

that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) ever, ever injected one ounce of politics in tough decisions which an individual could have done, and he never did it, and neither did the members of that committee on either side of the aisle. They hung together with what I call our Capitol family. We appreciate that. I will never forget it. We also hated to lose the gentleman, but we like the gentleman from Connecticut, too.

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to add that in the presence of a great leader like the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and, as he indicated, also a former President of the Maryland legislative Senate, what an outstanding job that he has done in this committee. It is always great when one is able to stand on the shoulders of those who came before you, and the work that he has done for this committee has set a very important and exemplary example of how we should conduct ourselves here on the floor and in the committee. On behalf of all of those committee members and the committee staff who especially appreciate the gentleman's commitment to the one-third/two-thirds ratio, we extend our great thanks, love and devotion. In a word, the gentleman is a class act, as is the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), and as we continue this love fest here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers on our side, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, Chairman NEY and Ranking Member LARSON, I am pleased to offer my support today in favor of H. Res. 148 to fund committees of the House of Representatives during the 108th Congress.

As the Committee on House Administration moves forward with its mission of overseeing the functions of the House, I want to make sure that as opportunities arise for companies to do business with the House, African American, Women and other minority-owned firms are included in the awarding of contracts. With the construction of the Visitors Center offering up to \$100 million in contracts for Sequence 1, and \$125 million in contracts to be awarded for Sequence 2, it is imperative that African American, Women and minority owned businesses have as much opportunity to submit and win bids as do majority-owned firms. Along these lines, I sent a letter to the Architect of the Capitol Alan Hantman on April 16 stating my interest in being informed regarding the status of the House's outreach efforts to include eligible women and minority-owned firms in ongoing construction projects.

As of 2001, we know that according to the Small Business Administration, 259,143 contracts totaling \$15.6 billion were awarded to small disadvantaged firms nationwide. Overall, small disadvantaged businesses won 7.12 percent of contracts awarded across the country in 2001 according to the Congressional Research Service. Given this information, we

must do all we can to ensure that minority-owned firms, which frequently come under the heading of small disadvantaged businesses are able to bid on and win contracts awarded by the House. I have a keen interest in this matter, given that my home State of California is one of four states across the country accounting for 35 percent of all businesses owned by African Americans as documented by the U.S. Census Bureau. Right here, the District of Columbia is home to the nation's highest percentage of African American-owned firms at 24 percent, yet only 2.5 percent of the District's business receipts come from these companies as reported by the U.S. Census. Further, the State of Maryland ranks second with 12 percent of the country's African American-owned businesses which generate 1.4 percent of Maryland's business tax receipts. It is clear from these numbers that as Members of the House, we can do more to assure African American, Women and other minority-owned firms greater access to contracts under our jurisdiction.

I wholeheartedly support the bipartisan nature of the funding resolution put forth by this committee, and I applaud the Chairman and Ranking Member as they continue to make efforts to make contracting opportunities controlled by the House more available to minority business owners.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the previous question is ordered on the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 148.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY IN THE ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH CONGRESS

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 110) providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Homeland Security in the One Hundred Eighth Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the resolution is considered read for amendment.

The text of House Resolution 110 is as follows:

H. RES. 110

Resolved,

SECTION 1. AMOUNTS FOR COMMITTEE EXPENSES.

For the expenses of the Committee on Homeland Security (hereafter in this resolution referred to as the "Committee"), including the expenses of all staff salaries, there shall be paid, out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives for committee salaries and expenses, not more than \$11,028,787 for the One Hundred Eighth Congress.

SEC. 2. SESSION LIMITATIONS.

Of the amount specified in section 1—

(1) not more than \$5,657,656 shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2003, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2004; and

(2) not more than \$5,371,131 shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2004, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2005.

SEC. 3. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the Committee, signed by the Chairman of the Committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 4. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment printed in the resolution is adopted.

The text of House Resolution 110, as amended, is as follows:

Resolved,

SECTION 1. EXPENSES FOR THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY FOR THE ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH CONGRESS.

With respect to the One Hundred Eighth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than \$10,952,787 for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of the Select Committee on Homeland Security.

SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATION.

Of the amount provided for in section 1, not more than \$5,366,866 shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2003, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2004.

SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATION.

Of the amount provided for in section 1, not more than \$5,585,921 shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2004, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2005.

SEC. 4. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the Select Committee on Homeland Security, signed by the chairman of such Committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 6. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.

The Committee on House Administration shall have authority to make adjustments in the amount under section 1, if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or to conform to any reduction in appropriations for the purposes of such section 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the

gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to consider House Resolution 110, a resolution providing for the expenses of the Select Committee on Homeland Security.

House Resolution 110 authorizes a total of \$10,952,787 for the 108th Congress for the Select Committee on Homeland Security with \$5,366,000 being allocated for 2003 and \$5,585,000 being allocated for 2004.

The select committee was created to oversee the implementation of the Homeland Security Act of 2002. Its functions include working with the President to ensure the efficient and timely establishment of the Department of Homeland Security; coordinating efforts between Congress and the Federal agencies responsible for protecting our Nation from terrorist attacks; and reviewing and studying laws, programs, and government activities affecting homeland security.

This funding will enable the select committee to provide this important oversight function by overseeing the newly created Homeland Security Department and ensuring that the combined agencies are doing the job we all expect of them with regards to protecting our homeland and its security.

The funding for the Select Committee on Homeland Security is being considered in a resolution separate from the resolution that was just passed that funds the other standing committees, which was House Resolution 148, again due to the fact that the select committee is not yet a permanent committee.

I think we can all agree that after the tragic events of September 11, 2001 and the subsequent biological attacks that took place here at the U.S. Capitol, it was necessary to create a Federal department to coordinate security activities on the home front and to follow that up by creating an entity that will conduct the appropriate oversight activities.

I believe this resolution represents the product of a carefully constructed budget request. Ongoing discussions were held between myself, our staff, the gentleman from California (Chairman COX) and his staff to come up with a budget that was not only reasonable, but would also allow the select committee to do the job that it was chartered to do. I should also mention the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), our ranking member, and his staff greatly assisted in this process by communicating with the select committee's ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) to produce the product that we have before us.

Like the other committees, the select committee will adhere to the two-thirds/one-third ratio of dividing com-

mittee resources between the majority and the minority. I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman COX) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for their efforts in reaching that goal.

In conclusion, I believe this resolution provides the Select Committee on Homeland Security with the necessary funds to complete its mission. I urge my colleagues to support the passage of the resolution. I again thank our ranking member and our members from both sides of the aisle and the staff on the committee for bringing this before us today.

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House Resolution 110 which provides almost \$11 million for the Select Committee on Homeland Security for the 108th Congress. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), for their outstanding choices in Select Committee on Homeland Security leadership. I do not believe one could select two finer individuals than the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) or the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER). We all know that they face a daunting task of building a committee from scratch while they simultaneously are engaging in substantive committee business. Since September 11, this has created an important urgency that the United States Congress must address, and both of these gentlemen, we believe, along with the vast experience that the members of that committee will bring, will handle this task adroitly.

Again, I would applaud the efforts of the committee Chair in ensuring the one-third/two-thirds split on the committee, and I also want to extend an extra thanks to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) as well who went out of his way to secure extra space on behalf of the committee as well.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House Resolution 110, which provides almost \$11,000,000 to the Select Committee on Homeland Security for the 108th Congress. The Select Committee on Homeland Security is the newest committee in the House of Representatives. Its mission—to oversee and set policy for the new Department of Homeland Security—will affect the security and safety of every American for years to come.

No one denies that the Select Committee on Homeland Security must be given ample resources to oversee the most significant restructuring of the Federal government since 1947 and help secure this nation's borders. I am pleased that House Resolution 110 proposes just that.

As I learned during committee funding hearings in March, the gentleman from California, Chairman COX, and the gentleman from Texas, Rep. TURNER, face the daunting task of building a committee from scratch while simul-

taneously engaging in substantive committee business.

House Resolution 110 will provide the wherewithal for Mr. COX and Ranking Mr. TURNER to hire professional staff with a wide-range of expertise, establish secure office space, procure office equipment and technology, and conduct field hearings on a wide-range of security issues, including port security, First Responders, and continuity in communications.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my leader, NANCY PELOSI, and Speaker HASTERT for their outstanding choices to lead Homeland Security Committee. If there are two individuals better qualified to lead the committee, I do not know them. I dare say our colleagues do not know them, either.

Rep. TURNER and Rep. COX bring a command of the issues, the respect of their colleagues, an ability to put politics aside when circumstances demand it, and an incredible appetite for hard work. Without question, these qualities will serve the new committee very well. In selecting the gentlemen from Texas and California to carry out the toughest and most sensitive assignments of the 108th Congress, Leader PELOSI and Speaker HASTERT have distinguished themselves by putting the security and safety of the American people ahead of all other considerations. That is what leadership is all about.

I was especially pleased to learn during the March hearing that Chairman COX intends to honor what is referred to as the "Two-thirds, One-third Principle." This common-sense principle, which has worked extremely well for the other House committees, will provide Ranking Minority Member TURNER and the Committee's Minority Staff a *minimum* of one-third of the total funds, one-third of the total staff positions, and the control to expend those funds within the Committee's administrative guidelines, with no unusual constraints on the gentleman from Texas. Practiced faithfully, this principle will help ensure that the Select Committee on Homeland Security operates in as non-partisan a manner as possible. Given the sensitive nature of the Committee's work, the American people deserve nothing less.

Finally, let me thank Chairman COX for his efforts to procure adequate committee space for Mr. TURNER and his staff. As we all know, space is a scarce resource in the House. Nevertheless, Mr. COX has gone out of his way to accommodate the space needs of Mr. TURNER.

I thank the distinguished Chairman for bringing House Resolution 110 to the floor, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the previous question is ordered on the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "Resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Select Committee on Homeland Security."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of House Resolution 110.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO TICKET TO WORK AND WORK INCENTIVES ADVISORY PANEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 101(f)(3) of the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999 (42 U.S.C. 1320b-19), and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following member on the part of the House to the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Advisory Panel:

Mrs. Berthy De la Rosa-Aponte, Cooper City, Florida, to a four-year term.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHY NOT HEALTHY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, as the recession began and the government was projecting a \$5.6 trillion surplus, the President muscled through a big \$1.2 trillion tax cut based on those rosy projections that we would have surpluses as far as the eye could see. He said we could have it all. We could fully fund the Social Security Trust Fund and the lockbox and the Medicare Trust Fund and the lockbox, we could increase spending for education, the military, and we could cut taxes. A number of us at the time said, well, we really should not spend the money before we have it in the bank, and we said, let us do it year by year. We lost and we went forward.

Now, they also said at the time, and this is a quote from the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, that their \$1.2 trillion tax proposal was the solution for the then beginnings of the malaise of the United States economy.

□ 1815

The quote, "By moving quickly our hope is to have both monetary and fiscal policy pull this economy out of its nose dive."

Since the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) made that statement on the day the bill was passed, March 8, 2001, the United States of America has lost a million jobs and the economy is still in decline.

Now the entire surplus has vanished. We are now confronted with deficits as far as the eye can see. And what do they propose? They propose now to borrow money to give tax cuts. That is right. We are going to borrow money to give tax cuts. Never before in the history of our Nation will we have borrowed so much, a trillion dollars, to give to so few. A few thousand individuals will benefit principally from this massive tax giveaway.

Every penny of the Social Security surplus only paid by wage-earning Americans will be borrowed and in great part transferred to those who earn over a million dollars a year, \$105,000 each average tax cut for people who earn over a million dollars a year. It is an awful lot of Social Security taxes. That is an awful lot of hours worked by Americans and their families to finance those tax cuts for the wealthiest of the wealthy. The top 5 percent, \$200,000 and up, will get 64 percent of the benefits. And as I said, families \$1 million and up will average \$105,600. And it principally goes to people who do not work for wages.

Somehow this administration honors those who either inherited or otherwise, perhaps they were part of the Enron scam or something else have accumulated a bunch of money, or otherwise honorably earned a bunch of money, but they can invest for a living. They do not work for wages. They do not have to go in 40 hours a week, 60 hours a week. They do not have to hold two jobs. They do not have to work for wages. They should pay a tax rate lower, according to this administration, than working American families.

Now, in the short term they say this trickle down from these wealthy people will put those working wage-earning folks back to work, and understand their theory since wage earners will pay higher taxes than investors, that will ultimately undo the deficits. We will get the money from the wage earners because the investors will not be paying the taxes anymore. But even to get there, they had to put in a Brooklyn Bridge provision which is that many of the provisions of this legislation will expire in a few years. Otherwise, the cost tag would go over a trillion dollars; and since we are borrowing all this money to give back, that would be a problem with a lot of folks. So the Brooklyn Bridge provision says that most of these tax cuts, except the ones that go to the wealthy, will expire in 2005. So the child care credit increase up to a thousand dollars, well, that drops back down to \$700 in 2005. The increasing of the 10 percent bracket for the lowest income earners, those around \$12,000-\$14,000 a year, well, that expires in 2005. Married couples, helping to do away with the mar-

riage penalty, that expires in 2005. The AMT, a lot of people do not know what that is, but a lot of middle-income families and upper-middle-income families will be falling into this trap, it needs to be fixed, that expires in 2005.

But guess what? The capital gains and dividend provisions, those that give the \$105,000 a year to the families that earn over a million dollars, that never expires under the proposal the House will vote on tomorrow. And the top bracket rate reductions, those will not ever expire either. Wage-earning suckers will pay the bill while people who can afford to invest for a living will reap the benefits.

But this is trickle-down economics revisited; and as we know, it worked really well in the 1980s. In fact, DICK CHENEY was one of the principal architects back then to the deficit-producing, job-killing, trickle-down economics of the 1980s; and now we will revisit it in the 21st century. Shame on this House of Representatives for bringing up this bill in this manner with this constrained debate with no alternative that would produce jobs and wealth in this country allowed to be offered.

MACROECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF H.R. 2, THE "JOBS AND GROWTH RECONCILIATION TAX ACT OF 2003" PREPARED BY THE STAFF OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 3 (h)(2)(A)(iii) of rule XIII, I submitted the following macroeconomic impact analysis:

In accordance with House Rule XIII.3(h)(2), this document, prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation ("Joint Committee staff"), provides a macroeconomic analysis of H.R. 2, the "Jobs and Growth Reconciliation Tax Act of 2003." The analysis presents the results of simulating the changes contained in H.R. 2 under three economic models of the economy. The models employ a variety of assumptions regarding Federal fiscal policy, monetary policy, and behavioral responses to the proposed changes in law.

I. DESCRIPTION OF MODELS AND RESULTS
FORMAT
(A) MODELS

The Macroeconomic Equilibrium Growth ("MEG") model.—This model, developed by the Joint Committee staff, is based on the standard, neoclassical assumption that the amount of output is determined by the availability of labor and capital, and in the long run, prices adjust so that demand equals supply. This feature of MEG is comparable to a Solow growth model, described as the "textbook growth model" by the Congressional Budget Office (An Analysis of the President's Budgetary Proposals for Fiscal Year 2004, March 2003, pp. 28-29) ("CBO"). Individuals are assumed to make decisions based on observed characteristics of the economy, including current period wages, prices, interest rates, tax rates, and government spending levels. Because individuals do not anticipate changes in the economy or government finances, this type of behavior is referred to as