

population happens to be in the States of the Mountain and Pacific time zones. Twelve of the 15 fastest growing States are in the West. In the West we have an average growth in our student population of 7 percent, where in the East, the average growth is a negative 2.6 percent. Ten of the 13 States with the highest teacher-student ratio are also in the West. And as the map that I am looking at right now shows, as far as growth in expenditures per pupil, 12 of the 15 slowest-growth States also happen to be in the West. The amount of money increased to public education for funding of students in the East was 57 percent. In the States of the West, it was half of that, at only a 27 percent rate.

Now, the question we should ask is, Why are these red States in here that are all encompassed in the West, why are they growing so slowly? It is not because we are not taxing our people. Indeed, the tax rate for both local and State governments in the West is actually higher than what it is in the East. It is not because we are not trying to present our portion of the budget for education. In my State of Utah, 42 percent of the budget goes to public education. If we add higher education, then it is up to almost 65 percent of the budget.

The reason for it is very simple, and it deals with this particular chart. What it means is that land and property tax driven by land propel local governments and school funding, and also income brought from property propels local government and school funding. The bottom line is, as we look at this map, the West land is taken from and controlled by the Federal Government. The blue areas within each of these States represent the portion of that State which is controlled by the Federal Government; and thus, the land is taken off the property tax rolls.

The State of Maine has a whopping .8 percent controlled by the Federal Government. New York has .3 percent. The large State of Texas, and it was smart when it became a State because they kept their own debt, but they also control their own land, only 1.5 percent is controlled by the Federal Government. But of the States in the West, every one of them has at least 25 percent of their land controlled by the Federal Government, and the States with over half of their land controlled by the Federal Government are, once again, all found in the West. The States of California and Arizona, Wyoming have 40 percent of their land controlled by the Federal Government. Oregon is 50 percent. Idaho and Alaska are 62 percent. My State is 65 percent, and 83 percent of Nevada is owned and controlled by the Federal Government and off the tax rolls. On average, 52 percent of the West is owned by the Federal Government compared to only 4 percent of the East.

Now, the bottom line for that means we simply do not have the resources to fund our education system accurately

and we are falling behind other States, and it is an unfortunate concept. There are several different ways in which that happens.

When these States were entered into the Union, there was an enabling act which provided for this unfairness to be rectified. That has yet to take place, as the Federal Government has changed its policies towards land, and we are now talking about an amount of land that has a value of close to \$14 trillion. Secondly, no property tax can be generated from those lands. If we average the acreage at merely \$500 per acre and compare that with the tax rate that this land could have generated, these Western States should have been generating \$4 billion, which could be used to fund education in the West.

Now, the Federal Government recognizes that because we have a program called PILT, Payment in Lieu of Taxes, in which the Federal Government will compensate Western States. The problem is, what happened in the year 2001, this land should have generated \$4.2 billion. The Federal Government compensated these States to the tune of \$165 million in the PILT program, and all of this money is going to governments that were local and, once again, not to education.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, as we will be talking about at some time in the future is students in the West should be afforded an equal, an equal education opportunity, and they are not. This land is controlled by all of us, and we are saying all of us should be paying for the benefit, because students in the West are still being disproportionately affected unfairly.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-173)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Iran emergency is to continue in effect beyond March 15, 2004, to the Federal Register for publication. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the Federal Register on March 14, 2003 (68 Fed. Reg. 12563).

The crisis between the United States and Iran constituted by the actions and policies of the Government of Iran, including its support for international terrorism, efforts to undermine Middle East peace, and acquisition of weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them, that led to the declaration of a national emergency on March 15, 1995, has not been resolved. These actions and policies are contrary to the interests of the United States in the region and pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to Iran and maintain in force comprehensive sections against Iran to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 10, 2004.

HIGHLIGHTING UNSTEADY BUSH BUDGET POLICIES RELATING TO AFRICAN AMERICANS

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the unsteady budget

policies of President Bush in regards to allocating Federal resources to African Americans and many working American families.

Yesterday, I was joined by the House minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus to issue a report that paints an accurate picture of how the Bush 2005 fiscal year budget will impact not just African American families but the majority of middle- and lower-income families. Our findings and those of others in the advocacy community reveal that the Bush budget ignores the very urgent challenges facing Americans across this great Nation. In fact, in the face of historic unemployment, President Bush seeks to cut, if not completely eliminate, critical education, health care, housing, and small business development programs that help families and employers survive during difficult economic times. Last Friday, the United States Department of Labor reported that not one, not one single private sector job was created during the month of February, and that the national unemployment rate remains at a staggering 5.6 percent.

This terrible news is particularly frightening for the African American community. The African American unemployment rate for February was 9.8 percent, almost double the national average. What is worse, since President Bush took office, the number of African Americans without jobs has increased by 20 percent. Sadly, Mr. Speaker, the outlook for the Bush 2005 budget is just as dismal as the Bush track record on job creation.

President Bush touts steady leadership, but his actions say otherwise. He once said that he would be a uniter, but his budget proposes to divide Americans by rewarding the wealthiest 1 percent of our population while leaving the rest of the American people behind. The Bush budget is bad news for the 8 million African American children enrolled in our national elementary and secondary schools. It is no secret that schools with high concentrations of low-income minority students spend significantly less per pupil than schools with fewer low-income students.

Instead of rising to the challenge, the President's budget underfunds his own No Child Left Behind legislation by over \$9 billion. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the Bush budget cuts in half the funding for after-school programs that enable parents to educate their children and hold down jobs. If this Congress is truly committed to family values, we must support all families from birth through the golden years.

Mr. Speaker, I want to yield to another member of the Congressional Black Caucus as we come together to highlight the budget of President Bush and how it affects African Americans, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on the budget issues.

Mr. Speaker, before we discuss what we cannot fund, we have to discuss a little bit about where we are in the budget. One cannot discuss these numbers without charts, because we hear rhetoric, and it is confusing. But when we see the numbers on the chart, we get an idea of where we are and how deep a hole we are in.

This is the on-budget deficit for years beginning with the Johnson administration through Nixon and Ford and Carter, Reagan and Bush, larger deficits; the green is the Clinton administration where we passed a budget in 1993 without a single Republican vote in the House, without a single Republican vote in the Senate, and were able to exercise fiscal responsibility, digging ourselves out of the deep hole and into a surplus. And this is an on-budget surplus, so that the Social Security and Medicare are temporary surpluses and are in a lockbox to be used for Social Security and Medicare in the future. We had a surplus.

When the Republicans came in after the 1994 elections, they passed significant tax cuts that President Clinton vetoed. They threatened to close down the government, as my colleagues will remember; and he vetoed them again. They closed down the government, and he still refused to sign those massive tax cuts because they were fiscally irresponsible. When President Bush came in after the 2000 elections, they passed those same tax cuts again, and we see how much damage has been done to the budget. Now, this is a net surplus in the budget, going down to almost \$700 billion, a total swing of approximately \$750 billion deterioration in our budget situation.

Let us put that into context: the entire revenue from the individual income tax, everybody's individual income tax, less than \$800 billion. We have seen a deterioration in the deficit, \$750 billion.

Now, this chart shows it another way: the percentage of the budget paid for with borrowed money. You see, this is World War II, you come through the years. The Clinton years, we went into significant surplus; and when this President Bush came in, we started spending, paying for more and more of our budget with borrowed money.

□ 1430

We are up now to over 30 percent, well over 30 percent of the budget, the Federal budget is paid for with borrowed money. And you will notice that that is a level we have not seen since World War II.

Now, we got there with tax cuts. It is interesting to know who got the tax cuts. This chart shows what the upper 20 percent, the next 20 percent, the middle 20 percent and the other 20 percentiles, how much of the tax cut they got. If you look at the top 20 percent and just look at the top 1 percent,

about half of the tax cuts have gone to the upper 1 percent of the taxpayers. To put it another way, you can look and see approximately what you got if you made more than a \$1 million on average you get about \$89,000 tax cuts. \$500,000 to \$1 million, you got about \$13,000. And on average as you get down to \$50,000 to \$75,000, you are getting about \$132. And below \$50,000 you hardly need any ink to draw the bar. Off the chart for millionaires, do not need ink to draw the bar for ordinary Americans.

Now, we were told we had to do that to create jobs. Let us see how many jobs have been created because we went so far in debt. We were willing to go so far in debt and give tax cuts to the wealthy, how many jobs were created? Well, we have lost, have not gained, we have lost almost 3 million jobs during this administration.

Now, we hear the great excuse: "9/11." Everything that goes wrong is because of 9/11. Because of 9/11 we lost jobs. But wait. Every 4 years back to Harry Truman, everybody has been gaining jobs, everybody has been able to end their term of office with more jobs than they came in with. President Eisenhower, in his second administration he lost about 200,000 jobs but he gained 1,900,000 in his first term to his net plus 1,700,000 jobs. Everybody else, every 4 years gained jobs.

If you want to blame 9/11, you ought to notice that this chart includes not just 9/11, but it also includes the Korean War and the Vietnam War, hostages in Iran, the Persian Gulf War from 12 years ago, the Cold War, Kosovo, Grenada, everything else, everybody is gaining jobs until the result of this fiscal irresponsibility has actually cost us jobs.

Now, when you run up this kind of debt, you have to pay interest on the national debt. This chart shows the interest on the national debt we expected to pay after President Clinton left office going down to zero because we were on target to paying off the entire national debt.

This red line is the interest on the national debt we are going to end up having to pay because of our fiscal irresponsibility. By 2009, the difference is almost \$300 billion. Now, let us put \$300 billion into perspective. At \$30,000 a piece, you can hire 10 million people with \$300 billion. 10 million. And it gets wider and wider as you go out.

This is an opportunity that we are going to lose because we are going to be \$300 billion less than we thought we were going to have when President Clinton left office.

We also have to recognize that the Social Security program will be a challenge. These red bars represent the fact that we are bringing in more Social Security funds than we are paying out. That is because we recognize that when the baby boomers retire, we will be paying out more than we are bringing in. And we need to build up the trust fund so that hopefully we can pay this as much as we can.

2017 it goes into deficit. We are now spending all of this Social Security surplus on the present budget. We are in deficit even after we have spent the Social Security and Medicare. The Medicare chart looks similar to this. We are spending the Social Security surplus.

Now, when you cross the 300 line, 2025, somewhere in there, when you cross the 300 line that is \$1,000 for every man, woman, and child including those on Social Security. Every man, woman, and child \$1,000. When you cross the 600 line, that is \$2,000 for every man, woman, and child just to make this, just to pay the Social Security shortfall.

Now, you may look at this and decide, well that is too challenging, we never could have paid it. It is just too much of a problem. But when you look back at this chart, we have been told that if you just look at what this administration wants to give to the top 1 percent, top 1 percent, that would have been enough to pay Social Security benefits without reducing benefits, without increasing the age for 75 years, or you can give the top 1 percent a tax cut.

Now, Mr. Greenspan told us that if you extend the tax cuts like it looks like this administration will propose, it has proposed, if we extend the tax cuts we should cut Social Security. Now, I think he used the word "adjust" Social Security. He is talking about increasing the age, reducing the COLA. I think most people, including the Republican officials, have categorized that as a cut. And I think most people would view that as a cut; they are going to be getting less than they would have if you had not made that adjustment. I would certainly call that a cut.

But he said if you extend the tax cuts, you have to cut Social Security. The GAO issued a report recently that showed that we are on track to disaster. A great political philosopher once said, "If you do not change directions, you may end up where you are headed."

Well, the GAO says that we are headed towards a situation in a few years, a couple of decades where the Social Security deficit and interest on the national debt alone will absorb all of the projected Federal revenues for those years. In other words, all of the revenues will be insufficient to pay just the Social Security shortfall and interest on the national debt. That is without Medicare, and Medicaid, and that is without any other Federal spending. Just the Social Security shortfall and interest on the national debt will absorb all of the Federal revenues.

Obviously, that is a direction we should not be going in. We need to change directions. And the reason we cannot fund many of the things that you mentioned that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the chairman of the Black Caucus, mentioned is because we are using up the money in interest in the national debt.

We are having trouble funding police officers, 100,000 police officers. And we said we could with the \$300 billion additional interest on the national debt that we will be paying in just a few years, we could have hired 10 million people at \$30,000 apiece, 5 million at \$60,000 a piece, and we are having trouble trying to find funds to hire 100,000 police officers.

We cannot properly fund veterans benefits, education, health care. There are a lot of things we cannot do because it is all being absorbed by the interest on the national debt necessitated because we have put our budget in unprecedented deficit.

Now, the idea that we are going to get a promise that the deficit will be cut in half in 5 years is really insulting. We should be talking about how we get back up into surplus where we were when this administration came in. Instead of running up debt, we ought to be running up surpluses so we will be prepared to meet the challenges of Social Security.

At this rate, with all this red ink, we will be so far in debt that we will not have anything for Social Security. We will not have anything for Medicare. We will not have anything for jobs because we are paying interest on the red ink that we are running up. That is the problem that we have. And the additional problem that we have is that the tough choices that created this green ink, were tough choices, politically tough choices. And you can not make those tough choices until you have at least acknowledged a problem.

This administration refers to this graph and the deficit as "manageable." That is why we need a graph to show the people what we are talking about. This administration refers to this job graph by saying that the tax cuts are working. The tax cuts are not working. We have lost 3 million jobs. And so you need the graph to show specifically what we are talking about in this budget and how bad it is.

And, so, I would say to the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, I thank him for the opportunity to present the problem so that we can, as others participate, can talk about the things that we cannot fund because we have this situation where we are so far in the hole with a graph such as this. You cannot create a graph like this by accident. We are far in the hole, and we need to dig ourselves out so that we can make the important investments in education, in health care, in veterans benefits and the other important challenges that we have before us. And I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for yielding.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) will yield for a second, I want to ask the gentlemen a few questions. They call this a jobless recovery. Would my colleague agree that there is a recovery?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is the problem with using rhetoric

without using charts to show what we are talking about. You have indicated that some have looked at this chart and said we are in a recovery. Others have said the tax cuts are working. One looks at the chart, this is a miserable failure. We have lost 3 million jobs. I do not call that a recovery.

Now, if you go back 50 to 75 years, they blame a recession. The experts will say that this administration did not inherit a recession. The recession began on this administration's watch.

Whenever it started, it has been over by all accounts since the end of 2001. Since then, we have had all of 2002, and 2003 and we are into 2004. No recession from the beginning of any recession in the last 50 years, we have always within about 30 months recovered all of the jobs that were lost during the recession within about 30 months. Here we are almost 40 months after the beginning, whenever they say it started, it has been at least 40 months, we have not recovered the jobs yet.

This is the worst recovery we have had in modern history. That is not a recovery.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a question that has been raised over and over again, and, as a matter of fact, I think I just heard the President say this within the last few days, that one of the problems was 9/11, and that 9/11 caused us to go through some extra economic problems. And I was just wondering when my colleague takes a look at his charts, is he taking into consideration, when he talks about 40 years back, is he taking into consideration the fact that we had this very, very unique situation and regretful situation with 9/11?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, when people talk about 9/11, they have to take into consideration that this chart goes back to Truman and Eisenhower, that includes the Korean War, it includes Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, it included the Vietnam War, the Cold War, the hostages in Iran, Grenada, Somalia, Kosovo, the Persian Gulf War. All of those are on this chart. Everyone created jobs during their four-year administration.

□ 1445

President Clinton, 10 million jobs the first term, over 10 million both the first term and over 10 million jobs over the second term. Everyone has had problems. There have been recessions all the way up and down here. Everyone has been able to deal with adversity and create jobs. Until you get here.

Now, if the President had offered an economic plan that had been rejected, he might say that because you rejected my plan, if you had only adopted my plan, things would have been better. We adopted his plan. We passed, I did not vote for them, but Congress passed his plan. And it resulted in a massive deficit and job loss.

Mr. CUMMINGS. In other words, when you have the loss of jobs and you

have, in looking at the very end of your chart there, does that, how does that affect the overall economy?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. When you lose jobs, there are things that, first of all, I do not know how you can spend that kind of money. Right after 9/11, we appropriated \$40 billion. At \$40,000 each you could have hired a million people. I do not know how you end up losing jobs; 9/11 actually should have stimulated jobs, not lost jobs. The problem is that this administration does not look at money, financial responsibility, with anyone. They decided to do something. It does not matter how much it costs.

Just look at the war in Iraq. The Persian Gulf War 12 years ago cost the United States \$7.4 billion, 7.4. Now, the 60, 70, \$80 billion was the total cost; but because we had allies, total cost was \$7.4 billion.

When we appropriated \$87 billion a few months ago, we had already spent \$79 billion on the war. Total \$166 billion; 7.4, 166, just to implement the my-way-or-the-highway, go-it-alone strategy. Had we developed some allies so that someone else could help pay the money and absorb some of the causalities, it is not all our money and all our causalities, it would have been closer to the 7.4 than the 166.

Now, we are going, the estimates are about \$50 billion. The chairman of the Committee on the Budget has estimated about \$50 billion will be coming next year for Iraq, so that is another 50, 7.4, 166, 50 and who knows what after that.

Let us put the 166 in perspective. That is more money than we spent in a year on the Department of Homeland Security for the security of the United States; and the Department of Education, the entire Department of Education budget. Plus, it is still more than the Department of Transportation, all road-building we are supposed to be doing. And it is more than the Department of Labor and Department of State. Add them all up, combined.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Combined.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Combined. Homeland Security, Education, Transportation, Department of Labor, Department of State, add them all up, it does not come to \$166 billion; 7.4, 166. How much do you have to spend before someone suggests that the spending is out of control?

Mr. CUMMINGS. One of the things that I remember when the President was considering going to war, one of the things that was asked of the President by the Congressional Black Caucus was exactly how were we going to pay for this war and exactly where was this money going to come from, because we have a limited situation. But I guess what you are saying is that what we are doing is we are overspending. I am trying to put it in laymen's terms.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. If you are going to spend \$166 billion and we

would be willing to spend whatever it takes to make the United States safe. We are now debating whether we are safer or not as a result of spending as a result of spending \$166 billion. It looks to me that there are a lot of other things you could have done with a \$166 billion budget that would have made America a lot safer than we are today.

But look at the red ink. I mean, when you start adding it up, there was not a peep mentioned about how we were going to pay it. No sacrifice. And, in fact, when you look at some of the things that the House passed right after 9/11 with most of the votes coming from the Republican side of the aisle, we passed one provision which was a repeal of the alternative minimum tax for corporations. That is kind of technical, but what we found about 15, 20 years ago was that a lot of corporations were paying out dividends year after year after year. They were profitable companies; but because they had so many loopholes and deductions, they were paying no income tax. And so they passed a provision many years ago called the alternative minimum tax for corporations. In the alternative for no tax, at least pay a minimum tax. And that has been a law right after 9/11 when everyone was supposed to be sacrificing. The House passed a provision to eliminate the alternative minimum tax for corporations.

They took that opportunity when everyone is supposed to be sacrificing to eliminate the alternative minimum tax for corporations. And while they were at it, they have made the repeal retroactive for 15 years. So if you had paid the alternative minimum tax in the last 15 years, you would get your money back. Several corporations would be getting a billion dollars back. Enron would get \$250 million.

Now, if you had a company and you got a billion dollars retroactive tax relief, an employee of that corporation would be no more likely to have a job the next day than the day before. That is not stimulating the economy. There is no more demand for your product. Now the uppity-ups in the corporation would be more likely to get their bonuses, the stockholders more likely to get their dividends. But an employee for the company, because there is no more demand for the product, is no more likely to have a job the next day than the day before. That is the kind of provision that this House passed.

Thankfully, there was a Democratic majority in the Senate at that time and that was defeated in the Senate. But when you talk about sacrifice and how do you pay for a \$166 billion war, well, you do not worry about it; you just let the next generation pay for it. You pay for it out of the next generation's Social Security. You borrow the money and worry about it later. That is not the fiscally responsible thing to do. It is not how you stimulate the economy. It is not how you produce jobs, and it is not what you ought to be doing to the next generations.

Mr. CUMMINGS. One last question. I will never forget when the President talked about the war in Iraq, when the President talked about the war on Iraq. I am sure you will recall one of the things that he said was that this war had been brought to us. I shall never forget it. I was sitting in this Chamber. And he said to us we need to take this responsibility so that our children and our grandchildren would not have to address it. And it sounds like what the gentleman is saying is that at least in part this war will have to be paid by our children and our grandchildren, at least, if not our great grandchildren because of the way things are going.

The other issue is this: one of the things we hear over and over again from the President is that he keeps talking about, saying that this side of the aisle wants to increase the taxes on Americans. And basically what he is saying is that if we do not extend and make these tax cuts permanent, that is like increasing taxes on Americans. That is a very interesting way to put it.

I just want to know what you thought.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. The idea that if we do nothing, that that is a tax increase. The important thing is not to worry about what the label is. The important thing is to look at this chart. The policies of this administration which have been pretty much adopted in total have resulted in a deterioration in the budget almost equivalent to the total amount of money that we get from the individual income taxes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. You said that is \$800 billion.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. The money we get from the individual income tax totals less than \$800 billion. We have a \$750 billion deterioration in this budget in just 3 years. And so whatever you call it, whatever label you put on it, look at the chart. This is called tax cuts are working, deficit is manageable, whatever you want to call it. Look at what this administration's policy resulted in.

Now, you talked about who is paying for it. Part of the war is being paid for by veterans benefits. We are debating now as to whether or not we are going to at least maintain present services.

Mr. CUMMINGS. To veterans.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. For veterans.

The President's budget does not include enough money to maintain just the little present benefits for veterans. They want some veterans to pay more fees for health services, some not to be eligible, less services, while the war is being fought. So the veterans themselves will have to come back and pay the interest on the debt on the war that they fought in. That is not right.

We are not able to fund the kind of things like Cops on the Beat. Now remember, in just 5 years we will be spending approximately \$300 billion more in interest on the national debt than we should have had to pay. You can hire at \$30,000 a piece, 10 million

people for that amount of money or 5 million at \$60,000. We are trying to find a little money to hire 100,000 police officers, to hire teachers, health care workers; and we cannot find the money because it is all being used up in interest on the national debt that is run up because you have to pay interest on the national debt since you are obviously not paying off any debt while you are in the hole. You only pay off debt when you are above the line. When you are in the hole, you are running up more debt, you have to pay more interest on the national debt.

We cannot pay for our transportation projects. There are so many things that we cannot do because we are running up so much interest on the national debt. And remember that we have the exploding Social Security problem in just a few years. We ought to be preparing for that, not wake up in 2014 and wonder why the Social Security surplus is no longer there. It is not going to be there after 2014. We are going to have to come up with more money. We will not have the gravy train of 100-some billion dollars or go up to \$275 billion in Social Security surplus to run through.

It is a growing deficit, and there is no provision in the President's budget or the Committee on the Budget's budget that we are about to, that they will probably adopt; there is nothing in there to prepare us for the Social Security shortfall and the interest on the national debt.

The GAO just issued a report in the last few days that shows if we keep going in the direction we are going, in just a couple of decades the Social Security shortfall and interest on the national debt will absorb all Federal revenues. That means no Medicaid, no Medicare, no Federal spending on anything including defense. You spend all your money just in Social Security and interest on the national debt unless there is a profound change in direction.

Mr. CUMMINGS. What change could reverse that?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Well, you need to make tough choices; and, fundamentally, the strategy ought to be the green.

In 1993 when President Clinton came in, we made tough choices. He vetoed bills that were inconsistent with his tough choices and we went into surplus. These are tough choices. This was the strategy that created fiscal responsibility and 20 million jobs in 8 years. Fiscal irresponsibility is when you start passing massive tax cuts without paying for them, just borrow the money for the tax cuts. Some say we are giving you your money back. No, no, no, no, no. We have spent your money. We are sending back money we have borrowed from overseas and giving it back because we spent your money.

□ 1500

We spend your money and everybody else's money and Social Security and

everything else, a deterioration in the budget, \$750 billion, almost the same as the total amount that we received from the individual income tax.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentleman for the explanation and for his excellent work on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, the Bush budget eliminates all kinds of programs, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) just talked about. There is one program that eliminates and that is the Even Start program. A lot of times, Mr. Speaker, we look at the numbers in a budget and we look at them purely based upon figures; but the impact on human beings and citizens and children in our country is phenomenal.

For example, this Even Start program is meant to uplift children and families through a combination of childhood education and adult literacy programs. That is very important; and when the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) talked about the whole jobless situation, it is one thing to have opportunities at some point in the future, hopefully. It is another thing for those parents of those children to be prepared to take advantage of those jobs and for them to be able to raise their family. It takes money to raise a family.

Then the Bush budget freezes funding for Head Start, which provides education and nutrition service for over 297,000 African American children, very, very significant. How do you even put a value on a child being able to get a head start in life and in school and to be able to go to school ready?

When we look at health care, the picture gets even worse. The Bush budget does absolutely nothing to hold down the costs of prescription drugs. It jeopardizes medical benefits for the 4.6 million African American children who receive health care through Medicaid, and it severely underfunds programs that combat the spread of HIV/AIDS and the increase of health disparities among minority communities.

These are things that go to the essence of life; and I have often said as we talk about the budget and other issues that the Congressional Black Caucus, as we do that, we are not just speaking for African Americans. A lot of people get a little bit confused. They see African American Congresspeople stand up, and they assume that in all our districts the majority of people are African American. That is just simply not true. We represent a wide range of people of all races and colors, religions in our caucus, and so over 26 million people in total.

But those costs that I just talked about, those are the costs, I guess, like I said, you cannot put a value on making sure that a child is well taken care of because it used to be a commercial that said you either pay me now or pay me later. If you do not give that child a good head start in life, then government, through State government in most instances, will pay later on through, unfortunately, juvenile deten-

tion centers, sometimes prisons, sometimes all kinds of programs, teenage pregnancy programs, things of that nature, to help lift people up after they have fallen.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget eliminates funding for the juvenile justice programs, the prevention programs, the early intervention programs, the kinds of things that you can pay now and pay less later. He had to cut those out because having spent all the money in tax cuts and having gone so far in debt, there is nothing left over for those important programs; and you are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars. This is hundreds of billions of dollars that we are in deficit, and we cannot make the little kinds of payments.

My colleague talked about jobs. The small business program which is just less than \$100 million, that is one-tenth of \$1 billion. Here we are almost \$700 billion in the hole, one-tenth of \$1 billion, and that program creates jobs. The only thing the government has to pay out is when the loan defaults because it is a loan guarantee program. So just for every now and then there is a default we have to pay. For every 2 or \$3,000 we pay out, we are creating a job because tens and hundreds of thousands of dollars has been borrowed, guaranteed, paid back. So we do not have to pay anything. For every 2 or \$3,000 we actually have to pay out, we have created a job.

When you start going in the hole hundreds of billions of dollars and have a program that can create jobs for 2 or \$3,000 a piece, why did that get cut out? Because you just ran so far in debt that you did not have any money left over.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

I want to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

I am joining my colleagues because I see now that the President's budget is cutting about 20-plus programs, and those programs are critical to our districts. And you are absolutely right, our districts do not comprise all African Americans. We are talking about Cambodians, Filipinos, Samoans, Vietnamese, Guamanians; and they are all concerned about the loss of jobs.

In L.A. County alone, which is the largest county in California, we have lost over 136,000 jobs. In the State of California, we have lost over 300,000 jobs. No State, no city, no county can be sustained with those types of job losses; and so this budget is absolutely the most outrageous budget I have ever had to deal with because it has no funding in there for No Child Left Behind to any great degree. We know the last budget was \$8 billion short. I think now it is \$9 billion short; and so here

we are trying to grapple with educating our children, some 53-plus million children in this country. California has over 6 million, and we do not have the funding to do that.

I think it has just gone off the chart, and so I thank the gentleman for allowing me to come and speak on this because I have never seen a budget that is so ill-fated, that has absolutely nothing to speak to the American people, when we have 11 million children who are uninsured, and over 44 million adults, and this budget does not speak to insuring them. It is an atrocity, and so I join you in saying this administration's budget is a hoax; it is not for the American people. It is everything but for the American people.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her statement; and I am just reminded, I think it was just yesterday the President went to Ohio. He stood there in front of quite a few people, and he said, basically, hold on, hold out; I am the one that gave you these tax cuts. Basically what he said, I still believe in this trickle-down theory and that things are going to get better.

The fact is that the President has been saying that over and over again. As a matter of fact, a little bit earlier this year, in his economic report, he projected that he would be producing some 2.6 million jobs before the end of the year.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I think they have been revising that number back and forth, but whatever the projections are, let us look at the results. No President has left office in over 50 years with fewer jobs than they started off with until this administration. We are down 3 million jobs; and if you are interested in jobs, remember that in just a few years we will be spending \$300 billion on additional interest on the national debt that had not been anticipated when President Clinton left office, \$300 billion dollar. At \$30,000 each, you can hire 10 million people. There are only 9 million people unemployed and receiving unemployment in America today. Instead of an unemployment check, you have enough money there in additional interest on the national debt that we should not have to pay to hire everybody that is drawing an unemployment check.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and I sit on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. That bill alone would bring the types of jobs for folks that have good wages and good benefits, and yet we have asked for over \$375 billion for that bill. He has now cut that bill down to some \$258 billion. How can we get Americans back to work if we are not going to put the type of funding in programs and on bills to support that?

So we are just outraged. It is outrageous to even speak of the fact that they are going to have so many jobs

per month, because that growth is not coming.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. On those transportation jobs, is there not something unique about those jobs? We keep talking about transferring jobs overseas. When you have a transportation-created job, where does that work take place?

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. That work takes place right here in America, in the heartlands, in the rural, in the urban areas of our cities and States; and this is why, if the President is really interested in getting jobs to the American people, he would invest in this transportation bill that will keep those jobs right here. They are great construction jobs. There are other suppliers jobs that come from that, and it is a multiplying effect. So if you get those jobs, those jobs create other jobs and, therefore, will bring back a lot of those jobs; but if he is not willing to invest the \$375 billion in a transportation bill, then he is not really anxious about getting jobs back to Americans.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me just say this. As my colleagues were talking, I could not help but think about how the President talks.

Could we bring that chart back up, the first one. The President talks so much about that. It is the one that talks about the tax cuts, I mean how much money people get.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. This?

Mr. CUMMINGS. You had one with red, that one.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. This is if you are making 50 to \$75,000, you are on average, the average income group, \$132. Below that you hardly need any ink to draw the bar. However, if you are making more than \$1 million, you explode way off the chart.

Mr. CUMMINGS. The reason why I wanted to point that chart out is because something interesting is happening here, and we are seeing it in all of our States.

The tuition, for example, in Morgan State University in my district, I sit on the Board of Regents, has gone up some 25, 30 percent. The average family at Morgan State has an income around about \$50,000, \$55,000. So about how much would they be getting based upon that chart in tax cuts?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Fifty to \$75,000: \$132. Now there are a lot of different variations in that, depending on the child tax credit. If you have a lot of children, you may get more tax credit. If you are single, you may not get anything at all. On average, 50 to \$75,000, you are getting \$132 a year.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Let us take it up to \$500. I will give them an extra \$500 instead of \$132. The tuition has gone up almost that much, and Pell grants are being leveled off; and we have got a situation where like other States we suffered a deficit. The State is not getting as much money so, therefore, the State's going through its difficulties.

So now our colleges are not getting as much money.

My point is that Americans have to understand that no matter what they are going to pay, they are going to pay one way or another. Property taxes are going up, but yet and still our President runs around talking about how great a tax cut we are getting when, in fact, I think Americans are going backwards and services are being less than they have to be. It is the only way that you can do all of this and still keep institutions open.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the problem is that unless you recognize that there is a problem you are not going to come make the tough choices to fix it. Most people would glance at this chart and say we have a problem. This administration says that this is manageable, and on the job chart where he looks like he will be the first one to leave office with fewer jobs than he started off with, the tax cuts are working. No, the tax cuts are not working. We are losing jobs. If we passed the transportation bill, millions of jobs would be created.

This will go above the line. Pass the transportation bill. There are a lot of things we can do to stimulate jobs. Tax cuts to the wealthy have not worked. Transportation jobs will work. Tax cuts to those in the lower end, who will actually spend it and buy stuff with it, will work.

A millionaire, if he wants a television, he would have already bought a television. If he wants a car, he would have already bought a car. Someone in the lower brackets, if they get a couple hundred extra dollars, they are going to spend the money.

So there are a lot of things. Repealing the alternative minimum tax for corporations, we discussed, will not create any jobs; but that is how we were trying to spend the money, and that is why, as a result of all that spending, it still ended up no jobs. If you look at the study of the Republican-dominated Joint Committee on Taxation, when they looked at the 2003 and looked at tax cuts and looked at the taxes that were cut, they concluded you might have a little short-term spike in jobs. As a direct result of passing that bill, you will have fewer jobs in the fullness of time than you started off with, and that is because you did it with borrowed money. There was limited stimulus, and because you have got to pay interest on it, on the debt that you ran up in the fullness of time and just a few years as a direct result of passing the bill, you will have fewer jobs than you started off with.

We should not be surprised because of the taxes we cut that we are below the line. Had we used the money for transportation, for targeted tax cuts where they would have made a difference to help fund States or other programs, where we actually use the money in such a way that people will be hired, with all the spending, this thing ought to be off the chart. The budget has deteriorated \$750 billion, almost the same

as what we get from the entire individual income tax. With that kind of spending, it should have been able to create some jobs.

□ 1515

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield once again. The other thing that would create the climate for jobs would be small businesses. And yet here at the end of last year, the 7(a) loan program, which is really the driving force for financing for small businesses was absolutely turned out. No money in it. It was eliminated. But because we raised so much havoc on it, they have brought that back, but with fewer dollars. So we still do not have the infusion of money for this powerful engine that drives the economy through job creation, which are the small businesses.

So, again, the President is not operating in the true sense of helping Americans to get back to work.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, again, the Congressional Black Caucus stands up, as we have over and over again. It is said that we are the conscience of the Congress. I claim we are the conscience of the United States of America.

The fact is that President Bush is doing no favors for not only the African American community but communities throughout this country; for hardworking Americans who got up early this morning, some of whom had a job, but for others who are about to lose their job, and still others, Mr. Speaker, who do not have to go to work because they have already lost their job. I just find it very interesting that the President would go to Ohio, a State where there has been phenomenal job loss, and tell people who do not have a paycheck to hold on and hold out.

CONDOLENCES TO TERRORIST VICTIMS IN SPAIN; AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS VULNERABILITY AND REDUCTION ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my condolences to the families of the terrorist victims in Madrid, Spain.

This heinous act of violence is becoming all too common an occurrence. This morning, as we are all painfully aware, a series of explosions ripped through several packed commuter trains in Madrid during the morning rush hour. The blast killed at least 173 people and wounded 600.

Last month, in an all too familiar circumstance in Moscow, a bomb exploded inside a crowded subway train during the morning rush hour, killing at least 39 people and wounding more than 130.

Securing our Nation's public transportation system has been a top priority of mine. At the outset of the 108th Congress, I introduced the Public Transportation Systems Vulnerability and Reduction Act of 2003, which is H.R. 1148. For years, Mr. Speaker, governments around the world have recognized that public transportation is a major terrorist target. Until 9-11, the United States had been largely spared the kinds of terrorist campaigns waged against public service transportation. However, we cannot wait for a tragedy to happen to prompt us to address our vulnerabilities.

In October 2001, a study released by the Mineta Institute, Protecting Public Surface Transportation Against Terrorism and Serious Crime: An Executive Overview, cites that between 1920 and 2000, there have been approximately 900 terrorist attacks and other significant criminal incidents involving public surface transportation systems. However, all but 14 of these attacks occurred after 1970, the year that marks the beginning of modern terrorism.

Attacks against transportation and transportation infrastructures accounted for about 42 percent of all international terrorist attacks according to the most recent statistics provided by the U.S. DOT Office of Intelligence and Security in 1998. We are seeing these statistics play out before our eyes on CNN.

My legislation, the Public Transportation Systems Vulnerability and Reduction Act of 2003, will provide our Nation's transportation systems and workers with the training and funding to help protect our homeland. This legislation will provide funding for ongoing vulnerability assessments which would build continuously on information collected, allowing for easier implementation of new technology that will assist in averting terrorist attacks on all modes of public transportation. It will have training programs for front-line transit employees, ensuring that these employees, who are the eyes and ears of transportation systems, are prepared to respond to emergency situations. And it will develop and have implementation of local and regional emergency preparedness plans that fully utilize a community's transportation resources.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in continuing to work to give our Nation's transportation systems and employees the resources to protect our communities. I urge my colleagues to support the Public Transportation Systems Vulnerability and Reduction Act of 2003.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding, because I want to identify with the remarks she made starting off her 5-minute speech. I was going to start my

special order in the same way, recognizing and extending our sympathy to the families of the victims in Spain.

It was only a short period ago that the prime minister from Spain was here, and last summer I had the opportunity to visit in Spain with the prime minister, along with the Speaker of our House, to express our appreciation to our colleagues in Spain who have been very involved in the war on terrorism. And so I thank the gentlewoman for bringing that to the attention of our colleagues here in the House.

I will also take a look at the legislation that the gentlewoman has authored, recognizing that the war on terrorism is a real war.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for his interest.

IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, today, I am joined in this special order by my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE). As my colleague from California just indicated, we come to the floor of the House recognizing the tragedy of the terrorist attacks in Spain. We are not quite sure who was responsible, but we know there was a significant loss of life.

We know that Spain has been an ally in the war on terrorism. Their soldiers have fought with our troops in Iraq. Their prime minister was here a couple of months ago indicating their strong support and their partnership, whether it was al-Qaeda, whether it was domestic terrorism, or whatever.

But we join in expressing our sympathy to the government and the people of Spain for the loss that they suffered today and reaffirm our commitment to the people of Spain that we will continue to work and fight with them in this war on terrorism that in so many different ways has reared its ugly head not only in Spain, the United States, but in Africa, in Saudi Arabia, and with the USS *Cole* and a number of other attacks throughout the world.

Today, we want to talk a little bit about the situation that has gone on in Iraq and kind of put that in context. We have recognized this war on terrorism. We have recognized the threats from Saddam Hussein and others for a long period of time. It was back in 1992 that Senator Gore was talking about what a threat Saddam Hussein and Iraq was.

Here is a quote from a speech he gave in 1992. Senator Al Gore: "He," meaning Saddam Hussein, "had already launched poison gas attacks repeatedly, and Bush looked the other way. He had already conducted extensive terrorism activities, and Bush looked