

certain personnel actions and not in others for minority men and women and White women in managerial and professional job categories compared with White men in these categories at the three laboratories. Most notably, with the exception of Asian men at Los Alamos and Sandia, and Hispanic men at Lawrence Livermore, the salaries for minority men and women and White women were lower than for White men.

GAO found statistically significant differences, with some exceptions, for disciplinary actions.

Minority staff attribute their low representation in certain jobs and management to recruiting strategies that do not extensively target colleges and universities with large minority populations.

Opportunities exist for DOE and OFCCP to work together to ensure that the labs meet EEO requirements. At the moment, DOE and OFCCP evaluations produced difference results. For example, in 1999, DOE rated Sandia as "outstanding" in human resources while the OFCCP cited Sandia for two affirmative action program violations. GAO recommends that the DOE and OFCCP coordinate their actions to support each other's efforts.

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

Mr. WU. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his cooperation with us. I appreciate his amendment. It is well written and well done. We support it, and I thank the gentleman for offering it.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, In May of 2002, the General Accounting Office released a report that revealed an alarming disparity in salaries and rates of promotion between minorities when compared to which males in the same jobs at the Department of Energy's National Laboratories.

GAO found that salaries for minority men and women and white women were lower than for white men, with the exceptions of Asian-American men at Los Alamos and Sandia and Hispanic men at Lawrence Livermore.

Comparing men and women of the same race/ethnicity, GAO found that White, Asian, and Hispanic women earned less than their male counterparts.

The report also found that there are further areas for investigation. For example, with over 300 Asian-American professional staff at Lawrence Livermore, not one was promoted to a managerial position between 1998 and 2000.

When the report was released, I called for congressional hearings to determine the cause of these inequities so that we may remedy them to ensure that the Department of Energy can recruit and retain the highest quality ethnically diverse work force.

Unfortunately, the Science Committee took no action on this issue. The Wu/Johnson amendment would finally bring about some congressional action, by requiring the Secretary of Energy to report to Congress on DOE labs' equal employment opportunity practices in promotion, pay raise, discipline, and recruitment and retention efforts. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mrs. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in favor of the Wu amendment. This is a simple, noncontroversial amendment that requires the Secretary of Energy to make a biennial report to Congress on DOE labs' EEO practices.

Why is such a requirement needed? This amendment's reporting requirements mirror the April 2002 GAO report's recommendations and I believe it would help safeguard our national security and help maintain America's scientific edge.

A Department of Energy internal survey demonstrates the sentiments of many minorities at the department. According to the survey, many minorities feel there are racial problems in this department.

In fact 80 percent of African Americans, 62 percent of Hispanic Americans, 26 percent of Caucasians, and 74 percent of Asian Pacific Americans working at DOE labs agreed that there is racial profiling at the labs.

Whether these are real or perceived sentiments, it is problematic that such a high percentage of lab employees have concerns about their work environment. Should this trend continue, the labs would cease to be an attractive workplace for American scientists. As a nation, we cannot afford to lose our best asset, our human resources.

This report also analyzed pay level, promotions, and management composition by race and gender at three DOE facilities: Lawrence Livermore, Los Alamos, and Sandia National Laboratories. While the GAO did not prove or disprove actual discrimination, it found statistical differences in the way that minorities and women were paid, promoted, or rewarded over a 5-year period from 1995-2000. According to the report, salaries for minorities and women at these DOE facilities lagged behind the salaries for white males.

There were also discrepancies in the promotion rate of some minority groups, including a failure to promote any of the 300 Asian-American staff members at the Lawrence Livermore facility during a 2-year period. In addition, white males were found to hold a greater percentage of managerial and professional jobs, 64 percent, than their representation in the work force, about 54 percent.

The results of this report painted a disturbing picture of inconsistency in the way minorities and women are treated in certain personnel action in the national laboratories.

I have long held the belief that America's work force—at all levels and in all sectors—should reflect the faces of this Nation. This report reveals that we have much work to do to encourage diversity and equality at our Nation's weapons facilities, and I hope that, by taking a closer look at how we are treating women and people of color in the workplace, we have taken a step in the right direction. I am encouraged that DOE has pledged to address the discrepancies raised by this report, and we in Congress will continue to monitor their actions and hold them accountable.

That is why this amendment is so important. It is vital that mechanisms be put in place to hold laboratories accountable to their promises to the workplace environment for minorities. The reports provided by this amendment would aid the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs at the U.S. Department of Labor and strengthen its oversight of DOE's hiring and recruitment practices. Without these safeguards, our national labs could become hotbeds that foster an atmosphere of pervasive mistrust and fear. And this is in no one's best interest.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) for his cooperation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member claim time in opposition to the amendment?

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6) to enhance energy conservation and research and development, to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-72) on the resolution (H. Res. 191) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-73) on the resolution (H. Res. 192) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 190 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 190

*Resolved*, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of April 10, 2003, providing for consideration or disposition of a conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 190 waives clause 6(a) of rule XIII requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Committee on Rules against certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules. The waiver authorized by this resolution applies to any special rule reported on the legislative day of April 10, 2003, providing for the consideration of or disposition of a conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 95, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013.

Mr. Speaker, I would advise my colleagues that adoption of this resolution is made necessary because the work of the conferees on the budget resolution has taken longer than anticipated. Fortunately, however, the conference has now completed its work, and it is imperative that the House consider the proposed conference report on the budget before beginning its April district work period.

So accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 190.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly oppose this undemocratic rule that will impose martial law on this House. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, this assault on regular order is appalling. The conference report was filed only a couple of hours ago, and here it is, hundreds of pages. Just a few minutes ago, the Committee on Rules met and reported the conference report to the floor.

I would only ask, have Members had the opportunity to read or review this

conference report? Were Members briefed on the details of this conference report? How about an outline? Have they read the summary? The answer, sadly, is no.

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, this is not the renaming of a post office we are working on tonight. This is not a Sense of Congress resolution commending a football team. This is the budget of the United States. This is a big deal, and we owe it to the American people to treat it that way.

I know there are even Members on the other side of the aisle who have grave concerns about hundreds of billions of dollars in tax cuts for the wealthy during a time of war, recession, and deficits. These are important issues, and they deserve to be debated fully.

For anyone who may have questions about what exactly is going on here, let me try to explain.

The majority has brought a rule before the House that forces Members to consider the conference report on the budget resolution on the same day as the report is filed. In other words, if this unfair rule is approved, Members will be voting on the conference report without having any chance to read and study the language.

□ 2300

Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle will undoubtedly say, "This is basically the same budget we debated and voted on a few weeks ago. Trust us, you do not need to see all the details," they will tell us. I would only say to them that over the past few years I have seen too many bills rewritten behind closed doors, too many important issues decided by a handful of Members and their staffs, to take comfort in their assurances.

The Congressional Budget Act of 1974 mandates that a budget resolution be in place by April 15. Today is April 10. I would be delighted if someone could please tell me, what is the rush to complete the conference report tonight. We will be here in session tomorrow trying to finish the energy bill, as well as considering the conference report for the supplemental appropriations bill.

Why can we not wait at least 1 day before we consider this bill?

I would be more than happy to work through the weekend if necessary on a matter that is so important to our country's future. Even the distinguished Chair of the Committee on the Budget conceded during the Committee on Rules meeting just a few minutes ago that this process was indefensible.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that the leadership just wants to get this over with, to shove this mess through the House as quickly as possible before anyone has a chance to really study it.

If the majority has nothing to hide, then I urge every Member to oppose this rule. Let this House and the people we represent read the budget conference report. Let us study and under-

stand it. Let us fulfill our responsibilities as Members of Congress. Let us do the job we were elected to do.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose this undemocratic rule. I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, out of respect for this House, both Democrats and Republicans, and out of respect for the American people, vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, we have before us a conference report, but everyone should understand there has been no conference in which the House or Senate Democrats have had any role or any part whatsoever.

This conference report comes to the floor in the same spirit, under a cram-down rule. Take it or leave it, here it is, a conference report that will spend \$2.2 trillion, one-fifth of our gross national product, which we have had less than 30 minutes to look over, 30 minutes to give the most cursory sort of examination to.

The rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, prohibit such unseemly haste when things are this important. The rules of the House require that a budget report of this kind lay over for at least 1 day before being called up. But our Republican colleagues, by this martial law rule, would take a chain saw to the rules of the House.

That is why this is called a martial law rule, it brooks no dissent. It mows right over the speed brakes we have set up to make sure that our decisions made here in the great House of Representatives of the United States are made carefully and deliberately and thoughtfully. This rule rips up those cautionary measures, those speed brakes, so that this budget resolution can be railroaded through this House.

Mr. Speaker, I choose my words carefully. That is what is happening here tonight in the cloak of darkness when this \$2.2 trillion budget resolution is being brought up. This resolution shows a disdain, indeed a contempt, for the process of deliberative government which we are all sworn to defend. It says, essentially, the majority has made up its mind; the minority should get out of the way.

There is a reason for this unseemly haste. It is not that we are about to go on the Easter vacation and do not have enough time to get it done tomorrow. No, that is not the reason we are pushing this thing, railroading this budget through the House.

The real reason is that it will not bear scrutiny. Republicans do not want a lengthy debate because it would reveal that this budget will raise the national debt by \$5 trillion, more than \$5 trillion over the next 10 years. That is right, this budget will raise the national debt from \$6 trillion to \$11 trillion over the next 10 years.

Everybody who votes for it should understand that this budget entails deficits of that size, debt accumulation

of that amount. It raises the national debt of the United States from just over \$5 trillion to over \$11 trillion over the next 10 years. Those are the plain consequences of it. That is the arithmetic of this budget resolution. There is no way around it. That is why it is being railroaded through here.

There is another reason, I think, that our colleagues on the other side do not want this budget debated. This budget is their economic policy. Their economic policy will not stand scrutiny. The economy is sagging, the number of jobs is decreasing, and rather than propose a budget that deals with these problems, they are bending the rules, they are distorting the process, they are doing whatever it takes to pass another round of tax cuts almost as large as the last round, which will go primarily to the wealthy and will drive deficits out of sight.

The objective is obvious: it is to pass this budget as quickly as possible and cut off debate before people realize the contents and, even worse, the consequences.

When they adopt a rule like this, Mr. Speaker, they diminish the minority and the role we play as the loyal minority, adversaries, ferreting out problems, thoughtfully going through major decisions like this. They diminish our role.

When they diminish my role and my colleagues' role, they do not diminish us or our party, but they diminish this great institution called the House of Representatives. They take that well, which should be a forum for ideas, a crucible where we grind out great policies for the good of this country, and they stifle debate, they cut off debate, they truncate debate.

When they do that, they do not just cut us off, they stifle this institution, this great institution. They violate the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution should be defeated by every thoughtful, respectful Member who respects the prerogatives of this House. We should not be taking this matter up in such haste and we should not be taking it up without an opportunity to see it. We should not be rushing this through, railroading it through to passage. This is the wrong way to deal with a matter of such gravity, a budget that will spend \$2.2 trillion.

Some would say, spend it in such a fashion and provide for tax cuts that will leave us with deficits that are almost intractable for the foreseeable future, well into the future, and will accumulate nearly \$6 trillion of debt over the next 10 years.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, just about an hour before the Committee on Rules meeting, the Democratic side got one copy of the budget, so it is impossible to coherently discuss the budget. That is why this process is unfair.

Let us discuss the best way we can where we are and where we are going. This chart shows the deficit over the years showing Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan. We went into a surplus under Clinton, and in 1 year under the Bush administration we are back into serious deficits. This does not include the war, so if Members actually wrote the amended numbers, it would be off the chart.

Let us see how we got in that mess. That is because we passed all these tax cuts. Who got them? The bottom 20 percent, 20 percent, the top 20 percent got the lion's share of the tax cuts. They call it a growth package. Give me a break. Private sector jobs created since World War II, we go over, administration by administration, the worst job creation since World War II, the worst economic growth in an administration, the worst economic growth since World War II. Do not tell me this is a growth package.

This has implications, because when we run up all that debt, we have to pay interest on the national debt. We are paying about \$4,500 a year for a family of four's proportionate share, \$4,500 interest on the national debt. That is going to go, under this budget, up to \$8,500 each and every year, interest on the national debt. So every time they cut another tax they have to pay interest, and this number is going up.

They are also cutting spending. Education, up about 12 percent every year, the last 5 years. They are cutting education. They say it is waste, fraud and abuse. We are budgeting. We have to have a line item. We are cutting, in this budget, school lunches, school lunches, student loans. They are cutting the line item that says school lunches, student loans, veterans' benefits. They are cutting those line items in the budget.

The fact of the matter is that this is an irresponsible budget. This is caused by the tax cuts, and this is a bad process. It is a bad budget.

This rule, which requires us to take this budget up tonight in the middle of the night, after virtually no notice, we have gotten the budget here in the middle of the night, it is an impossible process.

I would hope that Members would defeat this resolution and take the bill up tomorrow, where we can discuss it and point out even more problems with the budget.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask, does the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) have any speakers who want to defend this indefensible rule?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think this is a very fair rule because, as I pointed out right from the start, we have to comply with the law which says we have to have a resolution passed by both bodies by April 15.

We all know that the Easter break we have is always a week before and a

week after Easter. I congratulate the conferees on both the House and Senate for getting a budget done this year.

I would remind the gentleman, if he recalls, last year we did not have a budget. We did have a budget in the House, we did not have a budget in the Senate. As a result, we had a very difficult time putting the appropriation bills together. So I think that the conferees have done an excellent job.

This rule simply provides for consideration of the budget today.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I take the gentleman's comments to mean that he does not have any other speakers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL), a member of the committee.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan once said: Facts are stubborn things. Since the economic management in the last 2 years, 2½ million Americans have lost their jobs; 5 million Americans are without health care who had health care before; \$1 trillion worth of corporate assets, small and large, have been foreclosed on; and 2 million Americans have walked out of the middle class to poverty. Those are the facts of the economic performance of the Republican administration and the Republican Congress.

Tomorrow, we are going to be asked to vote for reconstruction for Iraq. They will be provided funds for 20,000 units of housing in Iraq. Yet in this budget, in this economic plan for America's, there are only enough dollars for 5,000 units of housing.

There will be 13 million Iraqis who will get universal health care in tomorrow's vote. In this, not a single dollar for the working uninsured in America. Twenty-five thousand schools in Iraq will be rebuilt; not a single dollar to modernize a single American school will be provided for in this budget.

There are 12,500 schools in Iraq that will get basic books and supplies. In this budget, we are asking teachers to take it out of their wages here in America. Four million Iraqi children will be given early childhood education; yet this budget, this economic plan, calls for 28,000 children to be cut from Head Start.

There will be 3,000 roads paved, enough to reach from New York to California, in the budget for Iraq. This budget cuts \$6 billion from America's infrastructure.

A port in Iraq, the only deep port, will be rebuilt from beginning to end; yet this budget cuts 10 percent from our Corps of Engineers. Reconstruction for Iraq, rebuilding Iraq, we are asking our troops to come home to a diminished American dream, a smaller American dream.

We are providing for Iraq an economic plan that envisions a future. The future envisioned here in America is one with less education, one with less health care, one with less infrastructure, one with a less promising future.

When the fog of war is lifted, the facts on the ground will be 2½ million Americans without work, 5 million Americans without health care, \$1 trillion worth of foreclosed corporate assets, and 2 million more Americans who walked out of the middle class into poverty. Those are the facts of this economic performance and economic mismanagement.

We can do better. Our troops expect more. They are coming home to a smaller American dream, a diminished American future. We are talking about reconstruction for Iraq, yet this deconstructs America's future. We can do better.

This budget, this economic plan, has resulted in a diminished future for our children; yet, we are asking our people to finance a bigger, stronger, and a fairer future for Iraq.

There should not be that disconnect between Iraq's future and the one here in America.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I wish to ask the gentleman from Washington if he might respond. I want to ask the gentleman a question regarding this resolution.

As I understand it, this is the martial rule, and this is necessary in order to bring up the budget resolution that just came out of the Committee on Rules.

I would ask the gentleman, is that correct?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this is a rule to allow for same-day consideration of the budget resolution when the conferees finish their conference, which they did today. There is a layover of time from the time the conference was done until they reported it in the House, so we complied with the House rules.

Mr. STENHOLM. That is the point I want to clarify, following House rules.

□ 2315

Does this resolution follow rule 26 by increasing the debt ceiling every year for the next 10 years?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. My understanding of the provision in the rules of the House means that an adoption of this budget this year will raise the debt ceiling, which, of course, we are running deficits because of the war effort and the downturn of the economy for this year.

Mr. STENHOLM. But not for 10 years?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. No. However, if our rules continue to have the provision that allows a budget vote to raise the debt, then we will take this up next year. But my understanding is this is for this year.

Mr. STENHOLM. So we are not exactly following House rules. Let me ask then, is it true that this resolution that will follow this same-day rule that will follow the other rule will increase our national debt by approximately \$900 billion in the next 12 months?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. STENHOLM. Nine hundred billion.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I believe the correct number is \$984 billion over the next 12 months. And under rule 27, if it applied, the debt increase would go up every year, staircase for the next 10 years, and the public debt subject to statutory limitation would increase from just over \$5 billion to a bit over \$11 trillion in 10 years, if the fiscal policies implemented by this rule are actually passed and carried out.

Mr. STENHOLM. Reclaiming my time, I see several Members on the floor, including the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

I think it is very critical for all Members to understand, when you vote for this rule you are setting in motion the passage of a budget that no one on this side of the aisle has read and I doubt very many on that side has read, and we are going to borrow 984 billion additional dollars. That is on top of \$450 billion we have borrowed since we increased the debt ceiling 8 months ago. That is \$1.430 trillion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I arrived in this body in 1979. In 1981 I watched our debt ceiling for our country increase through the \$1 trillion mark. We are about to borrow and spend \$1.400 trillion more than we have got, and we are going to do that within a period of 1 year following the economic game plan that we cannot get a majority on this side of the aisle to say is not working.

Now, I respect the right of the majority, and I respect all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle that for whatever reason find it impossible to change a plan that was put into effect last year. But I honestly do not understand when so many of you privately are concerned about this but publicly feel like, at 11:20 at night, you have got to have a martial rule, jam it through, pass it, which is every right of the majority to do; but when you do, you are going to be voting to increase the debt ceiling by \$1.400 trillion in less than a year's time.

Now, that used to bother folks on this side of the aisle and I used to vote with you. In fact, I have done it more times than I have the other way. But what has happened to you? Why is it tonight that you are not worried about borrowing and spending \$1.400 trillion in a 1-year period of time? September 11, 2001. Changed a lot of things. It should change the economic game plan that we are under; but if you are bound and determined to do it, be my guest.

But no one walk out of here tomorrow and complain that we could not do better. We could do better.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous. We are here tonight to consider one of the most important resolutions that we will take up this year in Congress, the budget. This is the blueprint for everything we do. And we do not even get a chance to read it before we vote on it.

As a member of the Committee on the Budget, I have spent a lot of time addressing the concerns on this budget, and we spent an entire day from early morning until early the next morning on the budget process looking at amendments. We knew what we were voting on. We had a chance to debate it. Yet, tonight when we are voting on final passage of the budget of the United States, members of the Committee on the Budget and Members of the House have not had a chance to see the product they are voting on. This process is wrong.

Members deserve a chance to review this document before voting on it. If leadership is determined to consider this resolution before the approaching recess, that is fine. Give us a day, give us a half a day, give us some time to see what is in this budget. I have a responsibility to my constituents just like everyone does to consider measures carefully, to know what is in that measure before we vote on it. Yet, I cannot thoughtfully consider this legislation because I have not had a chance to review it.

This is an awful process. I urge my colleagues to defeat the martial law rule so we can have adequate time to review this budget.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) has 28 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in listening to the debate of my good friend from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), when he inquired why we were dealing under the martial law rules, why we could not have an extended period of time for debate to reasonably address this in front of the American people, the good news is that my constituents are still up because we are an hour behind Eastern standard time. Maybe they will be able to make some sense out of this debate calling for

martial law. Maybe they will understand that the reason why we are rushing is because there is some need to announce a big tax cut before April 15.

Let me tell you what Americans want. They do not want a tax cut. They want mutual sacrifice. While the young men and women are on the front lines sacrificing, we are presenting to them a Nation of deficits. We have got a reconciled tax cut of \$550 billion, an unreconciled of \$675 billion, making the total \$1.225 trillion. We are spending billions of dollars for reconstruction of Iraq by ourselves with nobody else helping us. We are building thousands of schools in Iraq. We are taking thousands of American children off of Head Start. We are, in fact, losing 2.6 million private sector jobs. We have got so many people unemployed for 6 months that they are not even on the unemployment list and 4.6 trillion in loss in stock market wealth.

Where is the mutual sacrifice that this Nation is used to participating in in time of war? How can my friends in good conscience shackle us with \$1.225 trillion in tax cuts and provide us with a 2.6 or \$2 trillion deficit over a 10-year period when we just had a \$5.6 trillion surplus just about 2 years ago?

I will tell you how they can do it. By passing this martial law in the dark of night, believing no one will see it, and then being able to announce around April 15 that you are going to get a tax cut.

I can tell you that my constituents and most Americans want investment in American jobs, want children to have Head Start, want the children's health insurance program to still be active, want to restore wealth to the stock market, and want to make sure that we do not have deficit spending.

Now, frankly, I believe that investing in Americans' interests may require some deficit spending, but this is an outrage. And this kind of tax cut is simply without substantiation. I would hope that we could go back to the table and begin to look at creating jobs, begin to look at investing in America, and responding to our young men and women when they come home that they will have institutions of higher learning, their families will be taken care of, and we will invest in them so they will be the best and the brightest of this new America.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. None of us are ecstatic about the fact that we are here, but we have a requirement that we complete this budget process. We have spent a great deal of time on it already this year. We have had a full and very vigorous debate on the budget, and we had a very close vote that took

place here. And now we have gone through the conference process.

So as I listen to people say that they have had no chance to look at this whatsoever, it is very clear the Committee on the Budget did its job. And the conferees met, and they have come forward with this report.

Now, one of the things that we just discussed upstairs in the Committee on Rules is that, whether you like it or not, it is often a prerequisite to actually meet deadlines if we are going to get things done and have deadlines set. And everyone is enthused about the prospect of meeting our deadline to have this done by the 15th of April. Everyone is enthused about the prospect of our adjourning for the district work period that is upon us. And we want to deal with a couple of things.

We want to deal right now with completion of this budget conference report; and we also, when we pass another rule, look forward tomorrow to consideration before we leave of the supplemental appropriations bill which will pay for the war effort.

Now, I see my good friend from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) here with whom I am very pleased to work on a wide range of issues, and we have just been working upstairs. And I wanted to clarify one issue, and that is rule XXVII clause 2 makes it very clear that there is not a 10-year requirement, but when specificity is designed as is outlined in this measure, a 1-year debt ceiling increase is in fact allowed under the rules of the House.

Now, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that we are all continually concerned about an increase in the national debt. We are concerned about increases in spending. And I think my friend was very correct in raising the fact that things changed on September 11 of 2001. And while he talked about the fact that he believed that the overall program for economic growth should change because of what took place on September 11 of 2001, we have found that it is absolutely essential for us to deal with things that did change on September 11.

We embarked on that day on a war on terrorism which has cost us over \$100 billion just for the war on terrorism itself. We know that with the war that is, actually, we hope very much, coming to an end right now, that we will be able to realize what we have spent. Tomorrow we will be dealing with the spending of \$74.7 billion, and so it is true that things have changed. But we feel very strongly that the most important thing for us to do is to put into place an economic growth plan that will generate the kind of revenues that we need to pay for the war on terrorism, to pay for this \$74.7 billion in supplemental appropriations that will be necessary to deal with the expenses dealing with the war in Iraq in which we have all strongly supported our troops in a bipartisan way on that and had a great celebration of that today here in Statuary Hall.

So, Mr. Speaker, our plan is to try and get the economy growing. We all realize that during the 1990s, the latter part of the 1990s, we saw a strong, bold, dynamic economy. We saw rates of growth at 6 percent and even beyond that. We have seen this diminution, the flow of revenues to the Treasury, not only because of increases in spending, not only because of the war on terrorism, not only because of the war that we are dealing with in Iraq, but because we have seen a slowing in our economy.

We happen to believe that reducing the tax burden on working Americans, putting into place plans to have growth-oriented tax cuts will, in fact, generate the kind of revenues that we need to deal with this. And so I would say to my friends who are now talking about a level of fiscal irresponsibility, that what we are trying to do is we are trying to get the economy growing.

□ 2330

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I think repetition is often relevant in this body; but when the gentleman talks about how we needed tax cuts, a significant amount, to get the economy growing, did he give the exact same speech that he gave in 2001 when we were told that large tax cuts would stimulate the economy?

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that virtually every economist, virtually every economist has acknowledged that had we not put into place the tax cuts, the economic growth plan that we did in 2001, that the slowing in the economy would have been even greater than what we have suffered in the past and the recession which began as we all know during the last two quarters of the year 2000 was, in fact, during those two quarters in 2001, in a position where we were in economic recession, but it is clear that the plan that we had did, in fact, diminish the slow down that we witnessed.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I know as you get old your memory goes, but I do not remember hearing that this is new. I remember rehearing that this will get the economy going. I do not remember the defense of the 2001 tax cut being this will prevent the economy from slowing down so rapidly. There was no acknowledgment that there was going to be a slow down; and I asked people to go back to 2001, and we heard in 2001 these same arguments.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said that

repetition is sometimes good, and so I guess I repeat once again.

He talked about the fact that we put into place what we considered to be an economic growth plan in 2001, and that economic growth plan was put into place before September 11, 2001. So I am repeating again what I said earlier, we have had to expend \$100 billion-plus in the war on terrorism, and we know that September 11 played a big role in creating an economic slow down; and we also know that the cost of the war, which we have just gone through, has also played a role in slowing the economy, with increased oil prices and a wide range of other concerns.

We know that as we look at the challenge, Mr. Speaker, of trying to get this economy growing, doing things like reducing the top rate on capital gains for new investment, which is a measure that I have been pushing for a while, which would take the top rate and cut it from 20 down to 10 percent for new investment, if there were a 1-year holding period. I have talked to a wide ring of economists, Democrats and Republicans, and they believe that that would provide an incentive for new investment and could play a role in getting the economy growing.

So, Mr. Speaker, my point is that we need to have growth-oriented tax cuts. Our goal is to do just that, so that we will have the revenues that we need so that we will not have a further debt burden, so that we will not have the kinds of deficits that unfortunately we are going to have to deal with because of these economic challenges that we face for a while.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Let me just say that I know that there is time on the other side of the aisle. I have enjoyed having this exchange with my colleagues and appreciate my friend for yielding me the time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we do not have a lot of time. I would have appreciated the distinguished chairman yielding to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) does not have the floor.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding time to me, and I would be happy to yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me, and I think the spirit of the debate, and precisely what you have been arguing is why I so strongly oppose what you are about to do tonight because the very economic game plan that you

have once again articulated by your own scorekeepers, if it works exactly like you have got it planned, if all of the things happen that you believe will happen with it, we are going to owe almost \$13 trillion at the end of the 10 years. We are going to owe another \$3 trillion almost at the end of 5 years if we do it just like you are doing it.

That is why some of us are asking you respectfully, take a look at that rhetoric that you have been repeating since 2001 that you do again tonight. I know you believe it sincerely. I do not question that, but how can you continue to make that argument when the result of it in the budget that we are passing, we are going to have to borrow another trillion dollars almost in the next 12 months, and even if it works exactly like you have articulated so well, as you can do, tonight, we are still going to be borrowing that amount of money?

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I simply say that we believe that we have the potential to get back, if we can unleash this economy to the kind of bold, dynamic economic growth that we saw in the latter part of the 1990s, if we do that, if we do that, I am convinced that we will have a level of revenues that outpaces even the kinds of projections that are included in this budgeting process itself.

So I thank my friend. We have shared interests here. We have shared goals. I believe that Democrats and Republicans alike very sincerely want us to get this economy growing so that we can have the revenues that we need to balance the budget and to deal with our priorities. Along with homeland security, along with the war that we have dealt with in Iraq, we can deal with education, transportation, health care, a wide range of other concerns that are out there; and I thank my friend for his thoughts.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask all Members, in the spirit of debate on this rule, to only address the Chair during the course of being yielded time by either the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) or the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules for agreeing to that dialogue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, for the record and for clarity, we only got this document minutes before coming to the floor. It is hundreds of pages long; but if you turn to about page 70, you will see just for clarity our debt limit now is \$6.4 trillion. Vote for this resolution and you will raise that to 7.384 trillion, 984 billion in 1 year. Over the next 10 years, the deficits entailed by this budget resolution will require the debt ceiling to be raised to \$12.040 trillion. Those are your numbers in your

resolution, and that is what you will be voting for if you vote to adopt this budget resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, it is almost midnight here on the east coast, and I hope that whoever is up and watching will understand what I am about to say.

What we are witnessing here tonight is the largest, long-term, structural tax increase on the American people in the history of this Republic because every year we borrow money, we have to pay interest on it, a tax on the American people, the Blue Dogs call the debt tax, that cannot be repealed.

Mr. Speaker, you have heard under their budget resolution, if it works like they say, we are going to incur \$1.2 trillion in additional debt in the next 12 months, in addition to what we have already done and seen the last eight. Mr. Speaker, at 4 percent interest that is \$40 billion a year that the American taxpayers have to pay every year.

This is the largest, long-term structural tax increase in the history of this Republic, and nobody can doubt that. At 5 percent, it is over \$50 billion a year in perpetuity.

If that is not bad enough, Mr. Speaker, what really is happening here is we have sent young men and women from this Nation to die for other people in the Middle East; and Mr. Speaker, what we are doing is saying we are going to take a tax cut while they go over there and die, and we are going to send the bill for this war and we are borrowing the money to fund and borrowing the money for the tax cut, we are going to send the bill to these young men and women in uniform, the only people who are being asked to sacrifice anything at all in this war, send it to them and their children; some of whom do not have a daddy now because they are dead in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, where is the honor? Where is the sacrifice? Where is the honor of this House when we try to do something like this? That is exactly what is going on tonight.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct, there is no honor in this. Think about what you are doing tonight. Your majority leader said, and I will read quickly, Between now and the next Presidential election, through the end of the fiscal year 1996, the public debt will increase by almost \$1.3 trillion. During President Reagan's first term, the debt ceiling was increased from \$935 billion to \$1.8 trillion. That is an increase of \$889 billion. It took us over 200 years to get to \$1 trillion in debt, over 200 years, and in the last 10 years we have gone to over \$4 trillion of debt.

All of that so-called stimulus package is deficit spending. None of that spending, none of it is paid for. All of it borrows money to pay for it. That is part of why we are raising the debt ceiling.

He was speaking in opposition to the kind of action you are taking tonight and then the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) said this, "We need to do other things to balance the budget. Let us do it. But first and foremost, we have to shoot straight with the American people, and hiding things like this debt ceiling increase is not the way to do that."

How many of you campaigned and said you were against raising the debt limit? How many of you campaigned on the fact that you were going to balance the budget? I voted for the balanced budget amendment. I believe in balancing the budget; and very frankly, under the Clinton administration, we took the Reagan-Bush deficits into surplus for the first time for 4 years in a row, the first time in 80 years.

Do you have no honor? Are you not ashamed of the hypocrisy that this budget resolution that you bring before us represents? Is there no honor in this House? Is there no fiscal integrity? Is there no concern for generations yet unborn who, as the gentleman from Tennessee says, will have to pay this bill and the young men and women we have in Iraq today will have to return here to pay the bill? Can we not stand up as Americans, proud of our country, proud of our objectives and say to them, we will pay as you fight, and together, we will win this battle for a better America?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I have been trying to figure out this process because normally an organization that works only 2 days a week should be able to get its work done without working till 3 in the morning, and so if the House was run competently we would not be here till 3 in the morning. So I thought it might be incompetence, and then I realized, this is chicanery masquerading as incompetence.

The reason we are here late at night is because what we are doing would not stand the light of day. We are creating a system where our friends on the other side of this building can say they are only voting for a \$350 billion tax cut. We over here can say it is a \$550 billion tax cut, but ultimately, the resolution tells us that we are on our way to a \$1.2 trillion tax cut.

The plan is simple. They will pass the most obnoxious provisions of their \$350 billion tax cut over there. It will go to conference. It will come back as 550. It will be passed on both sides by their majority vote, and that will be the portion of the tax cut loaded exclusively to the most wealthy.

Then, having cut the taxes in an unbalanced way, then another tax bill

will be prepared, including the least egregious provisions, and they will be packaged in such a way that they can pass without a filibuster on the other side. If only the light of day would shine and the country knew what we were doing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

This is a rule that allows us to consider the budget resolution that we have to get out by law so we can plan for the appropriation process, which I know will be difficult. So I urge my colleagues to support this resolution that allows us to consider a rule and ultimately the budget resolution.

□ 2345

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 203, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Carter	Garrett (NJ)
Akin	Castle	Gerlach
Bachus	Chabot	Gibbons
Baker	Chocola	Gilchrest
Ballenger	Coble	Gillmor
Barrett (SC)	Cole	Gingrey
Bartlett (MD)	Collins	Goode
Barton (TX)	Cox	Goodlatte
Bass	Crane	Goss
Beauprez	Crenshaw	Granger
Bereuter	Cubin	Graves
Biggett	Culberson	Green (WI)
Bilirakis	Cunningham	Greenwood
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Jo Ann	Gutknecht
Blackburn	Davis, Tom	Harris
Blunt	Deal (GA)	Hart
Boehler	DeLay	Hastings (WA)
Boehner	DeMint	Hayes
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hayworth
Bonner	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hefley
Bono	Doolittle	Hensarling
Boozman	Dreier	Hergert
Bradley (NH)	Dunn	Hobson
Brady (TX)	Ehlers	Hoekstra
Brown (SC)	Emerson	Hostettler
Brown-Waite,	English	Hulshof
Ginny	Everett	Hunter
Burgess	Feeney	Isakson
Burns	Ferguson	Issa
Burr	Flake	Istook
Burton (IN)	Fletcher	Janklow
Buyer	Foley	Jenkins
Calvert	Forbes	Johnson (CT)
Camp	Fossella	Johnson (IL)
Cannon	Franks (AZ)	Johnson, Sam
Cantor	Frelinghuysen	Jones (NC)
Capito	Gallegly	Keller

Kelly	Osborne	Sherwood
Kennedy (MN)	Ose	Shimkus
King (IA)	Otter	Shuster
King (NY)	Oxley	Simmons
Kingston	Pearce	Simpson
Kirk	Pence	Smith (MI)
Kline	Peterson (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Knollenberg	Petri	Smith (TX)
Kolbe	Pickering	Souder
LaHood	Pitts	Stearns
Latham	Platts	Sullivan
LaTourette	Pombo	Sweeney
Leach	Porter	Tancredo
Lewis (CA)	Portman	Tauzin
Lewis (KY)	Pryce (OH)	Taylor (NC)
Linder	Putnam	Terry
LoBiondo	Quinn	Thomas
Lucas (OK)	Radanovich	Thornberry
Manzullo	Ramstad	Tiahrt
McCotter	Regula	Tiberi
McCrery	Rehberg	Toomey
McHugh	Renzi	Turner (OH)
McInnis	Reynolds	Upton
McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Vitter
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Walden (OR)
Miller (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Walsh
Miller (MI)	Rohrabacher	Wamp
Miller, Gary	Ros-Lehtinen	Weldon (FL)
Moran (KS)	Royce	Weldo (PA)
Murphy	Ryan (WI)	Weller
Musgrave	Ryun (KS)	Whitfield
Myrick	Saxton	Wicker
Nethercutt	Schrock	Wilson (NM)
Ney	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (SC)
Northup	Sessions	Wolf
Norwood	Shadegg	Young (AK)
Nunes	Shaw	Young (FL)
Nussle	Shays	

NAYS—203

Abercrombie	Fattah	McCollum
Ackerman	Filner	McDermott
Alexander	Ford	McGovern
Allen	Frank (MA)	McIntyre
Andrews	Frost	McNulty
Baca	Gonzalez	Meehan
Baird	Gordon	Meek (FL)
Baldwin	Green (TX)	Meeks (NY)
Ballance	Grijalva	Menendez
Becerra	Gutierrez	Michaud
Bell	Hall	Millender-
Berkley	Harman	McDonald
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)
Berry	Hill	Miller, George
Bishop (GA)	Hinchee	Mollohan
Bishop (NY)	Hinojosa	Moore
Blumenauer	Hoeffel	Moran (VA)
Boswell	Holden	Murtha
Boyd	Holt	Nadler
Brady (PA)	Honda	Napolitano
Brown (OH)	Hoolley (OR)	Neal (MA)
Brown, Corrine	Hoyer	Oberstar
Capps	Inlee	Obey
Capuano	Israel	Olver
Cardin	Jackson (IL)	Ortiz
Cardoza	Jackson-Lee	Owens
Carson (IN)	(TX)	Pallone
Carson (OK)	Jefferson	Pascarell
Case	John	Pastor
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Clyburn	Jones (OH)	Pelosi
Conyers	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)
Cooper	Kaptur	Pomeroy
Costello	Kennedy (RI)	Price (NC)
Cramer	Kildee	Rahall
Crowley	Kilpatrick	Rangel
Cummings	Kind	Reyes
Davis (AL)	Kleczka	Rodriguez
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Ross
Davis (FL)	Lampson	Rothman
Davis (IL)	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Davis (TN)	Lantos	Ruppersberger
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Rush
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
Delahunt	Lee	Sabo
DeLauro	Levin	Sanchez, Linda
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	T.
Dicks	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta
Dingell	Lofgren	Sanders
Doggett	Lowey	Sandlin
Dooley (CA)	Lucas (KY)	Schakowsky
Doyle	Lynch	Schiff
Edwards	Majette	Scott (GA)
Emanuel	Maloney	Scott (VA)
Engel	Markey	Serrano
Eshoo	Marshall	Sherman
Etheridge	Matheson	Skelton
Evans	Matsui	Slaughter
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (WA)

Snyder	Thompson (CA)	Waters
Solis	Thompson (MS)	Watson
Spratt	Tierney	Watt
Stark	Towns	Waxman
Stenholm	Turner (TX)	Weiner
Strickland	Udall (CO)	Wexler
Stupak	Udall (NM)	Woolsey
Tanner	Van Hollen	Wu
Tauscher	Velazquez	Wynn
Taylor (MS)	Visclosky	

## NOT VOTING—8

Boucher	Gephardt	McCarthy (MO)
Combest	Houghton	Paul
Duncan	Hyde	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). The Chair would advise all Members there are 2 minutes, approximately, remaining in this vote.

□ 0004

Messrs. RODRIGUEZ, PASCRELL and HALL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 191 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 191

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The conference report shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 191 waives all points of order against the conference report to accompany H. Con. Res. 95 and against its consideration. The rule also provides that the conference report shall be considered as

read. Finally, the rule provides 1 hour of debate in the House to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report we will shortly be asked to consider is absolutely essential to our efforts to stimulate economic growth and to simplify and reform our Federal tax system.

The agreement would produce steadily declining deficits, and would achieve a balanced budget by the year 2012. In addition, this agreement provides for the total supplemental appropriation necessary to fund the war in Iraq, and provides separate \$400 billion reserve funds in the House and Senate for Medicare reform, including prescription drug coverage.

On taxes, the budget conference report provides for total tax relief of \$1.226 trillion during the years 2003 to 2013. For fiscal year 2004, the conference agreement provides for discretionary spending of \$400 billion for defense and nondefense discretionary spending of \$384.4 billion. The budget also includes \$26.7 billion for the Department of Homeland Security, a 35 percent increase over the current fiscal year, and provides additional homeland security-related funds for the Departments of Defense, Justice and Health and Human Services.

Of special note is a provision in the budget establishing a \$5.6 billion reserve fund over a 10-year period for Bioshield, which will help protect the public from emerging threats of chemical, biological, or radiological agents. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the budget agreement directs all congressional committees to identify existing waste, fraud and abuse and report back to the Committee on the Budget, with an accompanying report by the nonpartisan General Accounting Office.

Mr. Speaker, we learned the hard way last year the consequences of proceeding with the appropriation process without a budget agreed upon by both Houses of Congress. It is a lesson that I believe once learned should never be repeated. We simply must complete our work in a responsible fashion. The American people expect and deserve no less. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to adopt this rule and support the conference report on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, since this mammoth budget was made available to Members of this House only a couple of hours ago, it is difficult to know exactly what goodies and gimmicks are hidden inside of it.

We know enough, however, to know that this Republican budget is bad for the economy, bad for American working families, and bad for the future of our country. In other words, we know

enough to vote "no." I have to give the majority credit, though; they have brought the term "creative accounting" to new heights. Never before have I seen a "unified" budget conference report with two different budgets in it. I guess this is what they mean by "new math."

Under this model of budgetary mischief, the House tax cut costs \$550 billion, while the Senate tax cut costs \$350 billion. It is extraordinary, it is dishonest, and it is shameful.

Why is the Republican majority trying to get away with this trick? Because despite all of their rhetoric last year, they cannot get their own membership to agree to a single tax cut figure. They are stymied by a few Members of the other body who believe that maybe, just maybe, it is not such a great idea to spend over half a trillion dollars in tax cuts for the wealthy while the deficits explodes, while we are fighting a war overseas with unknown costs, while the baby boom generation nears retirement, while millions of seniors cannot afford their prescription drugs, and while our States are facing their worst fiscal agencies, their priorities are crystal clear. Instead of deficit reduction, economic stimulus, and adequate funding for things like homeland security, health care, veterans, education and environmental cleanup, the Republicans prefer tax cuts for millionaires. No wonder they do not want Members to read this budget.

Now tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, we are told that we will vote on the supplemental. That bill contains nearly \$2 billion to help rebuild Iraq. What is striking to many people is that Congress seems to understand, rightly, in my view, that health care is important for the people of Iraq, that education is important for the people of Iraq, that rebuilding roads and bridges is important for the people of Iraq. But when we look at this budget, it is clear that the majority does not understand that health care or education or transportation is important for the people of the United States, the people who are actually paying for the war.

Those people, the American people, they deserve a budget that reflects their priorities, not the priorities of a wealthy few. They deserve a budget that actually pays for its tax cuts, not one that uses so-called dynamic scoring to claim that one minus one equals three. They deserve a budget that is fiscally responsible, that does not leave future generations crushed by even more debt. They deserve a budget that helps make college more affordable, that helps pay for prescription drugs, that strengthens homeland security, and keeps our promises to our veterans.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve a lot better than this. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and to vote "no" on the Republican budget.

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