

way. And right by his side is Donald Rumsfeld and, of course, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs who has been mentioned, General Myers. And of course we have that great American, very sharp, very smart, very effective in strategy and tactics, General Tommy Franks, leading this operation in the theater. With that team and with the team of all of the folks that wear the uniform of the United States, we are going to win this contest.

Once again, I want to thank this gentlewoman for bringing out not only the military operational effectiveness of this present campaign in Iraq, but also the campaign of goodwill that people in uniform are bringing to the people of that country, the good old GIs who by their values and by their demonstrations of kindness are winning a lot of folks over even as we speak.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. I thank the chairman. And maybe the way for me to at least close my participation in this 1-hour Special Order that we are having tonight is with another e-mail. I think it shows the goodness of the American military. It is one thing to be great. We have a great American military who can do things that no other military in the world can do, the overwhelming power. But we also have a very good American military. And sometimes I think it is more important to be good than to be great.

This is an e-mail that was forwarded to me by a master gunnery sergeant. And master gunnery sergeants are not necessarily known for their soft-heartedness, although I think that is actually a myth. I think some of them are the softest-hearted guys. They are kind of like chocolate-covered marshmallows, tough on the outside but marshmallows on the inside.

It says, few things move me to get misty but there are a few, and this one did. He saw this and described it this morning on CNN. And he wrote it down in an e-mail, what he saw. He said, Martin Savage of CNN, embedded with the 1st Marine battalion, was talking with four young marines near his foxhole this morning live on CNN. He had been telling the story of how well the Marines had been looking out for and taking care of him since the war started. And he went on to tell about the many hardships that the Marines had endured. And he told them that he cleared it with their commanders to call home, for each one of the four to call home. And he turned to the first marine next to him, a 19-year-old kid and said, Who would you like to call? And he said, Well, sir, if you do not mind, I would like to allow my platoon sergeant to use my call. I would like to give my call to him to let him use it to call his pregnant wife back home who he had not been able to talk to for 3 months.

Savage was stunned. And the young man ran off to get his sergeant. And then he turned to the other three who were still there and he asked which one would like to call home first. And the

marine closest to him responded, Sir, if it is all the same to you, we would like to call the parents of a buddy of ours, Lance Corporal Brian Buesing of Cedar Key, Florida. He was killed on the 23rd of March near Nasiriyah. We want to see how his parents are doing.

At that, Martin Savage was close to tears and unable to speak, and all he could say before signing off was, Where do they get young men like this?

I will tell you where we get them. We get them from Palestine, West Virginia and Saint Charles, Indiana; we get them from Sherwood, Oregon; Queens, New York; from Midland, Texas; from San Diego, California. We get them from Lee, Florida; from Adams, Colorado, and Mountainair, New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for letting me join him here this evening.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman. The USA will prevail.

□ 2015

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1559, EMERGENCY WARTIME SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-57) on the resolution (H. Res. 172) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1559) making emergency wartime supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHOCOLA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I come with a heavy heart and come with members of the Congressional Black Caucus and some members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

We come, Mr. Speaker, at a time when our country is at war; and we want to say from the outset that we support our troops with all our heart and that we spend our days and our prayer time praying that they will be kept safe.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, on next Friday, it will be my sad duty to be with a gentleman named Michael Waters as he parts with his son Kendall Waters-Bey, Sergeant Kendall Waters-Bey for the last time. His son was one of the first young men to die in the Iraq war. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I was supposed to be meeting with the father of Kendall Waters-Bey tonight; but he, I am sure, would have preferred that I join the Congressional Black Caucus this evening in not only

lifting up the name of his son but also lifting up the names of all of our people who are in our military who are giving their blood, sweat and tears and, in his case, his life.

So our sympathy goes out to all of those families who have lost loved ones. Our prayers go out to all of our military personnel and others who may have been harmed. Our prayers go out to all of those who find themselves in harm's way.

As I sat here, Mr. Speaker, listening to the previous hour, I could not help but think about the fact that the Republican budget cuts \$28.3 billion in veterans benefits over 10 years, compared to the amount needed to maintain purchasing power in at the 2003 level. It hurts my heart. Of this \$28.3 billion, \$14.2 billion are cuts in health care, and there is a 3.8 percent cut in overall benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I ask how we could possibly, with a clear conscience, deny the tens of thousands of veterans that we just heard about. They will be veterans, too. How can we deny them these benefits?

So it gives me great pleasure to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from the great State of Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), who has been a fighter with regard to standing up for what is right and has consistently been a conscience for this Congress and for the United States of America.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me express my appreciation for our Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus for organizing this hour tonight.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes when I hear the comments about the troops that we all strongly support, we forget that if they survive this war they will be veterans; and it is the veterans that we owe a great deal to for our freedom, but we really have left them behind in this budget.

So I rise to express my opposition to the Bush budget, because despite President Bush's pledge to leave no one behind, the budget has proposed leaving out over half of African Americans and Hispanic families; and this really is not compassion with conservatism, conserving resources for a very, very few.

Can my colleagues just imagine in less than 2 years, 2.5 million private jobs have been lost since January 20, 2001? The unemployment rate for African Americans has climbed 28 percent from 8.2 percent indicating really how African Americans will be disproportionately impacted by this budget. The employment rates for Hispanics is up by 33 percent.

I am from Dallas, Texas, where we have lost many jobs because we are very high tech in our employment. For every job lost in the high-tech field, there are three other jobs lost in low-income jobs because they are hired for cleaning homes, doing the yards, keeping the children; and we have a record number of foreclosures, not of poor people, but working people because they have lost their jobs.

This budget does not help because it is cutting adult training programs, the dislocated workers programs and the employment service State grants by \$60 million below the 2003 enacted level, while freezing funding for youth employment activities at the 2003 enacted level. That is leaving most of the American people, the workers, the real taxpayers behind.

The budget leaves Americans behind on education. Vital programs like Head Start are taking tremendous cuts. Many more children should be enrolled in Head Start because we have said over and over again that education is so important for the future. The proposed budget provides \$9.7 billion less than the amount promised in Leave No Child Behind.

The Bush budget proposes to cut the maximum Pell grant from \$4,050 in 2003 to \$4,000 in 2004, when he promised, in my presence, to some college presidents that the Pell grants are key to helping low-income young people to get to college. In fact, more than 45 percent of the African Americans and 40 percent of Hispanic students in 4-year public colleges and universities depend on Pell grants to make college affordable.

The budget essentially freezes the funding for the historically black graduate institutions to \$53 million, and for Hispanic-serving institutions to \$94 million at the 2003 enacted level, at a time when we encourage minority students, with everyone else, to get a better education. They have to get a better education in order to have a job. We are still the last hired and the first fired. So education really is essential, not just for jobs, but also to understand each other and to be able to relate to our diversity now.

It leaves our seniors very vulnerable, exhausting the Social Security trust fund over the next 10 years to try to fill in for this deficit that is, I cannot believe that we went from almost over a \$1 trillion surplus to over a \$1 trillion deficit in less than 3 years.

African American and Hispanic seniors are even more likely than others to rely solely on Social Security as their source of income upon retirement. The proposed budget does not even address Medicare increases for seniors, and yet I hear billions and billions being talked about, going out of the country, while we leave the American people at risk.

I am not opposed to foreign aid; but I do think homeland security is very, very important, and this is a part of homeland security. The American people want to feel safe, and safety has a lot to do with employment and education, but this budget does not seem to understand that.

Our college young people are coming home because parents have lost jobs, and they have to drop out of college, and they get home and find that the house has been foreclosed as well; but the President's budget makes many cuts in public housing, even though

these funds are critical to making it possible for 1.7 million low-income families to have homes, and this is not all African Americans and all Hispanic. This is low-income Americans.

More than 45 percent of these residents are African American, and nearly 20 percent are Hispanic; and it is growing. So that is according to HUD's multifamily characteristics report.

The proposed budget eliminates funding for the HOPE VI program which replaces distressed low-income housing with new strong community housing. That also provides opportunities for homeownership. All of us know that when one invests in a home it brings about pride. It brings about new wealth, and it also brings about a good deal of safety because crime goes down, children are stable in homes. When they are using rental property, some young people, some kids, change schools three times in one school year. They cannot be caught up because every time somebody offers a month of free rent, the parents move to get that one month of free rent; but they are dislocating children, inconveniencing and handicapping our teachers, and disproportionately burdening our school systems because they cannot plan when we have a moving population at all times.

So, sadly, in a democratic Nation, we have also witnessed Americans being left behind with a vote. We worked from January 2001 until November last year, 2002, trying to get some kind of election reform so we can be sure of who we elect to office. The proposed budget offers \$500 million in funding for election reform, undercutting the Help America Vote Act authorized at the level of \$1.5 billion. That is how we distinguish what a democracy is. It is whether someone can speak out for whom they want as their leaders and make sure it is counted. The Help America Vote Act must be fully funded to ensure that every citizen's right to vote is protected. Every citizen, every citizen.

In fact, the Civil Rights Commission found that minorities, particularly African Americans, were the Americans most impacted by the loss of voting rights. They were the ones who were not counted well in Florida. If they had been, we might have a better economy, because it sure would not be the President that is over there now. It would have been the President that got elected; and unfortunately, this Bush budget does not address any of these concerns.

So homeland security involves a lot of things; but most importantly, it also involves our first responders. Firefighters, police, emergency medical personnel, all are in jeopardy because the Bush budget includes \$4 billion less than what is required for them to do their jobs adequately.

We are in dismal shape in this country and everyone should be feeling it; and if they have not felt it yet, they will. We cannot afford to leave the

Americans and their agenda without adequate security through education, housing, and a means to economically sustain themselves and their families.

As lawmakers, we have the responsibility to ensure that all Americans, including minorities, are able to move ahead to achieve the American dream: life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

We must reject this budget. It is clear that if the President's budget office has given out negative information about this budget, we know that others see it, feel it, and will never forget it.

□ 2030

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her statement.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of people have asked the question, why is it that members of the Congressional Black Caucus have decided to address the budget issues while the war is going on? And it is very simple. It is what the gentlewoman from Texas just said. Life goes on in this country. We believe very strongly that not only must we protect our country from outside forces, and, sadly, some home-grown forces, but we also realize that at the same time we have to make sure that we keep America strong.

As the gentlewoman said, when we talk about our children and a program like Head Start, it is so very, very important with this budget that so many of our children will be denied the opportunity to get that head start. When we look at an issue like the \$215 billion of cuts in the House Republican's budget for Medicare and Medicaid, for school lunches and student loans, in agriculture and veterans programs, that is major. Major.

So while the war goes on, as the gentlewoman from Texas said, we have to make sure that when our veterans come home that they come home to a very strong America.

And speaking of a very strong American, it gives me great privilege to yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), our outstanding and very dedicated and very brilliant chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, for his leadership and for his vision and for organizing once again this Special Order to really discuss the disastrous Republican budget and to examine the terrible toll it will take not only on communities of color but on our entire country as a whole.

As we support and pray for our troops, for their speedy and their safe return, I have to ask tonight what kind of America, what kind of opportunities and support will we provide for them upon their return? Our troops and our veterans deserve a sense of economic security. This Republican budget, however, demonstrates nothing less than a very profound disregard for the majority of Americans and for the future of

this Nation. It sacrifices our children, our seniors, our security, our veterans, our environment, and our economy in order to advance special interests and promote tax breaks for the wealthy.

This is a national mistake, and the repercussions of it will be felt in cities and rural communities and towns across America. They will certainly be felt in my district in northern California, where the high-tech economy has struggled, where housing costs are sky high, where seniors and veterans are struggling to pay medical costs and grocery bills, where seniors sometimes have to choose between their medication or buying food, where school infrastructure is crumbling, and where the State budget is reeling from the body blows struck by the recession.

In the last year, we have seen rising unemployment, escalating housing costs, and a floundering economy. We have seen, however, tax cuts for the rich that the President wants to make permanent, forever protecting the richest 1 percent at the expense of the rest of us. That is wrong. And now we see \$1.6 trillion in additional tax cuts for the wealthy. Those tax cuts and those misplaced priorities help explain why this budget falls \$4 billion short of the money we need to invest in homeland security according to nonpartisan experts. They help explain why this budget underfunds education, short-changing special ed, gutting after-school programs, freezing Pell grants and ultimately leaving millions of children far, far behind.

With the struggling economy and millions of Americans unemployed, this budget cuts spending for job training and employment programs and does nothing, absolutely nothing, to create new jobs. It also cuts funding for environmental programs, including badly needed enforcement programs at EPA that will safeguard our water supply and our children's health. Communities of color will continue to pay the highest price for pollution. This budget will only increase environmental injustices and the health costs it exacts every day.

In terms of energy, the budget reinforces our dependence on fossil fuels by cutting energy efficiency programs and assuming drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. In energy, in education, in security, and in so many other areas, we should be investing in our future rather than bankrupting our children. With this budget, we will be spending as much on defense as the rest of the world combined. But, Mr. Speaker, \$400 billion plus for defense that underfunds homeland security will not make us any safer.

We could put some of these resources, and we should put some of these resources into health care, but the Republican plan is not designed to expand health care access. For example, seniors would be herded into HMOs and forced to abandon their own doctors if they want prescription drug coverage. This budget threatens Medicare with-

out offering real coverage. And again it will hit African Americans, Hispanic Americans and other minorities especially hard.

We have enormous health disparities in this country and this budget just makes them wider. Most of the 9 million children who lack health insurance in this country are minorities, children of color. Under this budget they remain uninsured. It even cuts Medicaid coverage for children. Cuts it. And it slashes funding for minority health programs.

Instead of spending billions on a faulty and unproven missile defense system, we should put more resources into housing, which is a national emergency and a national disgrace, but this budget cuts funding for public housing. It eliminates funding for the HOPE VI program to replace public housing structures that are in terrible condition. I ask you, without HOPE VI, what hope will those residents really have?

The credibility gap between the administration's rhetoric and its budget grows each and every day. The President promises an economic stimulus but offers tax cuts for the wealthy that leaves small business out of the picture, even though small businesses are the real engine for economic growth in this country. The President promises to leave no child behind, but then cuts nearly \$1 billion of funding, \$1 billion, Mr. Speaker, for elementary and secondary education. The budget cuts teacher quality programs and after-school programs for our kids and slashes Pell grants and Perkins loans that can transform college from an impossible dream into an actual diploma.

The President praises our troops, as we all do, but then decimates veterans programs, enacting cuts that will reduce cost-of-living increases for the veterans who are with us and who have served our country well. What a shame and what a sham. Our veterans deserve better. Again, rhetoric versus reality.

Look at the budget. It is about choices. We could choose to invest in our future, grow our economy, enhance our security, look out for our children, our senior citizens and those who are struggling economically, or we could, as the Republican budget has demonstrated, provide tax cuts for the multimillionaires and special interests.

I hope it is not too late to wake up America to the damage that is being done to our country, to our children, and to our future. That is the choice that the Republican budget offers. Once again, America, wake up to what is going on in Washington, D.C.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentlewoman for that wonderful statement, Mr. Speaker, and I just want to emphasize something that she said, because we have heard so much about support of our troops. We all support our troops. But the fact still remains, and we need to say this over and over again, the Republican budget cuts \$28.3 billion, billion, in veterans benefits over 10 years compared to the amount

needed to maintain purchasing power at the 2003 level.

The gentlewoman talked about veterans, and I just wanted to emphasize that because that is so significant. We do not want to be a Congress that says one thing and does another. I think that is what the gentlewoman was emphasizing.

Ms. LEE. Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, and, yes, I think this really highlights the credibility gap, this increasing credibility gap of this administration.

And as I say, with regard to our veterans, it is really a shame and a sham that this administration is cutting their benefits, cutting out their economic security that they so deserve. They have served our country well. Our troops deserve better upon their return, and we are going to fight this to the end, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CUMMINGS. It is very painful when we go to the American Legion meetings and we see our veterans in parades and they meet us at the shopping centers, or wherever they see us, and so often they come to us with their concerns. I agree with the gentlewoman, if we are going to support our veterans, we have to support them with everything that we have. Clearly, when we are cutting \$28.3 billion, and I emphasize that "b," over a 10-year period, I do not know what kind of message that sends.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what kind of message it sends, and also I do not think this administration remembers that we have many homeless veterans now who are just seeking shelter and a place to live. That, again, is a disgrace that we need to address in this budget. We need to address their access to health care and to housing and to all of those support services which they need. They fought for us and they deserve a decent life. They do not deserve to have their funding cut, as the President intends to do in this budget.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentlewoman. It is my pleasure now, Mr. Speaker, speaking of veterans benefits and speaking of standing up for veterans over and over and over again, to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN), who has been an 11-year veteran of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland for his leadership in organizing this Special Order, and to the members of the Congressional Black Caucus for participating.

Mr. Speaker, I have served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for 11 years, and I do not think I have ever been as outraged at the shameful act of this Republican leadership as I am today. On the same day that this House voted to commend our troops and the work that they are doing in Iraq, this same Republican leadership pushed through a veterans budget that cut the VA budget by almost \$30 billion. Let me repeat that. Thirty billion dollars.

Republicans can talk the talk, but they do not walk the walk. Or as one veteran group says, they do not roll the roll. It is not what you say, Mr. Speaker, it is what you do.

Our troops today are tomorrow's veterans. These cuts mean the loss of almost 20,000 VA nurses at a time when we are already experiencing a nursing shortage. These cuts mean the loss of 6.6 million outpatient visits. These cuts mean the disenrollment of over 160,000 veterans in a 1-year period from the VA health care system.

□ 2045

Not only that, but these cuts also mean reaching into the pockets of our Nation's service-connected veterans and robbing them and their survivors of a portion of the promised compensation. And the veterans are not the only unlucky recipients of the Republican budget ax. Elementary and secondary education as well as teacher quality programs also get the ax. Head Start and school lunch programs get the ax. The Office of Minority Health and the Ryan White program all get the ax.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have enough time here today to let the American people know about all the crucial programs that the Republican leadership does not think are more important than funneling money to their country club friends.

Mr. Speaker, this budget dishonors the service of millions of veterans and our Nation's commitment to care for its defenders. Mr. Speaker, I cannot express it any better than the Disabled American Veterans did so appropriately in testifying on this budget, and I quote, "Is there no honor left in the hallowed halls of our government that you choose to dishonor the sacrifices of our Nation's heroes and rob our programs, health care, and disability compensation to pay for a tax cut for the wealthy? " Let me repeat that again. Somebody out there needs to hear what I am saying.

The Disabled American Veterans, in testifying before the Committee on Veterans Affairs said, "Is there no honor left in the hallowed halls of our government that you choose to dishonor the sacrifices of our Nation's heroes and rob our programs, health care and disability compensation to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy?"

Mr. Speaker, I call on all of my colleagues who so vocally supported the troops 2 weeks ago on the floor to stand up today and put their money where their mouth is. This budget is one of the best examples of what I call reverse Robin Hood, robbing from the poor to give tax breaks to the rich. Wake up, America.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) for her statement, and I want to thank her for emphasizing our veterans when the gentlewoman said today they are soldiers, and tomorrow they are veterans. When we see those soldiers parting from their

families to go overseas, when we see their interviews over in Iraq, some of them with sand in their faces and hot weather, giving up their lives, blood, sweat and tears for us, it seems to me that we would not want to do this double talk thing.

I am so glad the gentlewoman said what she said because a lot of times when we talk about the Congressional Black Caucus, people conclude that we are just talking about African American people, but we are talking about all veterans. I know that the gentlewoman has been fighting year after year, day after day. I have heard her so many times on this floor standing up for all of our veterans.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we talk a great talk here, and on Veterans Day we are all involved in the parade; but what is very discouraging is when we get in the closed rooms of the conference and they say, well, we do not have enough. Well, the Bible tells us, and many of my colleagues talk about the Bible and the poor will always be with us, but our job in Congress is to help raise the standards.

How can we deny our veterans fighting for us today? They will come home tomorrow, they are going to need assistance and counseling, and yet we are cutting programs. It is a disgrace. I say, wake up, America.

One last thing as far as our veterans are concerned. Many of them are African Americans. They are fighting for this country today when we have a Commander in Chief who says you are good enough to go fight, but you are not good enough to go to our universities, and that is a disgrace. Wake up, America.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for mentioning that. Over and over tonight we have been saying we support our soldiers, our men and women in the armed services, and we want to make sure that they come back to an America that is strong, an America that will support their families, an America that will support them when they have health care needs. I can think of no better person than the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) to address those issues. The gentleman has constantly, like the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN), has stood up for veterans, but not only stood up for veterans, but stood up for people all over the world, traveling constantly to Africa and around the world trying to make sure that the entire world knows of the concern of not only the Congressional Black Caucus, but of the American people for people who may never even know all that he has done for them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for the leadership the gentleman has shown in the Congressional Black Caucus in the short time he has

been our Chair. Just this past weekend the gentleman conducted a housing summit in Florida where the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) had close to a thousand people during the weekend coming to a housing fair, and his participation in Houston, Texas, where he and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) talked about the fight against the Bush plan to end affirmative action. I think the great work that you have been doing is commendable; and as was just indicated, affirmative action is supported by many of the Fortune 500 companies. I spoke at a Black History Program at Merck in New Jersey, and mentioned seven or eight of the companies that were supporting affirmative action, and I failed to mention Merck, and as I finished my speech and came off the platform at their home office, they said we are part of that suit that supports affirmative action.

Our military generals, such as retired General Schwarzkopf, say we should keep affirmative action, especially because our troops need to see diversity in our leadership. As we talk about that, I would like to join with the gentleman in this question about the budget.

I rise to join my colleagues in expressing my grave concern about the budget plan approved by the Republican-controlled House of Representatives. With our Nation engaged in a military conflict overseas, we are told that this is a time of sacrifice on the part of Americans. Unfortunately, both in the military conflict and on the domestic front, sacrifices are being asked mainly from those at one end of the income scale. The fact is that the sons and daughters of wealthy Americans rarely serve in combat while minorities and lower-income men and women serve in disproportionate numbers. It is a time we as a Nation renew the spirit of shared sacrifice. That is what made us so strong in World War II, shared sacrifice, rationing of food, rationing of meats, fuel, price controls, wage controls. Everyone came together, and that effort during World War II made us and saved the world and rebuilt Europe, and Asia then began to strengthen itself. Shared sacrifice is what is fair, not what we are seeing today.

During this time of rising unemployment rates, we should be concentrating on creating jobs for those out of work rather than giving the wealthy more tax breaks through a \$1.3 trillion tax cut. Is that fair? Is that shared sacrifice? I do not think so from my math.

Is it fair to approve a budget that cuts domestic appropriations by \$244 billion over 10 years, below the amount needed to maintain services at the present level, and we know that services will need to increase, but at the present level cutting it \$244 billion? All of the spending cuts will be used to finance the huge tax cut for the wealthy, for those at the country clubs, which most Americans say we should not do. Most Americans say we should not

have a tax cut at this time, but the Bush administration insists on a \$1.3 trillion tax cut for the wealthiest of our Nation.

As a former teacher and as a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I am deeply concerned about the fact that the Republican budget approved by the House of Representatives cut education by \$2.1 billion in fiscal year 2004 and by \$25.7 billion over the next 10 years, and that is below the Bush budget which freezes spending for education by failing to keep up with inflation or increasing enrollments. His budget did not give any increase, but the House Republican-approved budget cuts \$25 billion below what President Bush asked for.

The House budget also fails to provide an increase for Head Start, despite the fact that the program is serving only 54 percent of those eligible 3- and 4-year-olds. We know there is a real problem with affordable housing in this Nation, and yet the Republicans drastically cut spending for housing. It is a shame. It is a disgrace.

The Bush administration budget eliminates funding for the Hope VI program, which displaces distressed low-income housing with new community housing. It is hope, Hope VI. That is what people are looking forward to. So what did they do, cut it out. Funding is slashed for the public housing capital fund by \$71 million below fiscal year 2003. Rents have increased for thousands of tenants who receive Federal housing aid through minimum rent requirements for public housing and section 8 vouchers. Section 8 vouchers are for the truly poor in our community. That has been cut.

The Republican budget calls for \$169 billion in cuts that could harm Medicare and Medicaid. By contrast, the budget put forth by the Congressional Black Caucus led by the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) and the Progressive Caucus led by the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) implements the Medicare For All Program. That is what our budget did, a single payer, universal health care plan that guaranteed access to health care regardless of income. There are close to 70 million people now. The number grew from 40 to close to 70 million who are uninsured today. Where are we going as a Nation? Our budget, the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus budget, provides an economic stimulus plan that provides \$20 billion in extended unemployment assistance and \$50 billion for Federal revenue sharing with States, as well as \$50 billion for needed infrastructure investment.

States need help. Our government has turned its back on our States. New Jersey has a \$5 billion budget gap, Pennsylvania has one, as does California and New York. States are cutting budgets, and we are turning our backs on them. That is unfair.

We need to restore fairness to our Nation's veterans in gratitude for their

service to our country. Our budget provides \$3 billion over what the Bush administration allocates. Our plan would provide a substantial investment in school construction, in our Nation's teachers, in student loan programs. We would also create a national housing trust and restore the reckless cuts in housing put forth by the Bush administration, including Hope VI and the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program which has been eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, let us come together as a Nation and truly move forward in the spirit of shared sacrifice. Let us not continually target those who can least afford those severe cuts in order to fund a reckless, unfair tax cut tilted towards the wealthiest members of this society.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I want to say when the gentleman talks, as a former teacher I know he can appreciate our children getting where they are supposed to be. I sit on the board of Morgan State University, and every year now as it is right now, we have to let go some 600 to 700 students every year. Why, because they do not have enough money to go to school. It is so sad with the Pell grant cut situation; it is going to make it even worse.

People ask me, why is the Congressional Black Caucus so concerned about this budget?

□ 2100

The reason why we are so concerned is because life has to go forth while we are also dealing with a war, and we also understand that a lot of these young people that I just talked about, and I am sure that the gentleman has them in his district, and I am sure that people who are watching this right now who do not have an idea of how they are going to pay for their college education, they may never, they may never get back in college, and their earning power is thus reduced. They cannot do for their families as well as they could have done if they had gotten the education, and it is so very painful to so many people.

So I want to thank the gentleman for all the things that he mentioned. It just kind of stood out in my mind because the gentleman talked about the Governors in various States, State budget suffering and we had our Republican Governor come down to meet with our delegation, and he gave us a book about that thick of things that he wanted from Congress. And as I began to flip through the book, I had to tell him the President and the Republicans have slashed just about every single thing he wants. So States are suffering tremendously. As a matter of fact, in the State of Maryland, it looks like we are going to have to go into extra days of session beyond our 90-day normal session just to figure out how to deal with the budget, and a lot of it is a result of this budget that we are dealing with on this Federal level.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. As I met

with our Governor, Governor McGreevey, a bright young man who for 2 years in a row had to cut \$5 billion each year, does not want to raise taxes, refused to raise taxes, but cut funding for arts, cut funding for hospitals, cut funding for all kinds of programs. The Governors deserve better, whether they are Democrat or Republican Governors. The people in the State are saying really do not tread on us, but bring us in. As a matter of fact, in the first 13 original colonies, New Jersey's flag was a flag with a snake that said, "Don't tread on us." We are treading on our States. It is unfair. It is wrong, and I wish that all the Governors, Republican and Democrat, would tell the unfair Bush tax cut, cut the tax cut, help the States. I thank the chairman.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT). We have often heard and we heard on this floor earlier tonight of people being very upset that there were people who were concerned about this war and expressing their concerns, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) has been one who has consistently stood up for our constitutional rights and has been a conscience of this Congress; and so it gives me great privilege to yield to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for yielding.

We have heard a lot of adjectives and descriptions. Let me just show some charts that show where we are and why we have so much trouble in funding programs. And one cannot spin these charts. These charts show the numbers of the budget.

This chart shows the deficit over the past few years starting with the Johnson administration, Ford, Carter. Reagan and Bush, as everyone knows, generated a great deal of debt. These are the deficits. When President Clinton came in, we passed a budget in 1993 without a single Republican vote, 218 to 216 in the House, 50/50 with Vice President Gore breaking the tie in the Senate and creating a straight line, straight up until we generated a surplus.

The Republicans note that they were in the majority in much of this time. However, people will remember that their budgets were vetoed. They closed down the government. President Clinton would not sign their budgets because they were irresponsible. So the line kept going because President Clinton had enough Democrats to sustain the veto and those Republican budgets were not passed, were not enacted; and we have a straight line going up into surplus.

In 1 year in the Bush administration, when there was no veto on those irresponsible budgets, we had the deficit coming right back worse than it ever was. This chart was developed before the recent budget that we will consider

tomorrow, \$70-some billion with no way to pay for it. So this red line will go almost off the chart.

What are the plans? The plans are we started with a surplus in 2000. In 2001 we spent all of the Medicare surplus. September 11 is 3 weeks before the end of the fiscal year; so there is nothing that could have been done in those 3 weeks. We had already gone into Medicare and almost into Social Security by September 10. In 2002 we are spending all the Medicare, all the Social Security surplus, and \$160 billion in additional deficits. In 2003 it looks like we are going to spend all of the Medicare, all of the Social Security, and \$300 billion in additional debt. As a matter of fact, we are going to spend Social Security and Medicare and hundreds of billions of dollars in debt as far as the eye can see.

How did all of this happen with this tax cut? Who gets the tax cut? The blue is the 2001 tax cut. The green is the proposed 2003 tax cut. My colleagues will see, and take my word for it, the lowest 20 percent do get some. There is a little bar there. We can hardly see it. The second 20 percent, the third 20 percent, the fourth 20 percent, the top 20 percent, what they get out of the tax cuts. This line right up to here shows the top 1 percent, the next 4 percent. So this is the top 5 percent population. The top 5 percent gets this much of the tax cut. We were told we had to do that for economic growth. This is a chart of economic growth since the Truman administration. Average growth of the Presidents, the worst growth since World War II as a result of that tax cut.

Most people who have any kind of retirement fund know what the stock market looks like. This is 2000, the average price on the Dow, the S&P and the NASDAQ collapsing right after we enacted those budgets. We ran up all that debt. My colleagues will notice that in the Clinton administration when he left, we had anticipated by 2008 paying off almost all of the debt held by the public so there would be almost no debt held by the public. Right now in 2008 it looks like we are going to have this much debt.

We have to pay interest on that debt. Here is the difference in interest that we are going to be paying over these years. We add up the difference of what we anticipated paying and, because we have no debt, what we are going to pay. By 2010 we would have paid an extra \$1.6 trillion, with a T, trillion dollars in additional debt.

Let us make this personal, a family of four. Add up the whole interest on the national debt, divided by the population, multiplied by four, and what do you get? In 2003 a family of four's share of the interest on the national debt, not the national debt, the interest, \$4,500. As my colleagues will remember, it was going to nothing; but instead, by 2008 it will be almost \$6,500; by 2013, almost \$7,500 interest on the national debt. We do not get anything for that.

This chart shows where we are with Social Security. Right now Social Security is paying a surplus. We are getting more into Social Security than we are paying out. 2017 we will break even, and then it gets worse. We will be paying almost \$1 trillion a year more out in Social Security than we have coming in.

The thing about this chart that is interesting is the tax cut in 2001 already enacted was twice as big as necessary to pay Social Security for 75 years. In other words, if we cut taxes half as much in 2001 as we did and the other half receive the taxes and allocate it to Social Security, that half would have been enough to pay for Social Security for 75 years. But, instead, we are paying more interest on the national debt, and what happens? We have heard about the cuts in veterans benefits, cuts in heating assistance for low-income elderly, cuts in education.

The last 5 years or so, 4 or 5 years, average 12.3 percent increase in education, this year a cut in education, which means that we are going to be cutting school lunches. We are going to be cutting school loans and Pell grants at the time when States are increasing their tuition. With No Child Left Behind, the president went all over the country bragging about that authorization, but the money is not there to fully fund it.

I just want to ask how bad it has to get before somebody realizes that the budget is not working and we have to do something. We are cutting veterans benefits, housing, health care, and education.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that excellent presentation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), who is a leader in the area of education and has consistently stood up for our young people.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for organizing this Special Order. I think all Members should be listening and should get the kind of education we have just gotten from the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

We have, the Congressional Black Caucus along with the Congressional Progressive Caucus, produced a budget, an alternative budget, to guide our people into understanding what the priorities should be. This is a budget which we call Leave No Family Behind because it addresses the needs of working families.

The New York Times just this past Sunday said that the military, the people who are fighting in Iraq right now, mirrors a working-class America. New York Times, Sunday, March 30, 2003. I urge all Members to get it and read it. It goes into an analysis of who is in the military in great detail. It is working families, representatives of working families. Those are the people who are fighting for America. It is our country as much as it is anybody else's country, and certainly the budget that the

Republican majority has put forward starting with the president does not mirror a concern for working families. The concern is not there.

We have heard from my colleagues quite a number of examples of items that are being cut. I will not go through all of that again, but the fact that food stamps for low-income families are being cut drastically, temporary assistance to needy families is being cut. The members of these families are out there fighting. Student loans are being cut. Schools are going to have to close early in some States because the States are running out of money, and they should be the beneficiaries of revenue sharing which is proposed in our budget.

The Federal Government would give the States money to help them make up some of the gap in their budgets. We need a budget which reflects a concern for the working families, members who are out there fighting in Iraq for our country. We need to let them know that this country cares about them and appreciates them and the benefits of the Federal Government certainly are going to be there for them when they come home. That is not true in the President's budget proposed by the Republican majority. We need to make certain that between now and the time we pass the appropriations, we correct this great injustice, this great gap between what is needed for working families and what is there.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I began this evening dedicating this hour to a young man from Baltimore, and I talked about how we wanted to make sure that we kept America strong for him although he has gone on, SGT Kendall Damon Waters-Bey. And the things that we have talked about tonight, Mr. Speaker, is about balance, balancing addressing our needs, for protecting ourselves from the outside, and for protecting ourselves from some home-grown enemies, and at the same time balancing our needs to take care of the American people.

It is so important to us in the Congressional Black Caucus that we focus in on this budget which, while it addresses a year or two now, it addresses expenditures for now, we realize that those expenditures that are made today or those cuts that are made today will affect people for a lifetime. A child only has 1 year to be in the first grade or to be in pre-K. If that child is denied Head Start, that might affect that child until she or he dies.

□ 2115

When it comes to prescription drugs and things of that nature, when our seniors simply want medicine and they cannot get it, it can affect them today and can cut their lives short immediately.

So we have come today to focus in on this budget. It is a budget that we have concluded is very unfair to the American people.

EDUCATING AMERICA ABOUT THE  
WARTIME SUPPLEMENTAL AP-  
PROPRIATIONS BILL

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHOCOLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first of all thank my colleague on the opposite side of the aisle for his generosity in granting me the opportunity to address the House prior to the hour that he has reserved for himself. I would also like to thank all of the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus for being here this evening to help highlight the problems with our budget.

I think that the case has been made. I think that the Members who came to the floor this evening were able to point out all of the devastating cuts in the President's budget that are going to wreak havoc on America. I think they have been able to make a very, very clear picture about what is happening in education, what is happening in housing, what is happening in health care. So I do not need to revisit all of that, but I would like to take time to talk about an action that I tried to take just earlier this evening.

Earlier this evening I went to what is known as our Committee on Rules. I went to the Committee on Rules because this is the committee that will decide whether or not we can amend the supplemental appropriations legislation that the President has asked us to pass in this House. The President has asked for supplemental appropriations legislation because the president needs to have more money to fund the war in Iraq. We understand, whether one agrees with the war or not, that once we deploy our soldiers it costs an awful lot of money. They have to be fed, their clothing, all of the supplies and the equipment, and I think every Member of this House is prepared to support our soldiers and the funding that is needed.

But, Mr. Speaker, as we examine the supplemental appropriations, one can readily see that there is something else going on in that appropriations bill. It is not simply a bill that is designed to support our soldiers and that war in Iraq. What it appears is we are literally paying some people off. We are rewarding some folks, maybe because they voted with us in the U.N., maybe because we want them to vote with us; certainly, Turkey is in the bill for \$1 billion. But in addition to Turkey, what I discovered in the bill was money for Afghanistan, for Israel, for Jordan, for Bahrain, for Oman and Pakistan, Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Bulgaria, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Djibouti, the Philippines, Colombia, and on and on and on.

Now, I went to that committee because I decided that if they can fund all of these countries for whatever reasons, billions of dollars, and, in addi-

tion to that, Mr. Speaker, in this bill we will find a very generous allocation for educational needs for not only Afghanistan, but also for Iraq where we are talking about rehabilitating schools and providing building and rehabilitating buildings, and building new schools. We are also talking about providing health care. As a matter of fact, it is the universal health care system that we wish for in America that we will be providing to Iraq. I am not jealous of the fact that we have torn up the countries and we need to in fact do something about funding them.

So I went and I asked that we appropriate \$5 billion for our rural and poor communities that need health care clinics and transportation systems to get people to the hospital, and that we fund urban communities so we can get rid of buildings that are burned out and that are boarded up and that have been standing for 35 and 40 years on land that we can have people investing in for growing these communities, if we could but clear them and package it so that we can do some economic development. Of course it is not going to be made in order.

But, in addition to a president's budget that is cutting and slashing domestic programs, now we have a supplemental appropriation that is asking for more money for all of these countries, I guess because they voted for us in the U.N.

Mr. Speaker, it is not right, and the people are going to want to know why we are doing this. We come to this floor tonight to do some educating.

#### IMMIGRATION REFORM

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about the issue of immigration and immigration reform and a specific aspect of that particular problem that we face here in the United States. I have, over the course of the last couple of weeks anyway, tried to enter into a dialogue here; perhaps it is more of a monologue, I suppose, at this time of night and in this particular setting, and the discussion that I have tried to focus on is one that I believe is of paramount, or should be at least, of paramount importance to the Members of this body. It is true that I am concerned about that particular issue and I intend to spend at least most of the evening tonight discussing this particular point, and I should say more particularly, more specifically, the issue of the drug importation into this country which is allowed by the porous nature of our border and the various hazards that that poses, because there are a wide range of problems that confront us because our borders are porous.

We are going to explore these one at a time; we are going to take them in

sections, I guess, if you will, and we are going to talk about, as I did last week, we are going to talk about the issue of national security and how that is affected by porous borders. We are going to talk this evening about the importation of illegal narcotics into the United States and how that threatens the country and how that phenomenon is made more, I guess prevalent, and it is, of course, much easier to import illegal narcotics into the United States because our borders are porous, and we are going to focus on that. And then we are going to talk about maybe in the next week or so, environmental degradation that comes as a result of millions of people crossing this border illegally and what they do to the land as they trespass upon it.

But let me just for a moment or two reflect upon some of the things that have been said in the prior hour by members of the Black Caucus.

Time and again we heard reference to the "cuts" that were part of the budget we passed, the Republicans introduced and passed in the House. And I am certainly not going to spend a lot of time talking about each of the issues, each of the different kinds of budget issues that were identified here, but I am going to talk for just a moment about one aspect of this, and that is, I think 13 or 14 times I heard the phrase "cuts in funding for veterans." I am going to only focus on that to show my colleagues the difficulty of debating this kind of an issue and actually getting the facts out to the general public.

Now, if anybody did in fact hear the last hour, Mr. Speaker, they would think certainly that there has been a cut in funding to veterans, and actually proposed, that is to say, by the Republican budget. A cut not just to veterans, but to a whole host of groups, the elderly, children, schools, you name it. So let me just focus on this one point, just on veterans, in order to put this thing in some sort of perspective for anyone who was actually listening to that discussion.

Cuts in the budget to veterans. Cuts. Now, I am not sure exactly how Webster defines the word "cut," but it has to do, I am sure, with a reduction from one level to another. I am just going to assume that. So if someone stands up in front of us and says there has been a cut proposed in the Republican budget for veterans, one assumes that the money that is being proposed to be spent for veterans benefits next year, 2004, is less than what is or what has been spent or will be spent in the 2003 fiscal year.

So that we again can actually understand what is going on here, let me tell my colleagues what the figures are. These are undeniable, undebatable; they are in black and white; they are produced for the public consumption by the printing office when it prepares these budgets. So anyone can determine whether or not I am being truthful here when I tell my colleagues that the budget for veterans for the fiscal