

the banking system, utilities, health and social services. Last Monday President Bush called him to congratulate him and urge him to follow through on his reforms, to move forward towards his promises of market-based and democratic reform.

Madam Speaker, let us hope so. Like the leader of Taiwan, the leader of Spain, I wish the leader of Russia, President Putin, success; but I will define success as: how free are your people?

HOW FAST WILL THEY RUN?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, this week we are going to see just how committed our Republican friends are to the irresponsible budget that they passed 4 days ago.

Tomorrow, Democrats will offer a motion to instruct House conferees on the fiscal 2005 budget resolution to accept the Senate's bipartisan pay-as-you-go budget enforcement rules. Those rules would require us to find offsets for both new spending as well as tax cuts. As a matter of fact, one of the real authors of pay-as-you-go, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), in the 1990s is here, which led to the most fiscally responsible administration's performance, frankly, in history, under Bill Clinton. And with a projected budget deficit of more than a half a trillion dollars this year, it is fair to ask, What could be more reasonable than that?

After all, our bipartisan agreement to pay-as-you-go rules in 1990 led to the steady decrease of our deficits throughout that decade and 4 consecutive years of budget surpluses between fiscal 1998 and 2001, the first time that has happened in 80 years.

But in their budget resolution, our Republican friends pretend that we can get our fiscal house back in order by applying so-called pay-as-you-go rules to spending only. Tax cuts, they believe, are a freebie, even though the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that 40 percent of our deficit is attributable to revenue reductions. Who is going to pay that bill? Our children will pay that bill. Our grandchildren will pay that bill.

And even the respected chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), said in February, "No one should expect significant deficit reduction as a result of austere, nondefense discretionary spending limits. The numbers simply do not add up." So said the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), conservative Republican.

So I urge my Republican friends: join us. Join us in this effort to restore fiscal sanity to our Nation's budget. Vote for this important Democratic motion to instruct. That is not so hard. And remember, you have done it before.

Last year, a mere 96 hours after you passed your fist 2004 budget resolution, you turned right around, 180 degrees, and voted for the Democratic motion to instruct conferees to reject the deep cuts called for in your budget for education, for veterans, Medicare, Medicaid, and other areas. The chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), even stood on this floor and railed against our motion for half an hour. For half an hour he railed against our motion, before he and most of the Republican leadership flip-flopped and helped pass it by a vote of, listen to this, Madam Speaker, 399 to 22. That was the Democratic motion passing. Why? Because Republicans wanted to pretend that they were actually for the motion to instruct's priorities when their budget clearly denied that, contradicted it, did not provide for those priorities.

So I urge my Republican friends to support the adoption of pay-as-you-go rules which helped Democrats produce a budget for fiscal year 2005 that was both fair and responsible.

Our Democratic substitute would balance the budget within 8 years. The Republican resolution would actually increase our deficits. Our Democratic budget would protect Social Security. Our democratic budget would match the Republican budget on defense spending to ensure our national security and provide nearly \$6 billion more over 5 years for homeland security to ensure that our people here at home are safer. Our Democratic budget would provide tax relief for hard-working families; and our budget, the Democratic budget, even as it reins in deficits caused by the Republican Party's failed policies, would provide more resources than the Republican budget for education, veterans, job training, public health, and infrastructure, the last, of course, being extraordinarily effective jobs-producing.

Finally, Madam Speaker, we also will consider this week, as I have said, the transportation reauthorization bill, which will pass, I predict, with wide bipartisan support, but leave both Democrats and some Republicans shaking their heads.

This is not only a bill about infrastructure, critically important to our economy, critically important to the safety of this Nation, critically important to every American; it is also a jobs bill. Democrats and some Republicans, including the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), himself supported a spending level of \$375 billion, which would have created 1.7 million new jobs.

Why is that important? Because for the first time in 75 years since Herbert Hoover, the first time, this is the first administration in three-quarters of a century that will end its 4-year term having lost jobs net in this economy. That is why we have over 8 million people unemployed and 2.5 million jobs

lost. Yet, the President, who has the worst record of job creation since Herbert Hoover threatened a veto of that jobs-creating bill, demanding a funding level that would create 1.1 million fewer new jobs.

□ 1245

I urge my Republican friends to stop ignoring the plight of the unemployed who have suffered under your failed policies.

Since December, more than 1 million jobless workers have exhausted their regular State unemployment benefits without receiving temporary Federal assistance. Why? Because Republicans allowed the Federal program to expire. Democrats have been asking for the last 6 months to extend that program, as we did under the Reagan administration, as we did under Bush 1. They have refused to do so.

Before we leave Washington this week for a 2-week recess, we should pass an immediate extension of temporary Federal jobless benefits. It is the right thing to do, it is the moral thing to do, and I would suggest to you it is the right thing to do for our economy as well. There is no excuse for failing to act.

Madam Speaker, I hope that when the motion to instruct on the budget resolution is made to have a responsible, effective, historically effective pay-as-you-go process, to discipline our budget so that America's children and America's grandchildren and America's economy will not be put deeper into debt and that we will have an effective enforcement process, which will, like America's families, make tough decisions so that we will have a better future for our country.

VOTE FOR THE MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HARRIS). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STENHOLM. Madam Speaker, let me follow in the same footsteps of my colleague from Maryland.

Last week, the House passed a budget, a very bitterly debated and very close decision on the final outcome as to which budget we should pass. A lot of speeches were made, a lot of promises were made, but one of the things that was not a part of the budget resolution last week was pay-as-you-go.

Now, our friends on the other side of the Capitol, the other body, in passing their budget they suggested that pay-as-you-go would be a good policy; and they included everything. In my opinion, unless we have everything on the table, spending and revenue, pay-as-you-go will not work as well in 2004 as it did in the 1990s.

There are those that believe there should be a difference. They are the

same ones that have succeeded in passing three budgets now in the last 3 years that have given this country the largest fiscal deficits in the history of our country. They are the same ones that are arguing now that pay-as-you-go should only include spending, not revenue. But they are the ones also that should accept the responsibility for their ideas, having, as I said, given this country the largest amount of fiscal deficits in the history of our country.

We borrowed \$1 trillion in the last 2½ years. We are going to borrow another trillion dollars in the next year and a half. And yet they argue, and will argue this afternoon on the motion to recommit, that we should only include spending.

Well, the pay-as-you-go resolution that I supported, and it was in the Blue Dog budget, was in the Democratic party alternative, was put everything on the table. If you want to spend more for any purpose, then you have to cut spending somewhere else. If you want to cut taxes, then you have got to cut spending somewhere to make room for them or raise taxes in some other area that will be more proficient, more efficient, and accomplish what needs to be done for the job creation in this country but also for getting our fiscal house in order.

We are not going to wish deficits away. We can argue about this, and we did last week. We can argue about what trade policy we should have. But one thing we cannot argue about, and no one does argue about, is the baby boom generation reaching age 62 in 2008, 65 in 2011, 67 in 2013. That is when the greatest economic pressure that this country has ever known is going to hit us, and that is why it is so important for this Congress and this administration to get real about fiscal responsibility.

Philosophy alone will not cut it. To those that argue that cutting taxes was going to produce more revenue, it didn't. It did not. It came up over \$100 billion short. Those of us that believe in pay-as-you-go say that when you advocate a policy, whether it be spending or revenue, and it does not do what you said it was going to do, then you should step up to the plate and pay for it. But, no, those who argue on the other side say we are not going to ask those fortunate to be alive today to pay for it, we are going to send the bill to our grandchildren. We are going to send the bill to them because they cannot vote in November.

Pay-as-you-go is a pretty simple philosophy. Every family in the United States has to adopt pay-as-you-go. Most families do not have the luxury, in fact, they would not even think about one of the solutions to the family problems is to reduce mom's or dad's paycheck and yet reduce that paycheck and live within that means. One would not think about doing that, but that is what the leadership of this House is suggesting. That is what they did even though a very large, I think

plurality, maybe majority on the other side of the aisle agrees with those of us that says pay-as-you-go is something that should be part of the budget resolution, and it should be implemented, and it should be implemented with everything on the table.

That is what the motion to instruct conferees tomorrow will be about, and I would encourage my colleagues, both sides of the aisle, to vote for it and put some muscle into the speechifying on budgets in this body.

NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR CONDOLEEZZA RICE SHOULD TESTIFY BEFORE THE 9/11 COM- MISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice should testify before the 9/11 Commission. She can no longer hide behind the right of executive privilege. Both she and the President should waive their rights to executive privilege in this case. The executive privilege can still be preserved for President Bush and for future presidents in other matters.

There are few matters in our Nation's experience as sobering as the tragic terrorist attack of 9/11. It was the worst homeland attack on our security since Pearl Harbor, and we need a full accounting from the administration about what happened prior to 9/11.

The National Security Advisor has tried to have it both ways. She has commented on the proceedings of the Commission to the press, she has questioned the evidence presented to the Commission, and challenged the integrity of the witnesses testifying under oath, but she refuses to testify in public under oath to the Commission and to the families about what she knew about the events leading up to 9/11, about our efforts to stop terrorism, about our efforts to protect our national security.

The families and the Nation need to know and want to know what exactly happened prior to 9/11. We need Mrs. Rice's testimony under oath to reach a full accounting, especially since she is now from the sidelines publicly contradicting evidence and testimony presented to the Commission.

If Condoleezza Rice has another version of the events and facts, she must come forward and present them to the Nation under oath. Congress, the families, and the public deserve no less.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, as soon as we call You "God with us," we realize Your covenant reenacted. You have committed Yourself to be in solidarity, "God with us." You wish to share our joys and pains, defend and protect us. You raise up from within us laments, shouts of praise, and hymns of constancy.

We will never truly know You, Lord God, as a compassionate God until we see You and know Your presence in the midst of our daily grind, at the bottom of our deepest longings, and as the sustaining strength in overwhelming trials.

You have chosen to be with us and love us with all our limitations as a people and as a Nation. So we rejoice in You now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CARTER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2241. An act to reauthorize certain school lunch and child nutrition programs through June 30, 2004.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 26, 2004.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of