

I rise to speak to this bill for its inclusion of support of the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. I was very pleased to be able to support the Slaughter amendment which added \$15 million to the budgets of the NEA and the NEH. It is a small but important step, for those two organizations raise the Nation's cultural competence. It is extremely important that the next generation of Americans be culturally aware. They need to understand the history, the art, the culture, the literature and archaeology not only of this Nation but of the world.

I am very proud, coming from the 18th Congressional District in Houston, to support the Houston Symphony, the Houston Ballet, the Houston Grand Opera, the Ensemble and many, many other arts institutions in our community. The many, many museums that we enjoy in Houston and the State of Texas, all of it benefits from the support of the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. That is why this bill was passed with such overwhelming support. That is why I am pleased to have supported the Slaughter amendment and to rise today to support the NEA and the NEH.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. OSBORNE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of important debates in the last 48 hours over critical spending bills and the creation of our national budget, a very, very important piece of law-making has taken place that will find its way onto the blue carpet of this historic place next week. It is the issue of partial-birth abortion, H.R. 4965, the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2001, which I am proud to say as a Member of the Committee on the Judiciary we marked up and reported out by an overwhelming vote earlier today.

Mr. Speaker, I would offer that societies are rightly judged by how they deal with the most defenseless among their citizenry and how they confront those who exploit the most defenseless. This is best expressed in the proverb that "Whatsoever you do for the least of these, you do also for me."

□ 2130

Today, in the House Committee on the Judiciary, we took up what for some, at times, sounded like the debate over abortion and the woman's right to choose that has been settled law in this country since 1973. In fact, Mr. Speaker, what we brought up today was an issue altogether different. It is about a practice in this country described in our legislation that is barbarous, to say the least.

In our legislation we describe the procedure that is banned, that the American Medical Association has said is never medically indicated. "A partial-birth abortion under this law is an abortion in which a physician delivers an unborn child's body until only the head remains inside the womb, punctures the back of the child's skull with a sharp instrument and sucks the child's brains out before completing delivery of a dead infant."

I must tell my colleagues that as a Christian and as an American and as a father of three children, it is astonishing to me that this is even remotely legal in America today, but it is. And as we will no doubt hear on this floor next week, it is practiced all too often in this country.

We will bring the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2002 to the floor again. We have changed the bill, adding findings of fact to overcome constitutional barriers, and I am confident that it will survive judicial review. The American people, Mr. Speaker, want this bill in overwhelming numbers, believing in their hearts that we are better than this. We are a better people.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, it is simply the right thing to do, to stand with newborn children, the most defenseless among us. The Good Book tells us, "See I set before you today blessings and curses, life and death; now choose life so that you and your children may live."

It is my hope, and it will be my prayer, in the intervening days as I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do as we have done in bipartisan fashion in the past in this institution, and send a deafening message into the laws of the United States that this heinous, barbarous practice of infanticide, which we call a procedure known as partial-birth abortion, has no place in the great and good Nation of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FILNER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LAFALCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KANJORSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SANDLIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN CELEBRATION OF THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF TITLE IX OF THE EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1972

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, June 23rd marked the 30th anniversary of Title IX of

the Education Amendments of 1972 which prohibits sex discrimination in any educational institution that receives federal funds. To commemorate this 30th anniversary, it is important that we celebrate the successes of Title IX, acknowledge its tremendous and positive impact on the lives of girls and women in our country, and rededicate ourselves to the continued pursuit of equal educational opportunities for girls and women.

I was a member of the House Education and Labor Committee in 1972. I worked diligently to promote civil rights legislation during my entire tenure. I consider Title IX to be one of my most significant efforts as a Member of Congress, and I take special pride in honoring its contributions to changing our view about women's role in America.

Title IX has opened the doors of educational opportunity to millions of girls and women who otherwise would have been shunned or relegated to a secondary place. Title IX has helped to tear down barriers to admissions, increase opportunities for women in nontraditional fields of study, improve vocational educational opportunities for women, reduce discrimination against pregnant students and teen mothers, protect female students from sexual harassment in our schools, and increase athletic competition for girls and women.

We have heard much about the many successes of Title IX, particularly in athletics. Most do not know of the long arduous course we took before the enactment of Title IX and the battles that we have fought to keep it intact. On the occasion of this 30th anniversary, it is appropriate to take time to reflect on the history of this landmark legislation so we may never forget the struggles and we may never forget the original purpose.

From the day at age four when I had my appendix removed, I knew I wanted to be a doctor. I went to college drive with this goal. I was elected President of our college pre-med organization. No one bothered to tell me that my career goal could not be achieved because I was female. In my senior year I applied to a dozen or more medical schools. Everyone turned me down because I was female. I was stunned. I had a degree in zoology and chemistry that could not get me to my coveted profession. America the land of the free had closed its doors of opportunity to me because I was female.

Again after I got my law degree I was shut out from employment because I was female.

When I ran for elected office was ostracized because I was "only a woman" and presumably therefore had nothing to contribute.

This personal story of my life adds meaning to what happened in Congress. Title IX had its origins in a series of hearings on sex discrimination and equal opportunities for girls and women held in the mid-1960s and early 1970s by the House Education and Labor Committee. Throughout that time, the committee had been engaged in the process of systematically gathering a large body of evidence of discrimination against girls and women in our educational system.

In 1965, the year I first came to Congress and became a freshman member of the Education and Labor Committee, Chair Adam Clayton Powell initiated an examination of discrimination in textbooks. Our committee scrutinized textbooks and found that they portrayed girls and women in stereotypical ways and

minimized our potential to lead. We hauled in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare because they were issuing brochures and films that consistently portrayed women in occupations such as nursing, teaching, or social work, but never as scientists, doctors, lawyers, judges, pilots, or engineers. We scrutinized vocational education courses and found that girls were being taught home economics while boys were being taught skills and concepts that would prepare them for higher wage careers. In addition, we found that the admissions policies of many institutions systematically excluded women from graduate and professional schools and rarely if ever afforded them scholarships, fellowships, research stipends, or staff assistantships.

In 1970, Congresswoman Edith Green (D-OR), Chair of the House Special Subcommittee on Education, held hearings on a bill she had introduced, H.R. 16098. This bill would have amended Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance—to also ban sex discrimination.

On July 3, 1970, Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights Jerris Leonard testified before Congresswoman Green's subcommittee on H.R. 16098. He said that while the Justice Department would not support language to amend the Civil Rights Act, "we suggest an alternative". The alternative was that the committee should concentrate on developing separate legislation that would prohibit sex discrimination in education. This was the genesis of Title IX.

It is important to put this initiative in the context of the times. This was right around the time of the big push for the Equal Rights Amendment. The women's movement was active and growing and supporters of equal rights for women were pursuing equal protection under the Constitution. Under the leadership of Representative Martha Griffiths (D-MI) Congress voted for the ERA in 1971 by a vote of 354 to 24, sending it to the states for ratification. While Congresswoman Green's bill to prohibit sex discrimination under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 would have provided broader protections for women, prohibiting sex discrimination in education would be a giant step forward in the fight for equal rights for girls and women.

The opportunity to add Title XI came in 1971 when the House turned its attention to consideration of amendments to the Higher Education Act, H.R. 7248. It was initially Title X of H.R. 7248 and it prohibited discrimination on the basis of sex in any educational institution receiving federal funds. It also authorized the Civil Rights Commission to investigate sex discrimination, removed the exemption of teachers from the equal employment coverage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and eliminated the exemption of executives, administrators, and professions from the Equal Pay Act.

The bill was reported out of the House Education and Labor Committee on September 30, 1971 and was considered by the full House on October 27, 1971.

During consideration by the full House, Representative John Erlenborn (R-IL) offered an amendment to exempt undergraduate admissions policies of colleges and universities from the prohibition of sex discrimination. This amendment won by a 5-vote margin, 194 to 189.

The provision that would have authorized the Civil Rights Commission to investigate sex discrimination (section 1007) was eliminated during the floor debate on a point of order by House Judiciary Committee Chair Emanuel Celler (D-NY) because it came under the jurisdiction of his committee.

At the same time, the Senate was working on amendments to its Higher Education Act. The Senate also argued bitterly over the inclusion of a provision banning sex discrimination in schools.

During the Senate floor debate on August 6, 1971, Senator Birch Bayh (D-IN) offered an amendment, along with Senators EDWARD KENNEDY (D-MA) and Phil Hart (D-MI), to ban sex discrimination in any public higher education institution or graduate program receiving federal funds. Senator George McGovern (D-SD) also submitted an amendment prohibiting sex discrimination in education, but decided not to offer it and instead supported the Bayh amendment.

As the Bayh amendment was considered, Senator STROM THURMOND (R-SC) raised a point of order against it on the grounds that it was not germane. The point of order was sustained by the Chair, who agreed and ruled that "the pending amendment deals with discrimination on the basis of sex. There are no provisions in the bill dealing with sex." A 50 to 32 roll call vote sustained the ruling of the Chair.

The Senate reconsidered the higher education legislation in early 1972 because it objected to the House version that included provisions prohibiting the use of federal education funds for busing. Again, the bill that came out of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare did not include any provisions banning sex discrimination in schools.

Fortunately, Senator Birch Bayh was persistent on the issue of sex discrimination in education. During the floor debate that began on February 22, 1972 he offered an amendment that would prohibit sex discrimination in educational institutions receiving federal funds but would exempt the admissions policies of private institutions. Later, Senator Lloyd Bentsen (D-TX) offered an amendment to the Bayh amendment that also provided an exemption for public single-sex undergraduate institutions. Both amendments passed by voice vote. This time, a provision prohibiting sex discrimination in schools was included in the bill passed by the Senate.

Negotiations in the House-Senate Conference Committees, held in the spring of 1972, finally yielded Title IX. The final language prohibited sex discrimination in educational institutions receiving federal funding and applied to institutions of vocational education, professional education, and graduate higher education, and to public institutions of undergraduate higher education. The conference report was filed in the Senate on May 22 and in the House on May 23. The bill was approved by Congress on June 8. On June 23, 1972—30 years ago—President Nixon signed it into law.

Since its passage most people have come to associate Title IX with gains made by girls and women in athletics. Certainly, this is the most visible, spectacular, and recognized outcome of Title IX. However, many are surprised to learn that the topic of athletics did not even come up in the original discussions about Title IX. Our primary goal was to open up educational opportunities for girls and women in

academics, and the most controversial issue at that time was the application of Title IX to institutional admissions policies.

The impact of Title IX on athletics became apparent almost immediately. We were thrilled to see that athletic opportunities were starting to open up to girls and women, although these changes also sparked controversy. When coaches and male athletes began to realize that they would have to share their facilities and budgets with women, they became outraged. In 1975, this anger prompted the first and most significant challenge to the law.

Opponents of Title IX proposed an amendment to the education appropriations bill to prohibit the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from promulgating Title IX regulations to apply to college and university athletics. They paraded a number of college and professional athletes through the committee room to testify that Title IX hurt men's athletics. At the time, women athletes were so few and unknown that the only well-known athlete we could bring in to testify was Billie Jean King. The fact that there were virtually no prominent women athletes in our country was a testament in itself to the necessity of Title IX.

The amendment was agreed to by the House and was included in the 1975 House appropriations bill (H.R. 5901), but it was not agreed to by the Senate and was stricken in conference.

On July 16, 1975, I managed the House floor debate against a motion by Representative Robert Casey (R-TX) to insist on the House position. In the midst of vigorous debate on the issue and just prior to the vote, I was sent word that my daughter had been in a life-threatening car accident in Ithaca, New York. I left the floor immediately and rushed off to Ithaca to be with her. After I left, the Casey motion carried on a vote of 212 to 211. The House had voted to exclude college athletics from Title IX regulations. The newspapers reported that I had left the floor "crying" in the face of defeat. Without checking with my office the paper indulged in the very stereotypical smear that we were fighting against.

The following day, the Senate voted 65 to 29 to insist on the Senate position and strike the amendment from the bill.

On the next legislative day, July 18, 1975, Speaker Carl Albert (D-OK) and Representative Daniel Flood (D-PA) took the House floor and explained the circumstances of my departure. Representative Flood then offered a motion "to recede and concur in the Senate position". An affirmative vote on this motion would reverse the vote taken by the House two days prior and would reject both the Casey position and the amendment. It carried by a vote of 216 to 178. Title IX's application to athletics for preserved.

While the story of Title IX is a story of celebration, it also a story of struggle to defend it against persistent challenges. Although we celebrate the year 1972 as the year of enactment of Title IX, in retrospect it is clear that I was engaged in efforts to pass a Title IX law since I first arrived in Congress in 1965. There is also a clear pattern of repeated attempts to weaken or undermine Title IX from the very beginning. For 30 years, we have constantly needed to be on guard to defend it.

Five years ago, several colleagues and I came together on the House floor to celebrate

the 25th anniversary of Title IX. Since then its story of spectacular successes, coupled with new and significant challenges, has continued to evolve. One of the most notable successes since the last anniversary was the tremendous victory by the U.S. Women's Soccer Team in the 1999 Women's World Cup. Hundreds of thousands of spectators attended the games and millions more watched on television. These strong, disciplined, and exciting athletes drew record-breaking audiences, inspired a whole new generation of girls to pursue their dreams, and captivated a nation.

This victory was significant not only for its impact on women's athletics but as a testament to the power of Congress to change the nation for the better. Mia Hamm, one of the team's brightest stars, was born in 1972—the same year that Title IX was signed into law. Without Title IX, she and many of her teammates may have never had the opportunity to develop their talents and pursue their dreams.

Along with recent public celebrations of Title IX however, there have also been new and high-profile attacks. In 1998, the Republican majority of the Committee on Education and the Workforce inserted an 11th hour provision into the Higher Education Amendments that would have required colleges and universities to report annually any changes in funding or in the number of participants on an athletics team. In addition, it would have required them to forecast four years in advance any decisions to eliminate or reduce athletic programs or funding and to "justify" their decisions.

During the House floor debate on the Higher Education Amendments on May 6, 1998 TIM ROEMER (D-IN) offered an amendment to delete the provision.

Several colleagues and I argued strenuously in support of the Roemer amendment. We believed that this provision would have been extraordinarily intrusive on the decision-making processes of colleges and universities. We believed that it was impractical because it would have been virtually impossible for institutions to know four years in advance whether or not they would need to cut programs. Most importantly, we opposed this provision because of its potential for severe and adverse impact on the enforcement of Title IX. This provision had been supported by opponents of Title IX who wanted to force colleges and universities into blaming Title IX for their decisions to make reductions or cuts to minor, non-revenue men's sports teams.

The argument that Title IX is to blame for the reduction of some men's minor, non-revenue teams is patently false. Title IX regulations do not require schools to cut men's teams in order to comply with Title IX. Instead, reductions or cuts to some men's sports teams—and to many women's minor sports teams as well—are due to choices made by college administrators in favor of the big budget, revenue-generating programs such as football and basketball. To blame Title IX is disingenuous and just plain wrong! The goal of Title IX is not to disadvantage men but to provide equal opportunities for women.

After a vigorous debate on the House floor, the Roemer amendment was agreed to by a vote of 292–129. The provision was deleted from the Higher Education Amendments of 1998.

Unfortunately, the myth that Title IX is to blame for the reduction of men's minor sports teams on college campuses has continued to

persist. In January of this year, the National Wrestling Coaches Association and other groups filed a high-profile lawsuit in federal court against the U.S. Department of Education, arguing that colleges and universities have cut wrestling teams and other men's minor sports teams in order to comply with Title IX.

This argument is unsupportable. The Department of Education's regulations regarding Title IX do not require schools to cut men's teams in order to comply with Title IX. Rather, "proportionality" is only one of three ways that schools can comply with the law. They may (1) offer athletic opportunities in substantial proportion to male and female enrollment, or (2) show that the institution is steadily increasing opportunities for women students overtime, or (3) show that the athletic interests and abilities of female students are being met. Institutions do not need to demonstrate all three.

While the Department of Justice filed a motion to seek dismissal of this lawsuit on May 29, 2002, the final disposition of the case is pending.

New challenges and questions have also been raised recently about Title IX and single-sex education. On May 8, 2002 the U.S. Department of Education announced its intention to encourage single-sex education in the nation's public schools by filing a notice of intent to propose amendments to the regulations implementing Title IX. According to the announcement in the Federal Register, the Bush Administration wants to "provide more flexibility for educators to establish single-sex classes and schools at the elementary and secondary levels". This announcement marked a reversal of three decades of federal education policy regarding single-sex education.

While advocates of this proposal cite research studies indicating that students may perform better in same-sex educational environments, opponents fear that the proposal endorses a form of segregation. In addition, many others worry that tampering with the current Title IX regulations is risky and dangerous and may have the ultimate effect of weakening Title IX.

Given difficult challenges such as these, it is especially important that we celebrate the many successes of Title IX. However, it is even more important that we not become complacent about Title IX. Many young girls and women today do not even know about Title IX and take it for granted that equal educational opportunities are safeguarded by the Constitution. While it is wonderful that equity has become the expected norm, we must also teach each new generation that there was a time when Title IX did not exist. Further, we all need to be reminded that since Title IX was put in a place by a legislative body, it can also be taken away by a legislative body. We need to be vigilant. Title IX must be protected and defended to ensure that equal educational opportunities for girls and women are preserved for all generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, as I have recounted this story here tonight, you can see that the pursuit and enforcement of Title IX has been a personal crusade for me for three decades. I am proud to have been a part of the enactment of Title IX in Congress 30 years ago, and I continue to be proud of its rich and lasting legacy of equal educational opportunities for girls and women. On this 30th anniversary, let us rededicate ourselves to the goals of dignity,

equality, and opportunity for all that characterized our dreams for Title IX 30 years ago. These goals are every bit as worthy and important today, in 2002, as they were in 1972.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BENTSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

LEGACIES OF DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, about a week ago the President of the United States went to Wall Street in the wake of the accounting scandals and the scandals that have caused so many Americans to lose so much money, so much of their life savings, so much money that they were counting on to pay for their retirements. One of the things he told the Wall Street firms was, you have to change the system of hiding your debts, making your balance sheets look better than they are. It is a shame the President did not live by his own axiom a year ago right now.

Those of my colleagues who watch television, those of my colleagues who read the newspapers know that starting last January, February, March, we are talking about a year ago, the President was telling the American people, Washington is awash in money, it is awash in money. We have to have this big tax break. Well, it is easy to pay, Mr. President, if you are hiding the debts of the country. You see, because a year ago right now, and I do mean a year ago right now, our Nation was \$5,726,814,835,287.17 in debt, and yet you had the American people convinced that we were awash in money.

What is even worse than the fact that we owed all of that money was that we owed; and I look into the audience and I look around the country and I see folks who pay taxes and the biggest portion of a lot of folks' taxes is what they pay to Social Security, that is that FICA on your tax bill. The promise was made in the 1980s when they raised those taxes, with a Democratic House and a Republican Senate and a Republican President by the name of President Reagan, they were going to take that money and set it aside and make sure it is used for nothing but Social Security. They lied to us.

Mr. Speaker, right now, if we were to find the mythical lock box for Social Security and open it up, all we will find is an IOU that says we owe the people who paid into the Social Security Trust Fund \$1,300,000,000,000. If we look a little bit farther down on our pay stub, and again, these taxes were raised in the 1980s, a Democratic House, a Republican Senate and a Republican

President, they raised the taxes on Medicare. If you were to find the mythical lock box for Medicare, and I do mean mythical, because there is nothing there, we would find an IOU for \$271 billion.

Now, for folks like myself from Mississippi, it is hard to imagine \$1 billion. I think one of the reasons that the folks in Washington use the term "billion" is we think of it as 271 of these things, be it apples or boats or whatever. So let me walk an average Joe like myself through it.

Everybody can visualize \$1,000. A lot of people pay \$1,000 on their house on rent. So we can kind of visualize a thousand times a thousand. That gets us up to a million. Visualize a thousand times that. That is a billion. So a thousand times a thousand times a thousand times 271 is what we owe the Medicare trust fund. There is not a penny there. It is spent. The money collected was supposed to be set aside for Social Security, for Medicare. It is gone.

How about our military retirees? How many times have we heard since September how proud we are of our troops and how we need to do everything for them? Well, Mr. President, maybe one of the things we ought to do for them is pay back the \$168 billion that we owe to their retirement fund. Again, a thousand times a thousand times a thousand times 168. There is not a penny there, it is just IOUs.

We have heard about our brave Border Patrol, the Customs agents, the FBI agents, the guys who sweep these buildings on a fairly regular basis looking for chemical and biological weapons. They pay into their retirement fund; this young lady right here pays into her retirement fund; her employer, you, the Federal Government pays a portion into her retirement fund. If we were to find the account for the retirement fund, all we are going to find is an IOU for a thousand times a thousand times a thousand times 540.

Mr. President, it begs the question, how did you tell the American people we were awash in money when we were \$5 trillion in debt? You had your budget. You had a Republican House, a Republican Senate, they passed you a budget dollar for dollar the way you wanted it. You got your tax cuts, and in the wake of all of that, in 12 months alone, we have increased the national debt, the debt that all of these young people in this room have to pay, the debt that my kids have to pay, by \$399,653,925,113.31.

Mr. Speaker, in the time that you have been Speaker of the House, the national debt has increased by \$511,040,208,939. That is more money than this country accumulated in debt in 199 years, and yet, for 1,300 days you have not allowed us a vote on a balanced budget amendment. Is this not enough? Is this the legacy you want to leave the American people, or do you want to leave the American people a legacy of a balanced budget? I hope, and I ask, for the latter.

MUSHARRAF AND DEMOCRACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my outrage over the continued infiltration by Pakistani-backed militants and the line of control in Kashmir and the continued blatant terrorist attacks on innocent women and children in Jammu and Kashmir.

About a month ago, President Musharraf of Pakistan acquiesced and promised to end infiltration of militants who were openly supported politically and morally by Pakistan. India had been willing to honor Musharraf's promise by giving him a chance to act on his word and waiting until October to assess the infiltration situation at the Line of Control.

But much to everyone's dismay, this brutal killing in this war-torn region is going on unabated, despite Musharraf's promises. This past weekend's savage attack has left 27 civilians dead and wounded another 30 civilians. Another attack today wounded 13 people in Kashmir. I do not think there is any justification for such violence.

Mr. Speaker, infiltration by militants at the border and terrorism in Kashmir needs to be stopped in order for peace and stability to be reinstated in this fragile region of the world. However, every step Musharraf is taking is, in fact, turning Pakistan in the opposite direction of achieving any sense of peace or stability, and, most importantly, achieving democracy.

Mr. Speaker, President Musharraf has proposed changes to the constitution that are of grave concern. The underlying strategy behind his guise of transitioning to democracy is, in fact, to restructure the Pakistani government to protect his dictatorship. Through over 70 proposed amendments, he is attempting to rewrite Pakistan's constitution in order to empower his branch of government over other branches of the Pakistani government. In addition, Musharraf would also be giving the constitutional power to dissolve the parliament, dismiss and appoint a prime minister, and establish a national security council as a constitutional body.

The latest piece of his proposal is to require members of parliament to hold university degrees which would disqualify 98 percent of Pakistan's 144 million citizens, but also would disallow over half of the politicians serving in the last parliament from holding office again.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the use of American resources provided in economic and military aid to an antidemocratic Pakistani regime. In October 2001, Congress passed a bill, S. 1465, which granted the President authority to waive all sanctions against Pakistan, including sanctions against