

Cable News Network also, and I think as an American people, we should expect attacks on American soil through acts of terror from the minute that that vote is taken, and we should be prepared for that as a Nation. The only way to be prepared for that as a Nation is to have the Guard and Reserve called up.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded that their remarks in debate should be addressed to the Chair. It is not in order to direct remarks directly to the President of the United States.

#### BALANCING THE BUDGET

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I want to continue on the general thesis of the concern that many of us have on this side of the aisle, that we seemingly have forgotten about budgets and balanced budgets and we seem to not be willing to talk about the deficits that are now occurring. That is very alarming.

As you know, last year this body passed a budget, an economic game plan. There seems to be a great reluctance to change that plan, which means that we are now willingly going to be endorsing deficits as far as the eye can see.

We on this side on the Blue Dog Caucus have repeatedly offered to work in a bipartisan way with our friends on the other side of the aisle and with the administration to come up with a new budget plan. But there seems to be no desire whatsoever to do so.

We now are very concerned, because at the end of this month the few remaining budget rules that have worked fairly good over the most recent period of time when we did achieve a balanced budget, pay-go, simply saying if you are going to increase spending you have got to find some cut somewhere else, expire. If you are going to cut taxes, you have got to find somewhere else to pay for it. It has worked pretty good, when the spirit of this body was behind it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be no willingness of the leadership of this House to pass these budget enforcement rules so that they might at least be enforced, and some would say so they can be ignored, which is basically what we have been doing in this body all year. The rules we have, we ignore them and we pass a rule over the objection of the minority.

The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget makes a very compelling argument that we should stop blaming the other body for what they are not doing and just us do our job. It would seem that it would make a lot

more sense to all of us in this body if we passed all 13 appropriation bills. Then we would have something to be concerned about, whether the Senate does or does not pass a budget.

□ 1930

But we seemingly are not going to be able to pass the 13 appropriation bills, but some of us seem perfectly willing to find somebody to blame. I was reminded a long time ago when you are pointing the finger of blame at someone else, there are always three pointing back at you; and we need to be reminded and we are going to take to the floor quite often over the next several days and remind everyone of the multitude of budget votes, lockbox votes that we voted in this body almost unanimously that no one was going to touch the Social Security surplus. We are. And as far as the eye can see, we are going to be doing it again.

Running up debt, we increased our Nation's debt by \$450 billion in a vote last year. We are going to have to do it again early next year because, as the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) pointed out, our public debt outstanding has now gone to \$6.210 trillion. That is an increase of \$440 billion, and I said increase because seemingly when you read the press and you read the rhetoric of what we are attempting to be told that it is not that bad, it is that bad. It is a serious problem, and it goes far beyond the war on terrorism.

CBO says the impact of September 11 represents only about 11 percent of the total deterioration of the surplus since last year, and now we are being told that we are going to possibly be in another war, that the estimated cost now ranges somewhere between 100 and \$200 billion. We should spend some time, instead of doing what we seem to be doing here this week, very few votes of substance, very few discussions, no bills being proposed to put the pay-go rules and putting some budget discipline back into our budget, no one talking about a budget, no one talking about a new budget, which means that somebody ought to come on this floor and defend the budget that we are now under.

Come on this floor and honestly talk about the fact that we have borrowed in the last 12 months \$440 billion; \$440 billion that we have borrowed. We owe the Social Security trust fund \$1.3 trillion. We owe Medicare \$263 billion. We owe the military retirement fund \$164 billion. We owe the civil service retirement and disability fund \$535 billion, and we are increasing that. I do not think that is the kind of a budget confidence vote that the markets are looking at or that anyone is looking at today.

I would conclude my remarks by saying Congress and the President need to come up with a new budget and economic game plan to deal with the changes in our budgetary outlook and deal with the new circumstances facing this country. To do otherwise is fiscally irresponsible.

#### IMPLEMENTING A LONG-TERM BUDGET PLAN

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

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on the themes that were developed by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. Speaker, we are less than 2 weeks away from the end of the fiscal year, and it is rapidly becoming very clear that the leadership of the House, this House of Representatives, has painted itself into a corner. How do we implement a responsible long-term budget plan? How do we extend the current budget enforcement rules that help control discretionary spending and require offsets for mandatory spending and new tax cuts? These budget enforcement rules are set to expire on October 1. How do we enact the 13 annual appropriations bills in regular order?

All of these questions must be answered by the House leadership if we are going to stem the flow of red ink and put the Federal budget back on the path to balance. Unfortunately, the only solution that the House leadership seems to have is to pretend that these deadlines do not exist. This is not a workable solution.

The Blue Dog Coalition has offered to work with the Republican leadership to develop bipartisan answers to these questions by establishing a viable long-term budget, extending the budget enforcement rules to control both the tax side and the spending side of the Federal budget, and to develop a road map to enact the appropriations bills in a fiscally responsible manner. We have offered in the past to work with the leadership, and we do that again this week.

First, Congress and the President need to make tough choices to address the changes in the budget outlook. The President has an obligation to lead in proposing a game plan to deal with the changed circumstances and to put the budget back on a path to balance without using the Social Security surplus. Right now under the President's budget, we will be borrowing from the Social Security trust fund until at least 2009. Given that the House of Representatives has voted seven times since I have been in this House in 5½ years to protect the Social Security trust fund by placing it in a lockbox, it is simply unacceptable to borrow the Social Security trust fund for the next 8 years to operate the general revenue side of the government. This is why we must sit down in a bipartisan manner and develop realistic tax and spending levels that will put us back on the glide path to a balanced budget.

Next, we must extend the budget caps which are set to expire, the provisions of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, which were adopted on a bipartisan basis expire, as I said earlier, on October 1. Unless we renew our budget

discipline, Congress will continue to find ways to pass more legislation that puts still more red ink on the national ledger. Even Alan Greenspan and the Concord Coalition agree that steps must be taken to answer these questions in such a way that we balance the budget. Chairman Greenspan stated, and I quote, "Failing to preserve (budget enforcement rules) would be a grave mistake . . ." The Concord Coalition warned that allowing budget enforcement rules to expire is "an open invitation to fiscal chaos."

Finally, we must work together to develop a bipartisan proposal to finish the 13 appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, our fiscal year ends in about 2 weeks. Over the past few years, when Congress and the President have not been able to finish the 13 appropriations bills, spending has far exceeded the levels that were recommended in the budget resolution earlier in the year. This year, we have not sent one of the 13, not one of the 13 appropriations bills to the President for his signature. As a matter of fact, the House, the House of Representatives has passed only three of the 13 regular appropriations bills off of the House floor; and again, the fiscal year ends in 2 weeks. There have been none that have been voted on on this House floor, or none scheduled since Labor Day, since we returned to our work from the August recess.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital, if we are going to put the budget back on the path to a balanced budget, that we work together to control the discretionary spending on these 13 bills. Working together in a bipartisan basis, we can balance the budget, just like we did in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. This is why I urge and call upon the President and the Republican congressional leadership to work with us to develop bipartisan proposals that will ensure that we have a fiscally responsible government.

#### SUPPORT H.R. 3612, THE MEDICAID COMMUNITY-BASED ATTENDANT SERVICES AND SUPPORTS ACT

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to request support for H.R. 3612, the Medicaid Community-based Attendant Services and Supports Act, also known as MiCASSA. This bill will enable our older Americans and citizens with disabilities who qualify for long-term care services under the Medicaid program to receive the non-institutional community support service options they are entitled to under the Americans With Disabilities Act.

The Americans With Disabilities Act, signed into law by President Bush in 1990, ushered in a new era of promise for a segment of our population whose talents and rights as American citizens have been too long ignored. It promised

a new social compact to end the paternalistic patterns of the past that took away our rights if we become disabled. It says that people with disabilities have the right to be active participants integrated into the everyday life of society. This premise, however, cannot become a reality until we roll up our sleeves and do the work necessary to eliminate the barriers that still hinder its full implementation.

In its 1999 Olmstead ruling, the Supreme Court said that States violate the Americans With Disabilities Act when they unnecessarily put people with disabilities in institutions. The problem is that our Federal-State Medicaid program has not been updated and has a built-in bias that results in the unnecessary isolation and segregation of many of our senior citizens and younger adults in institutions.

Too often, decisions relating to the provision of long-term services and supports are influenced by what is reimbursable under Federal and State Medicaid policy rather than by what individuals need and deserve. Research has revealed a significant bias in the Medicaid program towards reimbursing services provided in institutions over services provided in home and community settings. The only option currently guaranteed by Federal law in every State is nursing home care. Other options have existed for decades, but their spread has been fiscally choked off by the fact that 75 percent of our long-term care dollars go into institutional settings, in spite of the fact that studies show that many people do better in home and community settings.

Only 27 States have adopted the benefit option of providing personal care services under the Medicaid program. Although every State has chosen to provide certain services under home and community-based waivers, these services are unevenly distributed, have long waiting lists, and reach just a small percentage of eligible individuals.

Governor Howard Dean is a physician and Vermont's Chief Executive. He recently testified on Capitol Hill on behalf of the National Governors Association and asked Congress to give the States the tools they need to grow home and community-based service. In his testimony he said, "We can provide a higher quality of life by avoiding institutional services whenever possible. Some people insist we will need more nursing homes. They are wrong. Baby boomers today are looking for alternatives for their parents. We can't afford to protect the status quo. We need to listen to people and act boldly to develop those services they want and are, in fact, affordable."

So I ask, Mr. Speaker, all Members of this honorable body to be in support of services for individuals in home-based settings so that they too can realize the assurance of living as they choose and as they see fit. Support MiCASSA.

#### DOMESTIC POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSBORNE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, there are two subjects that I want to address this evening, and both are of critical importance to us. One involves domestic policy, and one of them involves international policy. Obviously, we can guess what the international policy would be: dealing with Iraq, dealing with our war on terror, dealing with the United Nations resolutions. But before I get into the international discussion that I want to have this evening with my colleagues, I want to discuss the domestic situation involving a subject a long ways away from the al Qaeda or from Afghanistan or from Iraq or from the United Nations resolutions. I want to talk for a few minutes about the national forests, especially the national forests on public lands.

Now, public lands are lands that are owned by the government. It could be a local government, it could be a State government, or it could be Federal Government. The largest owner of land in the United States obviously is the United States Federal Government. They own millions and millions and millions of acres of land in this country.

Now, when this country was first developed, our population was primarily on the east coast, and the government wanted to grow our big country. As our country began to make land acquisitions, for example, the Louisiana Purchase and things like that, they knew that in order to expand the country, we not only had to buy the land, but we had to occupy the land. We had to put people on the land.

□ 1945

We had to have the people willing to protect the land. The best way to do that was not to give them a deed that said, Here is some land out in the West. Obviously, to grow our country we needed to move it west. We needed to move the population west. West in the early days was West Virginia. People did not have to go very far west to find out that they were in wilderness areas.

To do this, the Federal Government knew that they could not just give a piece of paper that said someone owned a piece of property out in the State of Kansas or Missouri or up in the Colorado mountains. They knew they could not do just that.

Today, it is a little different. Today, one can actually have a piece of property in Colorado, and one can live in Florida, and their rights as a private property owner are respected. They do not have to worry about squatters or about people taking over their land when they were not there.

But in the early days of the country, that was not true. That is not what the