. Chairman. I would not deign to embarrass a colleague by saying who made the error between Memorial Day and Veterans Day. The truth is that in life, some remember history and others do not.

I think that frames very well the arguments that we have heard on this blue carpet today, Mr. Chairman, because while some on the other side do not remember history, we do. And it is my conviction that the overwhelming majority of the American people who join us today do as well.

They argue, for instance, of great anxiety, even using terms like desecration of this war supplemental bill, suggesting that our efforts to meet all of the obligations of the United States of America with full faith and credit by allowing a discussion in the conference committee about debt limit is a desecration of this bill. The gentlewoman again from California says she has no idea where this approach came from. It used to be called the Gephardt rule, and I know the distinguished minority leader is on the floor at this moment. It was in September of 1979 that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) developed a rule which allowed the Democrats to increase the debt limit virtually automatically whenever they went into red ink overspending the taxpayers' money. And we are to be denounced and accused of desecration by those who created a rule to do surreptitiously what we choose to do in the light of day?

Some do not remember history, Mr. Chairman, but we do. They argue that we are about the business of overspending in this bill. We hear laments on the floor from Democrat colleagues who are worried that conservatives like me have lost our commitment to fiscal restraint. Mr. Chairman, I am astonished by that comment, because I spent a lot of time on the floor in

March of 2002 as one Democrat colleague after another came to the floor to explain how much more money needed to be added to our budget resolution. And our effort to deem that budget, to live within the confines of that budget during this time of war, is now being ridiculed as excessive spending by those who wanted to make that budget much, much larger. Some do not remember history, but we do.

And they argue, of course, as I just heard from the gentleman from Florida and my colleague, they argue that by fulfilling our commitments to the veterans that are in the field, the soldiers in the field that are fighting this war on terrorism, both abroad and at home, that we raid Social Security, when we remember, Mr. Chairman, that it was in the 1960s when a Democrat administration decided to borrow from the Social Security trust fund to finance a war. The only distinction there, Mr. Chairman, is they did not stop for 40 years. Long after the Vietnam War was history, the practice of raiding the Social Security trust fund was the practice of a Democrat Congress. Some do not remember history, but we do.

Mr. Chairman, I would offer to you as we continue this debate and its vitriol that I am a guy that believes it is possible to disagree without being disagreeable, but I believe that it is our obligation to speak honestly and candidly on this floor about the issues that we face. The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that they have no budget, they simply have criticisms of our effort to meet the needs of our soldiers, to meet the needs of homeland security and to move legislation forward that will make our country distinctly safer and bolster the confidence of the American people as we go forward in these uncertain days.

It is of them that I close, Mr. Chairman. You see, I know that the majority of the American people know what Memorial Day is about. They also know what a big tax-and-spend liberal Democrat Congress would be all about if they were in charge. They may not remember history, but the American people do.

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

Mr. Chairman, we do not have the luxury of time today. We do not have the time to divert the vitally needed national security enhancements in this bill by taking a dangerous detour into a thicket of secondary issues that have no direct bearing on our urgent need to secure our country and defeat our enemies. We cannot afford to drag out the relief in this bill to serve an unstated political agenda that seeks advantage at the very expense of swift assistance. The people defending America do not deserve a legislative IOU today. They deserve timely action.

On the eve of Memorial Day, this House should not abdicate our mission by dragging out the urgent relief in this bill for our military, our homeland security and our hard-pressed intelligence agencies. As we all know, we

have taken great strides since September 11 to enhance our ability to detect, defeat and destroy the international terror networks. We have strengthened our homeland security. We have empowered our military commanders to secure victory. And we are moving aggressively to understand all the lessons from the terror attacks. But we also know that our job is far from over.

Our country has serious ongoing liabilities that we address through the relief in this bill. We cover the cost of our operations in Afghanistan and the call-up of Reserve and National Guard troops. We provide almost a half a billion dollars to firm up our coalition. We speed the elimination of unneeded chemical weapons. We supply the spare parts and replace the high tech munitions that our military needs to keep its edge, and we meet pressing needs for our special operations forces.

On the domestic front, we give the FBI the sophisticated technology systems that they need to coordinate and manage the flow of information. Clearly this improvement is urgently needed. We send resources to the INS to identify those people that are breaking the law by illegally overstaying their visas. We secure our airports with over a billion dollars in assistance to help detect bombs hidden in baggage. We provide substantial funding to harden our nuclear weapons facilities. In addition, we help the Secret Service build partnerships with sophisticated high tech firms to uncover terror's electronic footprints. And we also boost our intelligence capacity by sending the CIA and other agencies substantial resources to win the war on terror.

Today, Democrats, who we are asked to believe are motivated by a newfound passion of fiscal restraint, walked out on our work to provide the resources to improve our national security. They retreated from our responsibility to put politics aside when the time comes to strengthen our country. This campaign of jockeying for domestic political advantages while delaying swift action on our need to send these resources is beneath contempt. It is cut from the same shoddy cloth as the shameful campaign to sow doubt about the President's commitment to protecting the American people.

Following decade after decade of deficit spending when they held the majority, the idea that Democrats could now credibly lecture Republicans on the virtues of fiscal discipline just will not hold water. Their counterfeit fiscal discipline could be the most garish and grotesque case of ideological cross-dressing in the history of American politics.

House Republicans brought fiscal discipline back to Washington. We are the ones who balanced the budget. We cut taxes every year that we have been the majority party. We paid down over \$450 billion in debt on our children. And despite the war and the recession, we are still committed to holding the line on

spending. We are the true party of fiscal discipline.

Under our budget, we are going to pay down another \$180 billion on the debt. And once our economy gains a head of steam, we will pay down much more than that. If Democrats were truly concerned about fiscal discipline, why were they AWOL in March when House Republicans passed our budget by ourselves? They could not even offer a budget, because they did not want to divulge the taxes they are planning to raise or the security spending they are likely to slash.

In time of war, we cannot dawdle around in carrying out our constitutional obligations. This bill carries critical resources to defeat the enemies of freedom and we ought to put them to work today. Anyone who leaves town wondering how deep the Democrats' commitment to fiscal discipline actually runs should consider one salient fact: The House passed the President's budget over 2 months ago, but the Senate has not acted yet. They have not passed a budget.

Pass this bill and let us go home.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have just heard the most bizarre rewriting of fiscal history that I have heard on that side of the aisle in at least the last 5 minutes. Let me try to bring us back to reality and recite what the true record of fiscal discipline has been over the past 25 years.

Up until Ronald Reagan walked into the White House, we never had a deficit larger than \$73 billion. Then Ronald Reagan introduced in the Congress the David Stockman wonder bus budget and somehow we were supposed to be able to double military spending, cut taxes by huge amounts, especially for those at the top end of the scale, and we were told that would finally produce balanced budgets. Instead, the deficits quadrupled. The national debt rose from less than \$1 trillion to over \$3 trillion. So much for Republican fiscal discipline in the 1980s.

We then had an initial effort by the father of the existing President to try to get those deficits under control. He took the first needed steps in order to reduce the rate of increase of the Federal deficit. I congratulate him for his efforts. But that only got us to the point where the size of the deficits were slowing in their rate of increase. It did not turn them downward.

So then Bill Clinton was elected and he proposed a series of economic and fiscal measures to the Congress and over time, over a period of 8 months, we were able to put together the votes to enact that package.

□ 1800

We did so without the vote of a single Republican in either House. Not a single Republican Senator or House Member voted for that package. We were told by Mr. Gingrich, your Speaker, we were told by the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. ARMEY), your floor leader, that it would lead to a massive recession and job loss. Instead, just the opposite. We had the longest period of sustained prosperity in the post-war period in this country.

But it cost us, because we had to do unpopular things, and because of that we were attacked by your side, unmercifully so, and we lost our majority. But in the process of losing our majority in this House we were able to put this country back on a sound financial footing, and not a single Democrat on this side regrets that.

Mr. Clinton was succeeded by Mr. Bush, and within 1 year you blew it. You imposed tax cuts that over the next 20 years are going to result in \$7 trillion of lost revenue to the Federal Treasury. Then you wonder why we are not going to have enough money in the till to pay down the debt so we can prepare ourselves for the day when the baby-boomers retire and we are going to need to shell out huge amounts under Social Security.

So now, after you did that and after you committed us to massive future tax cuts, you now see that we are facing potentially \$300 billion deficits again, and at least half of those deficits are caused by your tax action. So now you come in here and try to sneak through the place a fancy two-stepper, which will enable you to raise the national debt, raise the national credit card limit, by \$750 billion, so you can continue to pay off your rich friends with their tax cuts.

That is what this fight is all about. We are resisting that because we care about the future of this country and we are dedicated to fiscal responsibility. No Democrat after the 1980s under Ronald Reagan, the free-lunch-era, no Democrat in either House has to take any lectures from the Republican Party leadership, most especially the gentleman who just talked, about fiscal responsibility. That gentleman himself added an amendment to the bill which added \$200 million to the cost of the bill.

So I would say: End of history rewrite! Bring us back to reality. You know what the truth is. Every person in this Chamber does.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not use the 5 minutes. I have listened for the last day, day and a half, to the arguments on this floor, the finger-pointing and the charges that have gone back and forth. "They are more fiscally irresponsible." "No, they started before." "They want to raise the debt ceiling." "They did it before."

We have raided the trust fund, and they did it before that. It is back and forth with these charges. None of this has been very productive to the legislation that is before us tonight. None of it is productive at all.

We all acknowledge that this Nation is at war against terrorism, and we all acknowledge this supplemental appropriation is needed. We all acknowledge

that our troops in the field need to have this done.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of substantive and real amendments to be considered to this bill that are relevant to the war on terrorism, that are relevant to American foreign policy, and I would just say to my colleagues, I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I would hope we could allow this debate to move forward, that we could allow the Clerk to read.

We had started, made a good and honest effort a few minutes ago, to get a start on that. I would hope that we could move forward, begin to read and consider some of the amendments for which there is a legitimate reason for us to debate and consider these amendments that are part of this bill. I say that with all due respect to my good friend on the other side and all of my friends on both sides of the aisle who have very deep feelings about this legislation and the things that were added to it.

I am part of a very tiny minority on this side of the aisle that did not support the rule yesterday. But this is where we are at. This is the bill we have got. It is an important bill, and there are important amendments, and I just hope that this body can now proceed with actually considering some of these so that the American people and our American soldiers, men and women in uniform, will know that we are dealing with the business at hand that affects them in fighting this war on terrorism.

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

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman, and I am perfectly willing to ask people on my side of the aisle to withhold their comments so that we can get to additional amendments, if the same thing would happen on that side.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am making that plea to people on my side of the aisle as well, that we do that and move forward here, I hope, with reading the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force", \$99,800,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That \$39,000,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for \$39,000,000, 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.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-

Wide", \$72,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That \$20,000,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for \$20,000,000, 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.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 301. (a) The appropriation under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy" in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 (Public Law 107-117) is amended by adding the following proviso immediately after "September 30, 2003": "*Provided*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph which are available for the V-22 may be used to meet unique requirements of the Special Operations Forces". (b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective as if enacted as part of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 302. During the current fiscal year, amounts in or credited to the Defense Cooperation Account under 10 U.S.C. 2608(b) shall be available for transfer, obligation and expenditure, consistent with the purposes for which such amounts were contributed and accepted, by the Secretary of Defense to such appropriations or funds of the Department of Defense as the Secretary shall determine, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and the same time period as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall provide written notification to the congressional defense committees 30 days prior to such transfer: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall report to the Congress quarterly all transfers made pursuant to this authority.

SEC. 303. During fiscal year 2002, the President may continue to provide assistance to Russia under cooperative threat reduction programs and under title V of the Freedom Support Act (Public Law 102-511; 106 Stat. 3338) without regard to the certification requirements in section 1203(d) of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 (22 U.S.C. 5952 (d)) and section 502 of the Freedom Support Act (22 U.S.C. 5852) if the President submits to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate a certification that providing such assistance is vital to the national security interests of the United States.

SEC. 304. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414): *Provided*, That any funds appropriated or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for agent operations or covert action programs authorized by the President under section 503 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, shall remain available until September 30, 2003.

SEC. 305. Section 8005 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 (division A

of Public Law 107-117; 115 Stat. 2247), is amended by striking "May 1, 2002" before the period at the end and inserting "June 15, 2002".

SEC. 306. (a) Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2002 for operation and maintenance under the heading "Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army", may be used to pay for additional costs of international inspectors from the Technical Secretariat of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, pursuant to Articles IV and V of the Chemical Weapons Convention, for inspections and monitoring of Department of Defense sites and commercial sites that perform services under contract to the Department of Defense, resulting from the Department of Defense's program to accelerate its chemical demilitarization schedule.

(b) Expenses which may be paid under subsection (a) include—

(1) salary costs for performance of inspection and monitoring duties;

(2) travel, including travel to and from the point of entry into the United States and internal United States travel;

(3) per diem, not to exceed United Nations rates and in compliance with United Nations conditions for per diem for that organization; and

(4) expenses for operation and maintenance of inspection and monitoring equipment.

SEC. 307. (a) In fiscal year 2002, funds available to the Department of Defense for assistance to the Government of Colombia shall be available to support a unified campaign against narcotics trafficking, against activities by organizations designated as terrorist organizations such as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), and the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), and to take actions to protect human health and welfare in emergency circumstances, including undertaking rescue operations.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered at this time..

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. MCGOVERN:

In section 307 (relating to Department of Defense assistance to Colombia), strike "to support a unified campaign against narcotics trafficking, against activities by organizations designated as terrorist organizations such as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), and the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), and".

In section 601 (relating to Department of State assistance to Colombia), strike "to support a unified campaign against narcotics trafficking, against activities by organizations designated as terrorist organizations such as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), and the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), and".

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to considering the amendment at this point in the bill?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to make a point of order against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona reserves a point of order.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I will not make a point of order against the

amendment. I simply want to say while I oppose the substance of the amendment and a point of order could be made because it considers 2 separate provisions, I will not object to that so that we can have the debate at this time on the entire issue, a very important issue, and that is the issue of the war on terrorism in Colombia and our Plan Colombia down there.

So I withdraw my reservation, and I am pleased to proceed with the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the amendment being considered at this point in the bill.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to discuss a critical issue of American foreign policy. Tucked quietly into this supplemental is language that will significantly increase United States involvement in the civil war in Colombia. Along with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), I am offering an amendment to strike that troubling and dangerous language and restore some common sense to our Colombia policy.

The supplemental bill expands our role in Colombia beyond counter-narcotics and into counterterrorism. The problem is that in Colombia, counterterrorism means counter-insurgency.

In short, Mr. Chairman, if the Colombia language in the supplemental survives, the United States will be plunging head first into a grinding, violent and deepening civil war that has plagued Colombia for nearly 4 decades. This House should think long and hard before it gives a green light to such a momentous shift in our policy.

For the past several years, the U.S. has invested billions of dollars into counternarcotics efforts in Colombia. It is difficult to argue that our investment has paid any dividends. Indeed, since the inception of Plan Colombia, coca production in that country has actually increased by 25 percent.

Now, having said that, our amendment will not affect our funding for counternarcotics. In addition, our amendment protects language in the supplemental that allows U.S. resources to be used for humanitarian assistance, including rescue operations.

Two weeks ago, this House unwisely voted to grant the Secretary of Defense the ability to waive the cap on the number of U.S. military personnel in Colombia. When you add it all up, increased U.S. troops plus increased involvement in the civil war equals bad policy. But that is the door that this bill will open.

The majority of U.S. aid to Colombia goes to the Colombian military, a military with an abysmal human rights record, a military that continues to maintain ties to paramilitary groups that are listed on the State Department terrorist list. I do not believe

that American taxpayer dollars should be used to fund an institution like that, and I certainly do not believe that we should expand American resources beyond fighting drugs and into fighting guerrillas.

Mr. Chairman, I am also deeply troubled by the timing of this Colombia language. On Sunday, Colombians will go to the polls to elect a new president. Polls show that the winner of that election will be Alvaro Uribe. Mr. Uribe has based his campaign on a promise to expand the civil war, and there are widespread indications that the violent right-wing paramilitaries that are responsible for so many of the human rights abuses in Colombia are actually supporting the Uribe campaign.

Now, I believe it would be a huge mistake to pledge additional U.S. troops and resources to the Colombian government before we see what the Uribe government will look like. Indeed, if Colombia decides to increase its own investment in fighting its civil war, it would be a dramatic shift. Right now Colombia spends less than 2 percent of its GDP on the war effort. People with high school diplomas are exempted from serving in combat roles, leaving the dirty work to the poor and uneducated. Our troops and our resources are simply too precious to be used as proxies in Colombia's civil war. If American personnel are not targets now because of our counternarcotic efforts, you will be sure they will be targets when we pick sides against the guerilla force of over 20,000 well-armed fighters.

Mr. Chairman, we all support the efforts to combat the kind of global terrorism that threatens our interests and people. We all support the campaign to dismantle al Qaeda. But Colombia is not Afghanistan. It is the site of a terrible, terrible civil war. Kidnapping and other homegrown acts of terrorism have been part of this war since the very beginning and used by all sides. There is no new war on terrorism to be waged in Colombia, there is only more of the same.

Mr. Chairman, what is our plan? How many U.S. troops? How much money? What is the end game? Colombia is a huge country, three times the size of Montana, 53 times the size of El Salvador. It is a hideously complex place with widespread poverty and social unrest.

Mr. Chairman, this is a defining moment. Getting directly involved in Colombia's civil war is a mistake, plain and simple. Let us demonstrate the good sense to think long and hard before we plunge ahead.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the McGovern-Skelton amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. Let me begin by saying what the amendment does. It strikes 2 provisions, and the reason we agreed to the unanimous consent is because it strikes one section dealing

with the Defense Department and one much later dealing with the State Department, so a point of order could have been made against this amendment. The McGovern amendment strikes the same language both in Defense and in the State Department chapters that permits the administration to allow U.S. assistance for Colombia to be used in a war against terrorism, not just simply against narco-trafficking.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by observing that this amendment does undermine a bipartisan compromise that this committee worked very hard to obtain regarding broadened authority for U.S. assistance in Colombia. Similar language with a good deal more conditions is also contained in the Senate bill, so this amendment would negate not only a bipartisan, but a bicameral agreement that has been reached.

The amendment would preclude the U.S. from supporting Colombia's counterterrorism efforts. When the Clinton administration began to seek support for Plan Colombia from Congress about 3 years ago, 1 argument was that the revenues from the narcotics industry were increasing the ability of the FARC, the ELN and the AUC, the guerrilla groups and the terrorist groups that operate in Colombia, to destabilize Colombia.

Now, 3 years later, with Plan Colombia under way, the groups are, unfortunately, stronger than ever, eradication has not kept up with new plantings, and Colombia is facing a more unstable future than it was before. It is time for a change in American policy.

The existing authorities to spend U.S. assistance are narrowly written, too narrowly written, to allow U.S. assets and U.S. trained forces only to be used in counternarcotics activities. I have been to Colombia twice since Plan Colombia was approved, and to me it is patently obvious that we are operating with restrictions that are much too narrow.

□ 1815

The lines between counternarcotics and counterterrorism are not clear anymore; I do not think they ever were. They are certainly not clear today. In today's environment, with terrorists attacking the U.S. and U.S. citizens abroad, this imaginary line between counternarcotics and counterterrorism ought not to be maintained.

With many of my colleagues, I tried to convince the administration a few months ago that by not approaching Congress to clarify the authorities under which the U.S. would provide assistance, they would jeopardize congressional support for U.S. assistance to Colombia. This came after the Colombian Government, President Pastrana, had announced that they were abandoning their plans to try to achieve peace because the many attempts to negotiate with the guerrillas

had come to naught, and they were going to pursue a military response. And I urged this administration, that if they were going to change U.S. policy, they should come and seek that approval from Congress, and that is exactly what they have done. This is a counterterrorism supplemental, and I commend the administration for requesting in the supplemental the language that we have in it today to allow counternarcotics assets to be used to fight terrorism.

Starting with the President's request, the committee arrived at a bipartisan compromise. And let me tell my colleagues a couple of things it does not do. The bill language does not extend through 2003, which was requested by the President. We are going to get into a markup of the 2003 appropriations bills in not too many weeks, so we decided to address 2003 in the fiscal year 2003, as I think we ought to. We have included report language that states our intent to use this bipartisan approach in the fiscal year 2003 bill, so we are making clear we probably will do so; and we can have this debate again in a few months if we need to have it, and that debate will take place after the elections and perhaps even after the inauguration of the new President. We want to see what the new Colombian administration will do after it is inaugurated in August.

Further, the committee deletes the broad "notwithstanding any other provision of law" provision, which was requested by the President. It was the conclusion by the committee that the authority is simply not needed by the Department of State at this time, given the existing authorities within the international narcotics and law enforcement account. And all existing human rights provisions, the caps on U.S. personnel in Colombia and the prohibitions on visas to individuals with terrorist links, are maintained.

With these conditions in place, with no large increase in the resources requested or provided to the Colombian military, this change in policy is not a major expansion of the U.S. role in Colombia's civil strife. It is a realistic approach to the situation in Colombia to combat terrorists using existing assets.

The Subcommittee on Foreign Operations had a hearing on U.S. assistance for Colombia in March. At that hearing the Under Secretary of State said on the record that the broader use of authorities would primarily make available U.S.-owned helicopters for counterterrorism purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this body to retain the compromise language that is in this bill that has been reached on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the Capitol building.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGovern-Skelton amendment. I am surprised that the gentleman from Arizona omitted a bit of history, because American troops were sent initially to

Colombia and a line was drawn and it was drawn to provide training in anti-drug activities only. This is a major step. This is a Gulf of Tonkin amendment that is in the bill that we seek to strike.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I speak today having recalled on so many occasions within the Committee on Armed Services and here on the floor, pointing out the fact that our troops are stretched, they are strained, their families are paying a severe sacrifice on their loved ones being gone so much, and that we have to increase the number of troops that we have. So with that in mind, I think that what is in the bill needs to be stricken. The implication is clear, that American servicemembers would become engaged in a broadened United States military effort in Colombia.

My concerns with the bill are several. Expanded American military activities will embroil us in a civil war that has been raging for 40 years. This is no small thing, as the gentleman from Arizona pointed out. This is a major policy change. We could find ourselves engulfed in a morass that would eat up American soldiers like we have not seen in years.

Second, and perhaps the most important, is that our military personnel are performing more overseas missions today than ever. In just the past several months, our forces have been deployed to the Philippines, to Yemen, to Georgia, in addition to the major operations in Afghanistan, Bosnia and Kosovo, not to mention Korea, not to mention the young men and women aboard ships on the seas. If the administration follows through with its plans to invade Iraq, invade Iraq, we simply will not have enough people to perform the missions, at least not to perform them very well.

So we should carefully weigh the consequences before undertaking expanding missions in places like Colombia. The administration has simply not made the case for this expansion of our role. It is well known that the Colombian law allows wealthy and educated youth to avoid military combat. Their own sons are not sent out to fight the insurgents, but American sons can do it. I do not think that is a good policy for the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, expanding the drug program in Colombia to include terrorist activities is inviting war in Colombia. It runs the risk of embroiling us in an intractable civil war at a time when our military is stretched already. A vote for this amendment is the right policy for Colombia.

The bill says that the Department of Defense funds can be used for a unified campaign. That is a magic phrase. That means, as I interpret it, that it is a license to change the rules of engagement for our troops that allows them to engage in combat or war. If this bill is adopted without this amendment, we could be embroiled in a no-kidding shooting war; and we will know that this is a Gulf of Tonkin effort that we

have passed, unless this amendment prevails.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment, and I compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for bringing this to us. There has been a lot of discussion in the last 2 days, a lot about the deficit; and it strikes me as a bit of an irony, especially because it comes from many, and I have to say on both sides of the aisle, that do a lot to raise the national debt and the spending, and yet the debate went on and on. For some reason, I think there has been a lot of politics in the debate.

The interesting thing about what is going on right now, there is no politics in this. This is about war, and this is important, and this is about policy. It is said that we would like to get things like this through without a full discussion; but this, to me, is a key issue. This amendment is about whether or not we will change our policy in central America and, specifically, in Colombia.

Mr. Chairman, a year or so ago we appropriated \$1.6 billion, and we went into Colombia with the intent of reducing drug usage. Instead it is up 25 percent. Drug usage is going up! They sprayed 210,000 acres, and now there are 53,000 more acres than ever before. It reminds me of Afghanistan. We have been in Afghanistan for less than a year and drug production is going up! I just wonder about the effectiveness of our drug program in Colombia.

But the theory is that we will be more effective if we change the policy. Pastrana tried to negotiate a peace and we were going to deal with the drugs, and we were going to have peace after 40 years of a civil war. Now Uribe is likely to become President and the approach is to different. He said, no more negotiations. We will be fighting and we want American help, and we want a change in policy, and we do not want spraying fields; we want helicopters to fight a war. That is what we are dealing with here. We should not let this go by without a full discussion and a full understanding, because in reality, there is no authority to support a military operation in Colombia.

What we are doing is we are appropriating for something for the administration to do without a proper authority. He has no authority to get involved in the civil war down there. We cannot imply that the issue of war is granted through the appropriation process. It is not the way the system works. The constitutional system works with granting explicit authority to wage war. The President has no authority, and now he wants the money; and we are ready to capitulate. Let me tell my colleagues, if we care about national defense, we must reconsider this.

This dilutes our national defense, it dilutes our forces, exposes our troops, takes away our weapons, increases the expenditures. If we ignore this issue I guess we can go back to demagoging the national debt limit.

So I would say, please, take a close look at this. We do not need to be expanding our role in Colombia. The drug war down there has not worked, and I do not expect this military war that we are about to wage to work either. We need to talk about national defense, and this does not help our national defense. I fear this. I feel less secure when we go into areas like this, because believe me, this is the way that we get troops in later on. We already have advisory forces in Colombia. Does anybody remember about advisors and then eventually having military follow in other times in our history. Yes, this is a very risky change in policy. This is not just a minor little increase in appropriation.

So I would ask, once again, where is the authority? Where does the authority exist for our President to go down and expand a war in Colombia when it has nothing to do with our national defense or our security? It has more to do with oil than our national security, and we know it. There is a pipeline down there that everybody complains that it is not well protected. It is even designated in legislation, and we deal with this at times. So I would say think about the real reasons behind us going down there.

It just happens that we have spread ourselves around the world; we are now in nine countries of the 15 countries that used to be part of the Soviet Union. And every country has something to do with oil. The Caspian Sea, Georgia, and why are we in the Persian Gulf? We are in the Persian Gulf to protect "our" oil. Why are we involved with making and interfering with the democratically elected leader of Venezuela? I thought we were for democracy, and yet the reports are that we may well have participated in the attempt to have a democratically elected official in Venezuela removed. I think there is a little bit of oil in Venezuela as well. Could that have been the reason.

So I would say, once again, please take a look at this amendment. This amendment is a "yes" vote, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my colleague on the Committee on Rules and good friend, as well as the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), my mentor and good friend on military matters.

I do not think anyone is insincere in this House of Representatives about wanting to be involved in doing what is right to protect our country and to maintain the President's vision with reference to the war on terrorism.

□ 1830

All of us are for the same set of circumstances. But my colleagues on the Republican side do not want spending in certain areas in America.

I harken back one night to one of the finest speeches ever made in the House of Representatives by John Kasich in a run-up to a budget. When John finished, I walked up to him and complimented him. I said to him, you know, John, the difference between you and I, and we were only going to spend \$1 trillion or \$3 trillion at that time, the difference is he wants to spend the money on what he wants to spend it on, and I want to spend it on what I want to spend it on.

I do not think anything has changed very much on that, from that time or any other time. They have the power to do Plan Colombia, but they do not want to spend; they want to cut programs in this country that I consider to be critical.

Some Members do not even have a clue about what is going on in Colombia. Certainly, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) does, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) does, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) does, and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) does, but most of the Members in this House, half of them cannot even point out where Colombia is.

Yet, we are going to stand up here and go forward and get ourselves involved in something that could help lead this country to the black oblivion of ignominious defeat. We never won a war on terrorism or on counter-narcotics. We have spent countless dollars in South America and elsewhere around the world that did not bring us to fruition with reference to our wishes.

While we are here doing this debate this evening, the Middle East is raging; India and Pakistan are poised to go to war with each other; Indonesia and Malaysia, and I harken to tell my friends that if Indonesia implodes, we will have eight Afghanistsans on our hands; famine and war is all over Africa.

I have been in this body when nobody cared about genocide occurring on the African continent, and yet we come here prepared to involve American troops in our hemisphere, knowing full well that it may lead to further difficulties.

Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting in my office or here on the floor listening to this debate all day. Frankly, I am astonished by the rhetoric and blatant hypocrisy that have come out of the mouths of some of our colleagues here.

As a Democrat, all Democrats over here have been called unpatriotic, undemocratic, irresponsible, and un-American. I heard all of that from the other side. To my friends on the other side of the aisle, all of us and I certainly take offense to those unpatriotic, undemocratic, irresponsible, and un-American comments. Nobody in

this House has any lock on patriotism. There are 535 patriots and 5 persons from other areas in this country of ours that serve this country in the best manner that they can. We deserve ourselves when we allude to others being unpatriotic.

I sat in the Committee on Rules Tuesday night and listened to Republicans' plans to increase the debt limit. I think that there should be some measure of increase.

At the time, I figured that the majority just did not get it. Today, I am certain that the majority not only does not get it, but they cannot sell it. They did not sell it to their own members, and they are certainly not going to be able to sell it to the American people.

So the Republican leadership has done what it does best: Rule with an iron fist. Never mind about who did it before them, they are doing it now. The leadership attached controversial and extraneous provisions to a widely supported bipartisan bill, and when the Republican leadership realized they did not have the necessary votes, it reminded its caucus that the bill is blanketed under the highly political title of a wartime emergency supplemental. I guess, Mr. Chairman, old habits are just too hard to break.

Like Americans all over this Nation and Members in this House, I strongly support the expenditure of supplemental funds.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. BALLENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) that no one has suggested tonight that Members of this body are not patriotic. This is a healthy debate, and this is a good debate. It is one that we need to have.

I want to say in response to one point made by my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON). I think it is a red herring to compare the language in this bill to the Gulf of Tonkin. We are talking about keeping the same number of troops, not expanding the number of troops, and not expanding their authority.

To suggest that we can make a distinction between a shot that is fired from a drug trafficker or a terrorist is

ridiculous. When a helicopter takes off and goes into a firefight, how can they determine whether the bullet coming at them is from a drug trafficker or a counterterrorist? That is all we are acknowledging here is that we cannot make that distinction.

Mr. BALLENGER. I thank the gentleman.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I have been to Colombia many times. I would also like to say that no additional troops to the 400 that we have there at the present time, and it is capped at 400, have been asked for or will be asked for by the Colombian government.

But I rise in opposition to the amendment being offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts which removes the freedom of the Colombian government to use our aid and makes them fight with 2 hands tied behind them. Colombia today is a nation under siege by 3 terrorist organizations. Two of these terrorist organizations, the FARC and ELN, have kidnapped over 50 Americans and murdered at least 10. The third, the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia, is a vicious, violent terrorist organization that indiscriminately murders Colombians.

All three of these terrorist groups have been designated by the Secretary of State as foreign terrorist organizations because it has been determined that they are a threat to our Nation's security. Terrorism in Colombia is financed by illegal trafficking in narcotics that kills up to 40,000 of our young people in the United States each year.

The largest terrorist organization in Colombia, the FARC, has in essence declared war on the Colombian people. This group is attacking Colombia's democratic institutions. The FARC is holding a presidential candidate, Colombia legislators, and local elected officials as hostages. They also attack police stations and kill innocent people.

The Colombian government is continuing its efforts to negotiate a peace agreement with ELN, and we should support those efforts. No one has done more than President Andres Pastrana, however, to hold that door open to a negotiated political agreement with the FARC. His perseverance and forbearance have made one thing clear: It is the FARC's willful disregard of the rule of law and human rights that led President Pastrana to make the decision to end the FARC's safe haven and send in Colombia's security forces to reestablish legitimate government.

On March 6, this body passed a bipartisan resolution expressing the sense of the House that "The President, without undue delay, should transmit to Congress for its consideration proposed legislation, consistent with United States law regarding protection of human rights, to assist the government of Colombia to protect its democracy from United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations and the scourge of illicit narcotics."

The Bush administration responded to this invitation and included such a proposition, so it is in this bill. The Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations have both held hearings in which the administration discussed its proposal.

The language that the gentleman from Massachusetts is seeking to strike is itself the product of a bipartisan compromise. We must help the people of Colombia in their darkest hour. Colombia is a democracy and an ally of the United States. It is under attack by terrorist organizations funded by illegal drugs.

Colombia is not asking us to send troops. The democratically-elected government of Colombia is asking that we make it possible for us to help them defend their democracy from these terrorists. The restrictions on the use of aid should be removed.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the amendments being offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as my friend, chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere of the Committee on International Relations indicated, we have traveled together frequently to Colombia, so I am all too familiar with the incredible violence that has plagued Colombia for far too long.

I acknowledge we must accept a certain responsibility, for it is our insatiable demand for cocaine and for heroin that has exacerbated that violence and brought it to a new horrific level.

Assistance and support for Colombia is part of our responsibility, but it is extremely important that we be clear about what kind of assistance we should offer and what we should expect from the Colombians. I believe that what we have been doing recently lacks that clarity.

The U.S. policy is undergoing a sea change in such an incremental fashion so as to be unnoticeable. That, I submit, is unfortunate and very risky. During debate on the original Plan Colombia, which I supported, I rejected the argument that our involvement in Colombia could lead us to a Vietnam-like quagmire, in part because there were clear and bright lines in Plan Colombia as to the limits of our support.

But now we are beginning to blur those lines, Mr. Chairman. We are removing those conditions and restrictions contained in Plan Colombia on a piecemeal basis. We are on the verge of making commitments that quantitatively and qualitatively substantially change our role in Colombia.

There have been recommendations that we increase military assistance and enlarge our direct counterterrorism role in Colombia, and I underscore "direct" role in Colombia, all this without a thoughtful and extensive debate that carefully weighs the implications of such a fundamental shift in American policy.

For example, 2 weeks ago, Plan Colombia contained an explicit ceiling, 500, on the number of U.S. military personnel permitted to enter Colombia. On May 10, this House passed a defense authorization bill that would essentially allow the Pentagon to introduce an unlimited number of American troops into that brutal conflict without any consent or notice to Congress.

Today, the supplemental contains \$6 million to protect a single oil pipeline in Colombia. But let us be clear: It really is simply a downpayment, because it is estimated that the full cost to the American taxpayer to protect that one pipeline is \$98 million, and I believe that those additional monies will be included in the regular course of the appropriation bills we have to consider.

How much will the next pipeline cost the American taxpayers? One can imagine American taxpayer dollars being utilized to protect all sorts of infrastructure projects in Colombia: bridges, aqueducts. The United States ambassador in Bogota indicated that there are more than 300 strategic infrastructures in Colombia that need protection.

Now we are also considering whether to eliminate the restrictions that limit our current assistance to counter-narcotics purposes. As others have said, make no mistake, not only will this result in an increased involvement by American forces in an expanding conflict, but it will be interpreted in Colombia as a willingness on the part of the United States to become directly engaged in actual conflict. That will be the interpretation that the Colombian people will make on their own. Now, do we really want that? Do we really want to chart this course without more debate?

I urge adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) has expired.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. SOUDER. I object, reluctantly. I think we should stick to the 5-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT). We have traveled to Colombia together. We have some agreements and some disagreements.

I think it is important that if each one of us got up and extended our remarks, we will not be following House order. It is not from any objection to the comments of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) or the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr.

DELAHUNT), though I may not agree. I assume that I will stick to my 5 minutes as well; if not voluntarily, then forcibly.

I think the first fundamental question here is do we have a compelling national interest. When we look at an issue like this, if we do not have a compelling national interest in Colombia, where would we have a compelling national interest?

Clearly, it is in our hemisphere, Colombia; clearly, the drugs on our streets that are resulting in deaths from cocaine and heroin in Fort Wayne, Indiana, in Massachusetts, in Florida, and North Carolina, throughout our Nation, are predominantly coming from Colombia.

□ 1845

Clearly we have a threat to the democracy in Colombia. As even the past speaker acknowledged, it is certainly exacerbated by our drugs, and we must accept responsibility. If it were not for our drug habit, quite probably Colombia could handle their problems.

Fourth, we clearly have a terrorist threat as the international terrorist groups interconnect and as the drug money provides support for terrorist groups around the world, not only within their country but in international networks. We have a terrorist threat. Clearly we have a trade threat. In fact, if the pipeline in Colombia collapses, Colombia has less ability with which to defend itself, not because they could not have protected their pipeline themselves, but if it is our cocaine and heroine money that threatens their pipeline, clearly that has complicated their ability to protect themselves and we have multiple products that are critical to trade with Colombia, and it has been one of the more stable countries historically in South America, both democratically and economically.

Clearly there is a threat and a potential threat to the Panama Canal, where now that we have turned it over to the Panamanians which, remember, was cut out of Colombia, and as we have seen the drug traffickers move into the Darien Peninsula and put many of their facilities in Panama, we have a direct threat to potentially cutting off our trade ability if the drug cartels get more control over Panama.

Clearly we have an energy threat. Colombia is either our seventh or eighth largest supplier of oil. Our economy depends on that. We already have instability in the Middle East. We have more compelling reasons to be involved in Colombia than almost anywhere else in the world.

Direct on our streets 16,000 deaths minimum last year because of illegal narcotics compared to the other categories of direct threat to the United States. They all pale in this area. So we have a bill before us today that reflects the truth, which we all have acknowledged and we realize was developing, that is, that there was a revolutionary movement that was, you can

argue what their predominant roles were, but it was the FARC and other groups there, they were at one time revolutionary. As they progressed and as they funded themselves, they increasingly started to provide narcotics protection. So did the paramilitaries that were initially designed to protect the people from other revolutionary groups to provide protection to individuals and families and businessmen. As they evolved, they started to look for drug money for protection.

So we have seen the paramilitary groups, we have seen the FARC and other groups basically move to protection for drug cartels and increasingly as we saw in the DMZ to actually protecting the people who were growing it, distributing it and processing it.

So what we are recognizing, increasingly that we just cannot fight narcotics, we have to also be able to fight the terrorist efforts in Colombia if we are going to have an effect on narcotics, if we are going to have an effect on protecting the democracy, if we are going to have an effect on protecting the trade, the Panama Canal, the oil pipelines, and most importantly the people in my neighborhoods who are being attacked by drugs.

This amendment, if it passed, would in effect start the repeal of our ability to help protect American citizens from illegal narcotics and our ability to help our friends in Colombia who have stood with us.

This is not Vietnam. This is not us going in to fight. This is whether we are going to adequately equip them and train them to fight their own battle, a battle they would not be having in Colombia were it not for our drug habits in the United States. They have some drug usage in Colombia, but Western Europe and the United States are the primary places that have funded these terrorist groups.

When they see these different people who are undermining the democracy in terrorizing the communities, they do not say, we are the drug division. We are the terrorist division. They cannot poll each one.

We have worked hard with the government in Colombia, and we will continue in the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources and the other committees of this Congress, to make sure that they follow human rights, that they follow human rights policies, that we monitor to make sure that they are doing the best they can, that as we work through trying to make sure that these groups follow the human rights and they get vetted units and they make sure that they are fighting both their battle and our battle, if they are successful, it is not just for the people of Colombia, it is for the people of Indiana. It is very important that we continue to support them and acknowledge what is going on on the ground, or we will lose Colombia and this Congress will have sat there and put our kids more at risk and our families at risk if we do not defeat this amendment.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, let me first comment on the gentleman's comments, the last speaker. We have spent close to \$1.5 billion in fighting drugs, and coca production is up by over 25 percent. Even in what we are supposed to be doing, we are not succeeding the way we should.

Secondly, I would like to and I am not being sarcastic here, I would like to commend those in the administration who have decided now that every time we are going to get involved somewhere it is to fight terrorism. And so how can you argue against fighting terrorism?

Well, Colombia is not about terrorism. Terrorism is my city. I understand it was the people who attacked the Twin Towers, who attacked the Pentagon, and they wanted to attack the White House. Yes, there are terrorists groups throughout the Nation, throughout the world.

We participate wholeheartedly behind President Bush and this Congress and the Senate in fighting that war. But this is a civil war. It has been going on for over 35 years. And history should tell us that every time we get involved in a civil war, we come out in a very bad situation.

I was thinking as I was listening to the speakers prior to me that there must have been folks, historical figures in this House, who sat here and debated this right before we escalated our involvement in Vietnam. And at that time they were probably questioned too, after all, were they unpatriotic in their desire not to fight Communism at that point, the same way some of us may not be patriotic in our desire not to fight terrorism? But Colombia, I repeat, is a civil war.

With all due respect to the people in Colombia who are the victims of this war, it is very hard on any given day of the week to determine who the good guys are and who the bad guys are in Colombia. No one can stand here and tell us that Colombia's governmental history has been one of stellar behavior. No one can tell us that the FARC is an organization that is respected by anyone. No one can tell us that the right wing paramilitaries are respected by anyone. No one fighting that war at one time or another is respected by anyone because it is very hard to determine who the good guys are and who the bad guys are.

And I suggest to you that to go in as we do in the change of language in this bill, and take sides, is the most dangerous thing we can do at this point.

Let me also make another comment. For many years now the left in Latin America has been pretty dormant. My friends, the sight of American troops in uniform on Latin American soil, as we will surely have as we escalate, would

only invite a backlash of anti-American sentiment that we do not need at this point. What we need above all is to continue to help in the peace process of Colombia.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) said it best, and I know it upsets some people, this is a Gulf of Tonkin resolution that we are voting on today. Make no mistake about it. We are moving towards a dangerous situation here, and we will not know how to get out of it.

Some people have said that I exaggerate when I say that, when I say Colombia could be a Spanish-speaking Vietnam for us; and that is the difference, the language we will have to learn to be able to stay there for 5, 10, 15 years. But when you have had a situation going on for that long and you cannot get people to agree on anything, how do you determine that we know how to handle this? How do you determine that we are the ones who will solve that problem?

What we should be doing is, one, making sure that we try to force the peace process to continue to take place somehow, somewhere for the Colombian people; and, secondly, that we stay away from any involvement.

Now, I know that some people on this floor are going to try to tie this in to other issues in Latin America. It is a natural for us. Let me just say that there is no involvement here by any other government. This is a civil war. In fact, the Pastrana government has said that he has received help from many other places, including the Cuban Government, on trying to bring about the peace process. And so no one is in favor of continuing this situation in Colombia.

Now, one last thing that we need to also remember. We Americans, I, myself included, refuse every so often to understand that if we use drugs at the alarming rate that we continue to use, someone will always grow it for us, someone will always produce it. So rather than to stand here and bash the Colombian society for what is a major problem and then try to solve that problem by getting involved militarily, that is a mistake.

A couple of years ago I said that we would be back here to expand. I hope I am wrong, but we will be here again to expand. I support this amendment. We should get out right now.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not profess to be an expert on Colombia or any other country. In fact, I do not profess to be an expert on anything, but I have been involved in some of these issues because I chaired the committee that my good friend from Arizona now does so well in chairing, and I was intimately involved when we first created Plan Colombia.

Let me just give my colleagues some insight into what really happened. All of the G-8 nations got together, and

they recognized collectively that there was a tremendous problem in Colombia because they were the basis for the supply of narcotics all over the world. The Europeans recognized it. The Japanese recognized it. Everyone recognized the problem. So they had a donor conference and they agreed collectively to come up with \$7 billion to fight this problem. So we went to President Pastrana and we said, Mr. President, we are going to participate too. Our participation is going to be \$2 billion. And the rest of the nations, according to the Clinton administration, at the time said that they were not going to contribute anything until we did. So we ponied up. We came up with our \$2 billion, and we sent our \$2 billion mostly in the form of black hawk helicopters. But we sent our \$2 billion and we told President Pastrana, here we are. This is the first step towards eliminating the problem in your country and thus helping the United States of America.

What happened then? Well, unfortunately, most of the other nations forgot their obligation. They have not still to this date come up with their contributions. Here is the first 2 billion. There is another 5 billion coming, so you eliminate this problem, only to find that the rest of the world has not contributed what they promised in the donor conference, including most of the nations in Europe who are now complaining about the cocaine that is flowing into Europe originating in Colombia.

So while there has been some fault with all of this program, we cannot blame it all on the Colombian government, we certainly cannot blame it on our government. We cannot blame it on this Congress because we did what we promised at the donor conference.

So what our administration ought to be doing, and I have emphasized this to the Secretary and to the Treasury Department and the Treasury Secretary, that they ought to be going to these countries who made these commitments and tell them to do what they promised they would do; but unfortunately in other circumstances where they all meet in these grand palaces all over the world and they agree that we are going to solve the problems, none of them will do anything such as in Bosnia until we put up our money first. We in good faith put up our money and the rest of the world has not, and they ought to be ashamed.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Alabama yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree more with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN). He is correct. The European Union has failed to meet its commitment. Let me also suggest that the Colombian Government in terms of professionalizing and providing the resources necessary for its own military has failed its people. During the course of World War II the

American people paid 40 percent of the GDP to the war effort. In Colombia today it is less than 2 percent of the Colombian GDP that is devoted to the military. And I suggest that this is an absolute appropriate rationale for us not to appropriate additional funds until the Colombian and the Europeans stand up to the plate.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

□ 1900

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, at the same time, we do not want to leave the President of Colombia out on a limb. He has come back to us. He has told us what the problem is and we are having to fill in a void, but the void has been caused by the failure of the other nations and especially the European nations to fulfill their promise.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I do not disagree. I think it is time we sit down and consult further with the Colombians, but on Sunday the Colombian people will begin the process of selecting a new president, a new president with different ideas, some of which we may embrace, some of which we may reject. What is the rush? I suggest this is risky, that this is premature and this is why the McGovern-Skelton amendment should be supported.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in strong support of the McGovern-Skelton amendment, and I want to thank my colleagues for their leadership on this important issue.

The Bush administration and the Republicans would have my colleagues believe that a change in our control policy, a shift from the policy of a counternarcotics to that of counterinsurgency is a logical part of our plan to eradicate the global terrorist network.

Last year's supporters of Plan Colombia were promising us that our efforts in Colombia were just about reducing the flow of drugs. They had many Members convinced that the policy was justified and that it was going to be successful. To date, our policy has been a spectacular failure and now it is even less justified.

It is a fact that despite our aggressive drug eradication efforts, coca cultivation has actually increased by 25 percent in Colombia. Despite our efforts, human rights abuses continue. Paramilitary death squads continue to brutalize innocent Colombians, and they operate with impunity from the military, and perhaps most disturbingly, military officials implicated in the deaths of the very people they are supposed to protect remain unpunished and on the Colombian government's payroll.

Anyone who thinks that the links between military and brutal paramilitary

forces have been severed are simply ignoring the realities on the ground, which I was able to see myself when I went with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN) to Colombia and listened to the people.

The May 6 Chicago Tribune editorial on this subject had it right. "There is no advantage to the United States getting deeper into the 40-year old Colombian civil war. Money spent on drug interdiction there would be much more productively used for treatment of addicts here. And more American military aid is hardly going to advance chances of a political solution to this multi-headed conflict. This failed foreign policy cannot be salvaged, certainly not by pouring good money after bad. The House has an opportunity to put a stop to this."

In 1999, I stood here in this Chamber and I warned my colleagues that Plan Colombia would be just the first in a series of blank checks for the war, with no foreseeable future.

Along with the sponsors of the amendment, I appreciate that the committee worked to narrow the parameters of the administration's original wide-open request to expand our role in Colombia. However, this bill still opens the door, and we all know that once a door is opened, it is very hard to shut.

This language reaches back and allows all fiscal year 2002 military aid, personnel and equipment to be used for counterterrorism, including any additional aid that might be sent under a continuing resolution later this year. Military escalation is built into this appropriation bill, but an exit strategy is not. Once we cross into counterinsurgency we are committing the might and the resource of the United States to a 4-decade old war that cannot be won militarily.

All of my colleagues should be reminded of President Johnson's agony and his inability to extricate the United States from a jungle quagmire in Vietnam. I would not wish that on a president of any party.

I want to also say in closing that I understand that tonight that the Republican leadership is going to adjourn at midnight, start a new legislative day, and it is just another strategy to shut down debate, and even as we argue the supplemental budget and wave the flag as we should for our military forces around the globe and for strengthening our fight against terrorism here at home, and even as we talk about strengthening democracy in Colombia, the leadership here is working furiously to be able to curtail democracy here on the floor of this House. We should not be so hypocritical as to be waving the flag and promoting democracy in the supplemental and then saying but we cannot have democracy here to debate what is legitimate debate here on this floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I am a bit perplexed when I hear the argument that there is no democracy in this Chamber, and hour after hour after hour after hour, we have been hearing debate on multiple issues, and the argument has also brought out that on this issue we are debating at this instance, at this instance, which is the aid that the United States is providing to our democratic ally, the democratically-elected government of Colombia, I am hearing that we cannot debate that as well.

The contradiction makes no sense. We are debating it right now, and we in the Committee on Rules permitted, authorized this debate and it is taking place. So that is one thing that struck me that I was not able to understand how the argument can be made that we are not debating when we are debating. We are debating. We have been debating hour after hour after hour after hour, and now we are debating on the issue, the very important issue of United States assistance to the democratically-elected government of Colombia.

The point was made previously that we do not know who the good guys are and the bad guys are in Colombia. The reality of the matter, that is not an issue to be decided by the United States. There is a democratically-elected government in Colombia that is a friend and an ally of the United States, and it is the democratically-elected government in Colombia that is under attack by 3 major, extremely well-financed terrorist groups that engage in narco-trafficking.

The supplemental that we are debating today is a counterterrorism supplemental, and I think it is appropriate for us to consider not only to debate but in this case to help the democratically-elected government of Colombia in counterterrorism efforts. That is the subject matter that we are dealing with in this supplemental.

Another point was brought out previously incorrectly as though this legislation would raise the cap on the number of American trainers that are in Colombia. There is a number of approximately 500 now, and that is not being affected by the legislation. The legislation, that I am informed by my friends on the Committee on Appropriations is the product of a bipartisan compromise, was voted out with votes from both sides of the aisle, and leaders from the Democratic party, with whom we have very serious differences on many issues, agreed in the Committee on Appropriations to this compromise.

So I think that it is very important, especially when we are 3 days away from a presidential election in that country, that friend and ally Colombia, when all of the major candidates for president agree that assistance from us, from the United States, is required for Colombia to achieve peace, that we at this point continue with the bipartisan compromise that came out of the Committee on Appropriations and that we say in a consensus fashion this

evening, again in a bipartisan way, that we realize what is going on in Colombia, that the majority of terrorist attacks in the world are against the people of Colombia. They may not be covered by the media, but the reality of the matter is there is not a day that passes that tragedy does not strike the people of Colombia from the terrorist groups that we are helping the democratically-elected government of Colombia combat, and that we are helping in this supplemental by increasing our assistance to the democratically-elected government of Colombia.

Those 3 terrorist groups have a stranglehold on our democratic ally in Colombia and that ally deserves and has received and must continue to receive our aid because those terrorist groups that are narco-terrorists are massacring, they are killing each day, attacking the fabric of society each day.

So that is why I think that the bipartisan compromise that was worked out is to be commended. I hope that this House this evening supports what the Committee on Appropriations passed and overwhelmingly defeats the McGovern amendment which would in effect tell the Colombian people, just a few days before their election, that we do not care about them and we do not respect their democracy. Vote down McGovern.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Very interesting. I cannot believe what I just heard the gentleman from Florida say. He said we ought to support the bipartisan compromise that has just been worked out in the committee on this product. That is what we have been saying for the last 2 days with respect to the entire bill.

What we have said on the bill is we had a bipartisan bill as it came out of the committee. It has been hijacked by the Republican leadership. If you want to continue bipartisan cooperation, which we ought to have, if this is indeed a war supplemental, then drop the partisan agenda that has been imposed by the Republican leadership of this House and stick to the bipartisan compromise. That is what we have been saying.

We have been ignored all day long until now. Suddenly it meets someone's convenience to utter those same words. Stick to the bipartisan compromise.

Well, I am going to do that. I happen to think that our policy in Colombia is futile. I have been following developments in Colombian society for almost 40 years. I do not for the slightest moment think that they have the capacity either economically or politically or socially to do what is necessary to help themselves against the FARC and the other terrorist organizations in that country, and I do not believe in getting involved in futile exercises. That is why I think the whole policy is stupid and doomed.

Frankly, if I had my way I would flip it. This language that is in the bill

does not particularly bother me because the language says if you are already going after FARC and the ELN and the paramilitary groups on the drug front, also go after them on the terrorism and kidnapping front. I do not have a special problem with that. In fact, I wish it were the other way around.

I would be a whole lot more comfortable seeing them focus on terrorism than on drugs because on drugs we are only fighting half a battle. We are sending our troops down to Colombia to advise them how to fight a war on drugs when we are not fighting that same war at home. We have tried consistently, consistently, at home to say that if you are going to invest \$500 million or \$1 billion in Colombia to fight drugs, do the same thing at home to build enough drug treatment slots so that we take care of the demand here. That is the way to fight drugs, but we have not been able to get the majority party to support that.

There is one difference between me and the leadership of your party. I am going to stick to the bipartisan deals that I sign on to. They have not. They sucker us on each bill. They say put together a bipartisan compromise, work together, and we do, and then they decide to impose a partisan agenda. So I do not have any faith in this policy, but we worked in good faith with the gentleman from Arizona and others to work out language on this bill as part of a bipartisan compromise that would prevent the administration from providing all of the waivers that are in existing law that are protections against excess involvement, and while I am not satisfied with that and I do not think in the end it will work, because I believe on whole I am a person of integrity, I am going to stick to the deal that we made even though I do not think that it will work, and I hope that we can in the Senate work out a different arrangement.

So I am going to take the advice of the gentleman from Florida. I believe on the big questions, as well as the little ones, we should stick to the bipartisan compromise. God, I wish your leadership agreed.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I heard the gentleman from Florida a few moments ago talk about the importance of debate and democracy, and of course, that is very true.

□ 1915

And of course that is very true. But the essence of democracy is the ability to vote, and we are being deprived of the ability to vote. That is what democracy is all about. Let us have some votes on some of these issues.

I also want to take this opportunity to express my deep respect for the gentleman from Arizona. He is a true humanitarian. I have had an opportunity to observe that firsthand. But the policy that we are arguing about in this

bill is contrary to that. We are in the process of getting ourselves into a very deep mess in Colombia. We have already gone too far. But now we are being asked to go even further.

As we learned just a few moments ago from the gentleman from Massachusetts, Colombia's own contribution to its military is limited. It spends less than 2 percent of its gross domestic product on the military, and recruits with high school degrees are exempted from serving in combat. High inequality, gaping urban-rural divisions and government abandonment of poor populations underlie this decades-old conflict in Colombia. U.S. military aid, as we are being asked to provide now, is only going to make this problem worse, reinforcing the inequities that exist in Colombia between the educated and the noneducated, between the poor and the rich.

There is already evidence that the United States aid has not made a dent in the drug war. In fact, things have worsened recently. Coca production rose by 25 percent last year. Killings of civilians rose from 14 per day in 1999 to 20 per day in 2002; 300,000 civilians were forcibly displaced last year. Most recently, on May 2, 117 innocent civilians were killed in the crossfire of the FARC and the United Self-Defense Forces, the AUC. While seeking safety in a church, these people were slaughtered. The Colombian military did nothing to ensure their safety, in spite of numerous calls for help.

According to human rights groups, 85 percent of Colombia's political killings and so-called disappearances and 76 percent of all civilian massacres were committed by the illegal paramilitary groups like the United Self-Defense Forces, which has extensive links with the Colombian military. Despite this, since 1997, 80 percent of U.S. aid to Colombia has been given to the military forces. It makes absolutely no sense to send aid to a military that works with a terrorist group.

If we are really interested in helping Colombia, we should support its civil institutions and effectively implement alternative development programs to support the rural communities which are most adversely affected by the war. We must continue to provide humanitarian aid to internally displaced persons, especially the Afro-Colombian community. We must demand the Colombian military break ties with the paramilitaries.

We must also recognize that our counternarcotics efforts in Colombia have failed to curb domestic drug abuse here in the United States. Instead of aiding and abetting a civil war, we should be spending more money at home on drug treatment and prevention programs to reduce the demand for drugs here in the United States. It is by dealing with the demand side of this problem that we will reach a solution to it. We are never going to reach a solution by focusing all of our attention and energies only on the supply

side. Administration after administration has failed in that regard.

Let us not allow U.S. forces to be deployed anywhere in the world under this undefined global war on terrorism. We are being asked over and over again to provide military aid and assistance, to send our troops to places far away, dispersed in the so-called war on terrorism, a war that has not been defined by the administration. We do not know who the enemy is precisely. We do not know who we are fighting. Nevertheless, we are asked to spend billions of dollars on this ill defined, unclear, vague war on terrorism and send our military people out there to do the fighting. It is a serious mistake.

I urge my colleagues to support this McGovern-Skelton amendment before we send more money to known human rights violators and become enmeshed even more deeply in a brutal civil war on the side of the oppressors and against the oppressed.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we heard from the gentleman from Florida a lot of talk about democracy. Today we stand here talking about democracy, and yet we are going to be adding \$750 billion to our citizens' credit cards, increasing their credit card debt. And at the same time we fight this war, this war is being paid for by our seniors, the ones that are least capable of doing that, from our Social Security and Medicare fund.

Every single war that we have had, we have had a tax, all the way from the Spanish-American War. And in fact we still have it to this day. Every single war, we have been there and we have been willing to pay that tax to pay for that war. This is the first war that I know of that we have rewarded the corporations by giving them a tax cut to the most wealthy, and we put it on the backs of the ones who least are able to pay. In addition, not only are we doing that, but we put it on the backs of our soldiers that are out there fighting the war. We expect them also to pay the debt later on after we are gone.

The amendment before us, authored by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and we all know him to be the ranking minority member on the Committee on Armed Services, is an amendment that I would ask for my colleagues to look at seriously. It is an amendment that talks about the fact that for the longest time in South America we talked and they learned the lingo. In South America, they learned, well, if we talk about Communists down here, we might get some money from the Americans; if we talk about drug dealers, we might get some money from the Americans. And now the lingo is, let us identify them as terrorists, and we might get some money from the Americans.

The reality is that in Colombia the commitment on their part when we look in terms of their expenditures for

the military and our expenditures, we are basically funding their war. I know later on we will hear from the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) about the haves and a large number of have-nots. So we have a struggle for the last 35 years, a genuine struggle for democracy in that effort; and we have a struggle that we are now deciding to get involved in.

I sit on the Committee on Armed Services; and when they first came to us, I will be honest, I voted for the amendment to go and get involved in Colombia. One of the first questions I asked, because we asked the military for a military response, and that is what we got, we got a military response, and I asked them, how are you going to make a distinction between who the dealers are, who are the good guys and who are the bad guys? Initially, they could not respond. They said they were going to go after the drug dealers.

We recognize that there are both drug dealers on the right, on the left, on the genuine side and even on the government side. They are all over. The key is, who do we go after? The gentleman from Florida talks about the fact that it is a democracy. Yes, it is a democracy, and we need to push it forward. And we can do some things to help them to move forward, but this is not the way to do it.

When they came before us, I also asked them, in dealing with drugs, how do you expect to be able to contain it to just Colombia? We talked about it, and there was analogy made that if we put the squeeze on Colombia, we knew darn well that, like a balloon, when you squeeze the balloon, and if there are drug dealers there, they are going to move elsewhere. And sure enough, now they have come to us and they have said, you know what, this thing has gone into the other surrounding countries. So now we are funding about seven other countries around there because there are also drugs occurring there. That is exactly what we did not want to occur, but we have that happening now. We put the squeeze on them and they are gone.

The reality is in dealing with drugs in this country, and we have to face it, and we know it full well, that we have been unwilling to deal with it here in this country. I worked as a drug counselor, as a social worker for 7 years, with both heroin addicts and adolescent substance abuse. And in the 1970s and 1980s, I recall the district attorneys every election time they would come up and pick up a lot of the heroin addicts. Very few times did they ever pick up the ones who were actually pushing to make the money. Most of those people, as we well know, some are pillars of our community that we have chosen not to go after. We have chosen our scapegoats.

It is better to go spend our resources in South America and elsewhere, because we have chosen not to go after those pillars of our communities after

those drugs. And until we decide to do that, and until we decide that is the way we will be able to fight this, this is only going to escalate and go further.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, while today our colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue their dilatory tactics, our Armed Forces are in combat and the Nation is at war. The bill before us represents Congress' simple role in fighting that war. It provides necessary funds for our ongoing military operations, and it improves our security at home.

The bill provides a total of \$15.7 billion for the Department of Defense. These additional funds represent the additional personnel costs associated with force mobilization, the replacement of critical spare parts, and the procurement of essential high-priority munitions. We need to pass this and encourage our troops.

However, our friends on the other side of the aisle are only willing to approve these necessary funds if, and I emphasize if, they are brought to the floor under the terms that they would dictate.

Admittedly, the bill contains funding that would not go to the war effort and homeland security, but that is nothing really new with any kind of supplemental. Nothing new in this Chamber. The reality is each of us can find something wrong with this bill, but overall the bill is necessary and our colleagues know that that is true.

Mr. Chairman, it is now time to end the debate and move on and pass this bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this has been an interesting debate, and I believe that it is a crucial debate. I rise to support the McGovern-Skelton amendment, and I raise a number of questions today.

This is an emergency supplemental; and, therefore, the basis of this amendment should be in the context of an emergency. I am concerned that we are creating an emergency.

I had the opportunity to speak to both the president of Colombia and the ambassador. Let me say that I am certainly impressed with the efforts that are being made by this new president. I believe that he is sincere. I am also aware of what Colombians seem to be confronting.

As was said early on the floor, they spend little, if any, on their own military personnel. In addition to the 14 a day that have been killed since 1999, we now know that they are killing 20 per day in 2002. Included in those deaths are elected officials, women who have been assassinated, who have been decapitated, those who are speaking about democracy.

So when we come to the floor with legislation that begins now to pierce

further into the dilemma in Colombia, the war that Colombia is having, and we begin to start designating terrorist organizations and funding terrorist organizations, we have to raise this question of whether or not this is the right direction.

I understand they had hearings in the Committee on International Relations, but I am not sure of any resolution that came about as a result of those hearings.

□ 1930

The issue required their deliberation, but the decision was made not to pursue a markup. I would have wanted to hear their input. Because what I view in the present legislation is almost similar to the open rule that I thought we had and would have allowed us to vote on the increase in the debt ceiling. This is smoke and mirrors. We now have language in this emergency supplemental that, one, characterizes this as an emergency in a war supplemental, and so it suggests to me that we are actually going to war and that now we have defined fighting drugs, which have not been that successful in Colombia, to now fighting terrorists. What does that mean? It means that a whole new set of armed forces and military personnel may find themselves, U.S. personnel, to Colombia on the basis of we are fighting the war on terrorism.

Let me just suggest to my colleagues, realizing that I have the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) on the floor, and I know that he has worked on this issue, that this is bad policy in an emergency supplemental to start a whole new war. I am disturbed and believe that the McGovern-Skelton amendment is the right approach to take because what it says is it will narrow us to the work that we were intended to do, to try to be successful on that work, which already has its faults, and not begin to wage war against terrorists without any further investigation of such.

This language in the supplemental would open up sending our young men and women to Colombia to fight a war not thought out and where Colombia sends few of its own to fight. This is bad foreign policy and should not be pursued.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas very much for yielding.

To my dear disingenuous friend from Florida who wants to know why the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) was complaining about the procedure, it is not that we are debating it now. Is there a Member here that does not know that at midnight you are going to run a rule through us and keep us up until 3 or 4 in the morning? Oh. Oh.

To my dear friend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) who said, "Colombia is a democracy. It is a friend and an ally. What are we doing questioning this?"

The answer is that they only spend 1.9 percent of their GDP for defense. That is why.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is not about Colombia. It is about our own military. That is what this bill is about. That is what you people should be talking about.

Freedom is not free. I am standing here before you as a 29-year Air Force veteran. During that time I had the honor of running two military bases. At that level, you know firsthand what it takes to keep our military safe, strong and secure. And when you are in charge, you want to give them the best. They need great planes, tanks, trucks and munitions. This bill helps give our military men and women just that.

America is a whole different country since September 11. A terrorist attack, designed to tear us apart, has actually put our Nation closer together. We cannot desert our troops now.

Despite the ill wishes of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, this bill shows our military that America cares about them and wants the best for them. This bill would replenish depleted attack munitions. The war will be long. Our troops have been strong. So we must give them more munitions they need if they are going to fight for our freedom.

Sadly, no one knows more than I the horrors of fighting without munitions. I fought in both Korea and Vietnam. When I was in Vietnam, we ran out of munitions because this Congress would not fund them. We are at that same point again. I had to carry munitions on a mission that I was not supposed to carry that munition on. They were cannibalizing airplanes. They are doing that today in our services. And the gun that was cannibalized on my airplane did not fire. Because that gun did not fire, I was shot down. I tried to fire at the enemy, but nothing came out.

It was on that tragic mission, April 16, 1966, that started my 7 years in captivity, more than half of that time in solitary confinement. Please, I urge you not to let that happen to any other member of our military. We must learn from our mistakes. Our men and women in uniform deserve the best America has to offer, not the worst.

Make no mistake, the U.S. military has come to the aid of America. It is time that America came to the aid of our military. We must win the war for freedom. It is not for freedom just for America. It is for the freedom of the world.

Let us help our military. God bless you all. I know you will.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGovern-Skelton amendment and I want to particularly salute the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Forces.

Let me begin by saying I believe that every Member here cares about Colombia and wants to see peace for our South American neighbor. There is this disagreement which leads to a discussion about how to get there.

I argue for not rushing to a change of policy. That is all this amendment does. Because if we do, it will be hard to undo. Because in such a short time, Colombia will have a new president and congress. And so, my friends, the prudent and commonsense course of action would be to wait until after the Colombian presidential elections and the new administration is installed in August. Can we not wait until August to find out who is going to be running the country? Of course we can. At that time it would be perfectly appropriate to discuss strategy and commitments that the new government is willing to make regarding human rights, judicial reform, alternative development and peace efforts. Then let the Congress consider it fully after, and not before, we know who will make up the Colombian government, because we have got some problems there. We have got paramilitary getting elected to this democratic form of government.

There is an unknown aspect of this conflict about Afro-Colombians that I would like to raise, not well known. Afro-Colombians, my friends, make up 26 percent of Colombia's 40 million people. There are few in the Congress who are aware that Afro-Colombians have constitutionally protected cultural and territorial rights. Their Federal Law 70 of 1993 sets out a land titling process by which Afro-Colombian communities may be granted collective title to lands that they have traditionally lived on. Yet they suffer immensely and are often neglected. They make up a disproportionate number of displaced persons in Colombia. Some say they make up half of the two million to three million internally displaced persons in that country. They have been forced to flee, mostly by the paramilitaries, sometimes in collaboration with the Colombian military, and sometimes by apparent neglect by the Colombian military. Some question why these Afro-Colombians are being pushed off the land, which brings me to the May 2 church massacre already referred to by the gentleman from New York, the church massacre in Bellavista, Choco, the Colombian province with the greatest percentage of African-descended Colombians. At least 119 people died. A third were children, 95 wounded, 40 missing, and now thousands displaced. All of the victims were of African descent. The bomb that burned the church was thrown by the FARC gue-

rillas in a battle with the AUC paramilitaries. I deplore the actions of both of these illegal and armed groups. But what is disturbing and more alarming was the inaction of the Colombian government. Despite repeated warnings of imminent violence issued by the Colombian Human Rights Ombudsman's office beginning in July 2001 and up until a week in advance of the massacre, the Colombian armed forces did nothing.

The warnings were echoed by the United Nations High Commission for Human Rights in Colombia. Yet the Colombian armed forces did not even arrive until three days after the massacre.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGovern-Skelton amendment. Let me begin by saying that I believe that every member cares about Colombia and wants to see peace for our South American neighbor. There is disagreement on how to get there.

First, we should not rush into a change of policy that will later be hard to undo. Why? Because in such a short time, Colombia will have a new president and congress. The prudent and common sense course of action would be to wait until after the Colombian presidential elections and the new administration is installed this August. At that time, it would be appropriate to discuss strategy and the commitments the new government is willing to make regarding human rights, judicial reform, alternative development, and peace efforts. Then let Congress consider it fully, after, not before, we know who will make up the next Colombian government.

Second, the situation of Afro-Colombians is not a well-known aspect of the Colombian conflict. Afro-Colombians make up 26 percent of Colombia's 40 million people. There are few in the Congress who are aware that Afro-Colombians have constitutionally protected cultural and territorial rights. And, Law 70 of 1993 sets out a land titling process by which Afro-Colombian communities may be granted collective title to lands they have lived on traditionally.

Yet, Afro-Colombians suffer immensely and are often neglected. They make up a disproportionate number the displaced persons in Colombia. Some say they make up more than half of the 2-3 million internally displaced persons in Colombia. Once displaced, many Afro-Colombians face the double discrimination of being black and displaced. They have been forced to flee mostly by paramilitaries, sometimes in collaboration with the Colombian military, and sometimes by apparent neglect by the Colombian military. Some question why the Afro-Colombians are being pushed off their land.

Which brings me to the May 2, church massacre in Bellavista, Choco, the Colombian province with the greatest percentage of African-descendants. At least 119 people died, a third were children, 95 wounded, approximately 40 are missing, and now thousands are displaced. All of the victims were African descendants. Yes, the bomb that burned the church was thrown by the FARC guerrillas in a battle with the AUC paramilitaries. I deplore the actions of both of these illegal armed groups. But what was perhaps more alarming was the inaction of the Colombian government. Despite repeated warnings of imminent violence issued by the Colombian Human

Rights Ombudsman's office beginning in July 2001, and up until one week in advance of the massacre, the Colombian Armed Forces did nothing. The warnings were echoed by the United Nations High Commission for Human Rights' office in Colombia. Yet, the Colombian Armed Forces did not arrive in the area until after May 5th according to a report in *El Tiempo*, Colombia's largest daily newspaper.

In fact, 24 members of Congress and I signed a letter to President Pastrana asking him what happened. We give Colombia money to develop an early warning system to prevent such atrocities. But early warning does not work if it is not followed by early action by the Colombian government. Ambassador Anne Patterson called my office immediately upon receiving the letter. We have yet to hear from the Colombian government. This is not an encouraging example of Colombia's commitment to protect its own citizenry. To top it off, there were reports of paramilitary and Colombian military collusion. The Colombian government invited the UN to investigate this tragedy. Then according to *El Tiempo*, high officials in the Colombian government criticized the UN Commissioner for Human Rights in Colombia, Mr. Anders Kompass, when he mentioned reports of the collusion between the Colombian military and the AUC paramilitaries, who are a US-designated foreign terrorist organization.

The UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Mary Robinson defended the work of the Commission in Colombia and said it was lamentable that the Colombian government questioned their work. The UN Commission just completed its report and found the FARC and the AUC responsible for the massacre because of their fighting near civilians. The Commission also found the Colombian government responsible due to its inaction and what looks like collusion with the paramilitaries. The paramilitaries traveled by air and boat in the area and were not stopped by government forces.

Again, the situation of Afro-Colombians is not well known. Some question why the Afro-Colombians are being pushed off their lands. Afro-Colombian territories are strategically located and rich in resources. Law 70 requires that Afro-Colombian communities be consulted regarding projects that may impact their lands. This is not happening, if people have had to flee. Also, a number of displacements and massacres occurred shortly after collective titles were granted. This land-terror aspect of the Colombian conflict needs to be investigated. So, before we change our policy in Colombia, I would like to know what commitments the next government will make to protect its citizens, in particular Afro-Colombians. I would like to know how their territorial rights are being protected and if the government has a plan to ensure people's safety so that they can return to their lands. We all know the Colombian government does not have a perfect human rights record. Given the past, there are many important questions to ask of the next administration.

In addition, President Pastrana wrote an op-ed that was published in the *Herald* on May 1, 2002, the day before the Bellavista massacre. In it he wrote that "for the first time, the Colombian military is capable of defeating the terrorists on the battlefield," and that his administration is spending more money on defense. If that is the case, where is the emergency? And, where was this capable army after the early warnings in Bellavista?

This is a nearly 40 year-old civil conflict. In 1967, 35 years ago, Dr. Martin Luther King spoke of the use of American helicopters against rebels in Colombia in his anti-Vietnam War speech, exactly one year before he died. And this war is still going on. Where is evidence that Colombia has a winning solution now? The House Defense Authorization bill grants Secretary Rumsfeld a waiver allowing him to lift the 500-person cap on US military personnel in Colombia in the name of national security. He then only has to inform Congress within 15 days after the fact. Colombia begins to look like more like Vietnam every day. There are no Al Qaeda cells in Colombia. But, the State Department admits that the Colombian Armed Forces still collaborate with the AUC paramilitaries, a US-designated foreign terrorist organization. Why would we give lethal aid to a government that works with one terrorist group to fight another? Where is the consistency in our policy?

The military leader of the AUC paramilitaries, Salvatore Mancuso, recently claimed that their candidates received more than 35% of the seats in Colombia's March legislative elections. If Mullah Omar claimed that Taliban candidates received more than 35% of the legislative elections in Afghanistan, you can bet that would be investigated. Also, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Mary Robinson has expressed concern about this claim. She also is concerned that the leading candidate has spoken of arming one million civilians and warned that the civilian population should not be dragged into the conflict.

We are told peace is our goal in Colombia, yet the House has not even had one hearing on the Colombian peace process. Why are we seeking a military solution in such haste? What is the hurry in going down what appears to be a slippery slope? And what ever happened to our own homeland security in the War on Drugs? Why is there no money in this bill to fund substance abuse? The administration and some members of congress are obsessed with taking drug money away from guerillas, but don't share the same obsession when it comes to helping the American people who need drug treatment. The Office of National Drug Control Policy spends millions of dollars on television ads trying to persuade our citizenry that those who do drugs in the United States are supporting terrorism. So, in this "Global War on Terrorism", should it not be a priority to help our own people overcome their addictions?

To change our policy before knowing who the next government will be would be premature, imprudent, and naïve. The common sense course of action is to wait until we know who we are dealing with and what commitments they are prepared to make.

Vote yes on McGovern-Skelton.

Note—Even though the authority granted in this bill would run out September 30, 2002, that still would give an unknown government 54 days to wage war. A lot can happen in 54 days.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. The reason I do this is that I, along with other members of the Committee on Agriculture, spent time in Colombia in January. We spent

quite a bit of time with President Pastrana. We spent quite a bit of time with their ambassador. I do not believe that a lot of people in the United States really fully realize the situation there.

At the present time, the guerrillas and the paramilitary forces control most of the firepower and control most of the money in the country. And so we are concerned about the fact that the government in Colombia is not providing enough aid to the military. The reason is that most of the money is in the hands of the guerrillas.

At the present time there are 600,000 acres of coca plants in Colombia. Out of that 600,000 acres of coca plants, 90 percent of the cocaine coming into the United States comes from those fields. The only way presently that anyone down there knows to control the problem is to bring in gunships, helicopters, which hover over those fields and protect the spray planes that then come in and spray the coca. Without those gunships and without that military aid, they have no chance, because they do not have enough military help and they do not have enough financing to battle this issue.

I certainly agree with one of the previous speakers when that person said that we need to dry up the demand. That is the number one thing that we have to do in this country. Drugs are ruining our young people and we have to fight drugs on every front. Interdiction is part of this.

And so I think that we are missing the point here if we say we just do not want to help Colombia, because they have a significant problem and we are talking about fighting terrorism around the world and the people who are controlling the situation in Colombia right now are terrorists. There is no question. We talked to President Pastrana. He spent one week in the control of those terrorists and escaped miraculously through many fortunate events. Of course, since then they have had other politicians that have been captured by those terrorists and have been killed. So we went to Cartagena, which was the one city we could find in Colombia that was reasonably safe, that was reasonably under friendly control down there. So many other cities were not even safe to attempt to control at that time.

That is why I oppose this amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect for, and I am sorry he is not on the floor anymore, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON). I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), the former coach. But they have come to the wrong conclusion on this.

I think I have been to Colombia more than any Member of Congress in the past 10 years. I do not know that for a fact, but I think so. I have lost track of

the trips. And I do not go to Cartagena and take the carriage ride through the tourist section. I have been to Neva, I have been to San Jose, I have been to where the pipeline is that the President wants to spend \$98 million of our tax money to protect a pipeline owned by Occidental Petroleum through which Colombian National Oil Company oil flows and, by the way, they had record profits last year.

□ 1945

I have got to tell you, every time I come back from Colombia, I come back with the same sick conclusion, and that is that the Colombians are going to do their utmost to get us to fight this civil war for them.

You see, what has not been mentioned yet today is unlike the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) who had two sons in Desert Storm, the Colombians just changed their law to where if you have a high school diploma, you are exempt from their draft. All of us can get the gist of that real quick. The politicians' sons are not going to fight this war. The poor bubba from the countryside, he does not have a high school diploma, so he goes and gets shot.

The Colombians are in the midst of a 38-year civil war, and yet they have cut their own defense budget in the past three years. Now, that is a fact.

Let me tell you what is even worse. When I went to little towns like Neva, it is probably a big deal in a little town like that for an American congressman to show up, so their chamber of commerce came out to meet me. We had a very long visit. We drank a few beers. They were amazingly honest.

I said, "Guys," I was trying to compare their tax load to ours. I said, "What do you all pay in taxes?" These were bankers, these were lawyers, these were the local mayor, the civic leaders. Their answer was, "We don't pay taxes. Yes, they are on the books, but we don't pay them."

You see, Americans do pay taxes, and what I really resent is a country where they pride themselves on not paying taxes, where they pride themselves on their kids avoiding military service, asking people in Mississippi and Alabama and Georgia, whose kids do volunteer to serve our country, to go fight their war for them.

I think the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is exactly right. And I will take it a step further. I want to make this as personal as I can. I think it is insane for this Nation to spend \$98 million to protect a pipeline that Occidental Petroleum owns with American lives.

I am going to make this as personal as humanly possible. President Bush, I will send my kids to guard that pipeline when you send your kids to guard that pipeline. Because I do not think you are going to see your daughters down there, and I sure as heck do not want to see my daughters or my son down there.

If the Colombians do not take their civil war seriously, then we should not either. My God, all day long we have been talking about being for the troops. Is not the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) proof positive what goes wrong when good kids go off to fight a war that our Nation does not really understand, that a Nation maybe should not be involved in? This is that case.

Guys, this is dead serious. I shut down the House two weeks ago because I wanted a vote on this. I cannot go to a funeral in Wiggins, I cannot go to a funeral in Louisville, I cannot go to a funeral in Waynesboro, and look somebody in the eye and say your son or daughter died doing the best thing for America.

This is not about America. The FARC and the ELN have gone out of their way not to target Americans. In 20 years, only 10 Americans have died in Colombia. They do not want us in their war. It is their war, and it is not worth sending my kids or your kids to die in. They do not even pay their own taxes. Their kids do not serve. So why on good God's good earth are we going to send our tax money and our kids to fight in it? Please support the Skelton-McGovern amendment. Do not waste one American life needlessly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote and, pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(b) The provision shall also apply to unexpired balances and assistance previously provided from prior years' Acts available for purposes identified in subsection (a).

(c) The authority in this section is in addition to authorities currently available to provide assistance to Colombia.

SEC. 308. In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available elsewhere in this Act for the Department of Defense or in the Department of Defense and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States Act, 2002 (Public Law 107-117), \$93,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004, is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense for the procurement of three MH-47 Chinook helicopters, as follows: "Aircraft Procurement, Army", \$63,000,000; and "Procurement, Defense-Wide", \$30,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire

amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for \$93,000,000, 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.

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

Mr. Chairman, a lot of Members have been asking me about a couple of the amendments that I have pending that no doubt we are going to get to later on tonight, or at least early in the morning. In anticipation of that, I have had my staff try to assemble some charts so I can stand here like so many experts have stood here today and back up my statements with charts. So as we move forward into this evening in anticipating that I certainly will have the opportunity later on tonight to explain my rationale in suggesting that we ought not give Israel and Arafat the \$250 million that is encompassed in this bill, I prepared some charts. Actually, I borrowed some.

I prepared some, like this one, that said "we have to do this." It says "President George Bush, August 14." I do not think Mr. Bush was talking about my particular amendment, but it is the only chart I had available to say, among other things, that President Bush did not ask for this money to be put in here to begin with, and I am sure if President Bush were here and I could get him on the telephone he would say so, but, unfortunately, he is in Europe, and, fortunately for us he is there, because he is trying to bring about peace throughout the world.

As we go into the debate on my amendments I want to talk about the economy, and this is another chart that mentions the economy. I had to borrow this one, too. It is not exactly what I wanted with respect to making my point, but, nevertheless, I wanted to talk about the economy and Israel, I wanted to talk about the economy and Egypt, I wanted to talk about the corresponding economy in the United States, to make certain that Members understood that the economy in Israel and the economy in Egypt and the economy in other countries in some cases is better than it is in the United States.

So by the time we get to mid-morning, when I am certain that the Committee on Rules will allow me to bring my amendments up, I will have all of these charts done in such a professional manner that you will be able to readily see my point with respect to what I am trying to say.

So I have got some other charts. This one, I have to use it upside down to make my point. This is a chart that tells about the economy in Israel, about the economy in the United States and, even though it is not exactly what I would have liked to have had, it does personify my point. I will have some more charts for you.

So as we reach this stage and as the Committee on Rules brings a rule tonight that permits my amendments to

come up, I will have some real professionally done charts to make my point. I am optimistic that once I make my point, not only will I convince a majority of this House of the merits of my amendment, we will also be able to convince the American people that when you adopt my amendment, you are doing exactly the right thing.

So anticipating that we will be debating this later on tonight, I just wanted to let you all know that I am working feverishly trying to come up with some professional charts. I hope to have some pictures by 1 o'clock when this probably will come up, and I probably will have.

But all of you are asking about these amendments, and especially that aid to Arafat, and I want you to have the opportunity to vote on that, and we are going to bring it up, I am optimistic, in whatever rule the Committee on Rules comes out with, and I will have some charts for you that will prove my point.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I just was wondering if you all had some handouts like this one as well?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will have handouts as well, too, provided I have the opportunity to bring my amendment up. When I bring my amendment up, I will ask some of you that have been coming up to me telling me all day long, "Sonny, you are doing exactly the right thing," I am going to have some handouts, and I want some of you to take these handouts and stand at the door and give these to the Members as they come in so they can understand exactly what we are talking about.

It is not a question of whether or not we love Israel, because we all do; it is a question of what is right and wrong. So, in any event, to those of you that have been anxiously awaiting all day long, we are on the brink of having this debate, as soon as the Committee on Rules comes back. By the time they come back, I will have the charts that really bring out vividly my points.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, with great respect to my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), and he is my good friend, because we have worked together on so many issues, I really do not find this issue a laughing matter, and I do hope, my good friend, that when we bring the charts here, we will also show pictures of the devastation, of the lives that have been lost, about the empty hotels, the empty streets. Because of the suicide bombers, people are afraid.

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

Ms. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, what my amendment would do would pro-

hibit money from going to a terrorist that has been blowing up all of the people in Israel. It denies him the money to use for other things so he can have his money to blow up the people of Israel, and that I am opposed to.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I was aware of several amendments. I am not sure if one amendment is regarding the \$200 million for Israel as well. I thought that was one of the amendments.

I think for those of us who are in touch with people who are living there and hear stories of the empty hotels, the lack of commerce, the lack of any kind of interaction in the region, many of us had great hopes, as the gentleman was saying, for the economy to begin booming again, for trade between Egypt and Israel and the other nations in the region, certainly with Jordan. There was a great deal of work done with Israel and in the region in trying to have projects, sewer projects, water projects, to help lift the people up, to educate the people.

So I take this amendment very seriously, and I do not believe that my colleagues should just treat it as an aside.

I just want to say one other thing. The vast majority of funding in this bill was requested by the President and will be granted by Congress to help bolster the war on terrorism, and whether resources go to secure our Nation's borders, improve transportation security, help our men and women in uniform in Central Asia or alleviate the poverty and instability that provides a breeding ground for extremism, all of our oars should be pulling together against terrorism. And providing assistance for Israel, our ally, in that part of the world, is just one part of the campaign.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield for one other compliment to the gentlewoman, as you will recall, since you sat immediately to my right next to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) when I chaired this committee, together we gave Israel \$20 billion during the six-year period that I chaired that committee, more than any amount of money in any six-year history of this country. So we are not talking about aid to Israel that is a shortfall. It is in addition to the \$20 billion that we have already given them.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, and I am afraid that I am quickly losing my time, yes, I was there when we were negotiating. The gentleman is talking about the Ne'eman Plan, and we all agreed to it. That was the time when there was interaction in the region. We did not have terrorists in the region blowing people up, blowing innocent children in a marketplace up. That was the time when we had hope for the future.

The President has made it clear that we are united in the war against terrorism. We see what is going on in that region of the world, and that is why I have supported the amount put in the bill.

Let me just say this: I have applauded the gentleman for crafting the plan. We worked together, we supported it. But times have changed. At that time, I would say to my chairman, my former chairman, we did not have a plane go into the World Trade Center. We did not have people dying in the street because of terrorists blowing people up.

So I think this is very different, and I would certainly ask my colleagues, when these amendments come up, unless the gentleman decides not to offer those amendments at 2 in the morning, when they come up, that we understand the difference in the world today and how those people are suffering and how we need to deal with our allies and make sure that we keep that message consistent.

□ 2000

There is a war on terrorism. We support the war on terrorism whether it is the Middle East, whether it is in Afghanistan, no matter where it is; and that is the position of our President.

So I hope the gentleman will reconsider and not offer those amendments.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, primarily, we are talking about the assistance to Arafat, the very person that we both despise because of the atrocities he has placed upon the citizens of Israel. How in the world anybody in this House could support giving money to a terrorist so he can use his existing money to do other things is unimaginable?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am very pleased that the chairman has withdrawn, as I understand it, one amendment which was funding for Israel, and if the gentleman is talking about the funding for Arafat and withdrawing that money, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will insert in the RECORD at this point my letter to Ambassador Burns confirming my earlier conversation with him in which he represented before the administration that none of the funds provided by this bill will be made available for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, UNRWA, but would rather go to NGOs and contractors working directly with the United States.

CONGRESSMAN BRAD SHERMAN, 24TH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA, LAS VIRGENES AND MALIBU, CA.,

May 23, 2002.

Hon. WILLIAM BURNS, Assistant Secretary of State for the Near East, The State Department, Washington, DC.

DEAR AMBASSADOR BURNS: Thank you very much for your telephone call this evening.

I want to confirm with you that the \$50 million in Economic Support Funds for humanitarian and refugee assistance provided

for the Palestinian people in HR 4775, the Supplemental Appropriations bill, will be distributed to NGOs and contractors operating in Palestinian areas to help provide for the critical needs of Palestinians.

Thank you for confirming that none of the funds in this bill will be made available by the Administration for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA).

Sincerely,

BRAD SHERMAN,
Member of Congress.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inform the House tongue in cheek that I have just been informed by an intelligence agency that the Netherlands are preparing for an invasion by the United States in response to the bill now before us. I have a note from Harry DeWit, counselor of cultural affairs, Netherlands Embassy saying, "We are quite alarmed to hear about the impending invasion of the Netherlands. Our military is on high alert. We would really value you forwarding any news and relevant information as soon as it comes to your attention and, in particular, as it regards the timing. I would like to be able to notify my superiors at the ministry prior to any invasion, and by doing so, I hope to improve my chances for promotion. I would appreciate your contacting me at your earliest convenience."

Mr. Chairman, I assume that is because the DeLay amendment to this bill, which is now part of this bill, gives the President the authority to use military force to extract prisoners from the World Court if they are accused of war crimes, but it does not just apply to U.S. citizens, it also applies to allies. So we could have an appointed official from a foreign country who we are going to use our military force against such as the Netherlands in order to "rescue."

If we did that, I am informed we would also be in violation of the NATO charter, because the NATO charter says, if you make war against one NATO ally, you make war against them all.

I have a chart here which I showed my colleagues yesterday labeled "Tom DeLay's Proposed Invasion of the Netherlands." It shows that perhaps we might do it by sea, we might do it by air, we might involve paratroopers. To make sure that this time, the gentleman from Texas knows where the Hague is, we have listed it on the map. I do not know what military force the Netherlands would use to repel our invasion, but I assume they will use something.

So I would simply say that this appears like a laughing matter, but it is not. The greatest deliberative body in the world, the House of Representatives, for the greatest democracy in the world, the United States of America, ought to approach these issues with more seriousness than was demonstrated by the lack of care in the drafting of the DeLay amendment. I

think the DeLay amendment raises a legitimate question with respect to United States citizens, but I think the proper way to deal with that is to allow the President to negotiate changes in the treaty, rather than having Congress ride off like the Lone Ranger, Marshal Dillon, and Daffy Duck at the same time.

So with that, I would urge Members to think soberly about how this proposal as presently constituted makes us look to the world.

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 144, noes 252, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 199]

AYES—144

Ackerman	Hilliard	Murtha
Allen	Hinchev	Nadler
Andrews	Hinojosa	Napolitano
Baca	Hoefel	Neal
Baird	Holden	Oberstar
Baldacci	Holt	Obey
Baldwin	Honda	Olver
Barrett	Hooley	Owens
Becerra	Hoyer	Pallone
Berkley	Inslee	Pascrell
Berman	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Berry	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)
Bishop	(TX)	Pomeroy
Borski	Jefferson	Price (NC)
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Boyd	Jones (NC)	Rodriguez
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Rothman
Brown (FL)	Kaptur	Rush
Brown (OH)	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Capuano	Kildee	Sanchez
Cardin	Kilpatrick	Sanders
Clay	Kind (WI)	Sandlin
Clayton	Kleczka	Schakowsky
Clement	Kucinich	Schiff
Clyburn	LaFalce	Sherman
Conyers	Langevin	Shows
Coyne	Lantos	Slaughter
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Smith (WA)
Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	Snyder
DeFazio	Lee	Solis
Delahunt	Levin	Spratt
DeLauro	Lowe	Stark
Dingell	Lynch	Stenholm
Doggett	Markey	Stupak
Doyle	Mascara	Tanner
Etheridge	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Evans	McCarthy (NY)	Thurman
Farr	McDermott	Tierney
Fattah	McGovern	Towns
Filner	McNulty	Velazquez
Ford	Meehan	Visclosky
Frank	Meek (FL)	Waters
Frost	Meeks (NY)	Watson (CA)
Gephardt	Millender-	Watt (NC)
Gonzalez	McDonald	Waxman
Harman	Miller, George	Wexler
Hastings (FL)	Mink	Wu
Hefley	Mollohan	Wynn
Hill	Moran (VA)	

NOES—252

Akin	Barcia	Bereuter
Armey	Barr	Biggart
Bachus	Bartlett	Bilirakis
Baker	Barton	Blagojevich
Ballenger	Bass	Blumenauer

Blunt	Hall (OH)	Pickering
Boehlert	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Bonilla	Hansen	Platts
Bono	Hart	Pombo
Boozman	Hastings (WA)	Portman
Boswell	Hayes	Putnam
Brown (SC)	Hayworth	Quinn
Bryant	Herger	Rahall
Buyer	Hilleary	Ramstad
Callahan	Hobson	Regula
Calvert	Hoekstra	Rehberg
Camp	Horn	Reynolds
Cannon	Hostettler	Rivers
Cantor	Hulshof	Roemer
Capito	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Capps	Isakson	Rogers (MI)
Carson (IN)	Israel	Rohrabacher
Carson (OK)	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Castle	Istook	Ross
Chabot	Jenkins	Roybal-Allard
Chambliss	John	Royce
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Ryan (WI)
Collins	Johnson (IL)	Ryun (KS)
Cooksey	Johnson, Sam	Saxton
Costello	Kanjorski	Schaffer
Cox	Keller	Schrock
Cramer	Kelly	Scott
Crane	Kennedy (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Crenshaw	Kerns	Serrano
Cubin	King (NY)	Sessions
Culberson	Kingston	Shadegg
Cunningham	Kirk	Shaw
Davis (CA)	Knollenberg	Shays
Davis (FL)	Kolbe	Sherwood
Davis, Jo Ann	LaHood	Shimkus
Davis, Tom	Lampson	Shuster
Deal	Latham	Simmons
DeGette	LaTourette	Simpson
DeLay	Leach	Skeen
DeMint	Lewis (CA)	Skelton
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (GA)	Smith (MI)
Dicks	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Doolittle	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Dreier	Lofgren	Souder
Duncan	Lucas (KY)	Stearns
Dunn	Lucas (OK)	Strickland
Edwards	Luther	Stump
Ehlers	Maloney (CT)	Sullivan
Ehrlich	Maloney (NY)	Sununu
Emerson	Manzullo	Sweeney
Engel	Matheson	Tancredto
English	McCarthy (MO)	Tauscher
Eshoo	McCollum	Tauzin
Everett	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
Ferguson	McHugh	Terry
Flake	McInnis	Thomas
Fletcher	McKeon	Thornberry
Foley	McKinney	Thune
Forbes	Menendez	Tiahrt
Fossella	Mica	Tiberi
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Dan	Turner
Gallely	Miller, Gary	Udall (CO)
Ganske	Miller, Jeff	Udall (NM)
Gekas	Moore	Upton
Gibbons	Moran (KS)	Walden
Gilchrest	Morella	Walsh
Gillmor	Myrick	Wamp
Gilman	Nethercutt	Watkins (OK)
Goode	Ney	Watts (OK)
Goodlatte	Northup	Weiner
Gordon	Norwood	Weldon (FL)
Goss	Osborne	Weldon (PA)
Graham	Otter	Weller
Graves	Paul	Wilson (NM)
Green (TX)	Payne	Wilson (SC)
Green (WI)	Pence	Wolf
Greenwood	Peterson (PA)	Woolsey
Grucci	Phelps	Young (AK)
Gutknecht		Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—38

Abercrombie	Granger	Radanovich
Aderholt	Gutierrez	Reyes
Bentsen	Houghton	Riley
Boehner	Hyde	Roukema
Bonior	Linder	Sawyer
Brady (TX)	Lipinski	Thompson (CA)
Burr	McIntyre	Thompson (MS)
Burton	Nussle	Toomey
Combest	Ortiz	Trafficant
Condit	Oxley	Vitter
Crowley	Pastor	Whitfield
Deutsch	Petri	Wicker
Dooley	Pryce (OH)	

May 23, 2002

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H3011

□ 2029
Messrs. GANSKE, COLLINS, SOUDER, WILSON of South Carolina, WELLES, PICKERING, BLUNT, and Ms. DUNN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” So the motion to rise was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

NOTICE

***Incomplete record of House proceedings.
Today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.***