

tried to prevent Congress from creating the independent commission in the first place. Since then it has failed to hand over critical documents and fully cooperate with the commission's stated goal of providing a full and complete account of the circumstances surrounding the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, including preparedness for and the immediate response to the attacks. Even more recently, the White House refused to support the commission's request for more time to complete its work.

To me, it seems like the White House is less than enthusiastic about getting to the bottom of these catastrophic events. As part of the deal struck for allowing Dr. Rice to testify, the 9/11 Commission had to agree in writing not to require additional public testimony from any White House officials, including Dr. Rice. The 9/11 Commission agreed to these terms, but this deal means that regardless of what the commission may learn in future months, no other White House official will be allowed to publicly testify under oath.

That is like an attorney asking a judge if half of the witnesses to a crime can skip the trial. It is a ridiculous concept.

President Bush and Vice President CHENEY will meet with the commission, although privately, and from what I understand, will read their remarks without taking questions. This is very disappointing. I think the American people, and especially the families of the victims of September 11, deserve to know what their leaders knew and when they knew it.

I remember when the country rallied together in September and October of 2001. These episodes of unity begin and end with the President. Tough times call for strong leadership. It is once again time for President Bush to lead this country forward, towards truth and reconciliation. He should help us grow as a people by being the very first person to volunteer himself for public testimony. He should avail himself and his staff to the 9/11 Commission so that we might learn something about our past and protect ourselves for the future.

The American people, Madam Speaker, deserve no less from their Commander in Chief.

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

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

SOCIAL SECURITY

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. Madam Speaker, this is a good budget we

passed out of this House and sent to conference. I am hoping that the kind of frugal budget that we sent to conference is going to come back to this House for a final budget of the House and the Senate.

One thing that the budget did not deal with is unfunded liabilities. Unfunded liabilities are the promises that politicians make when they do not know where the money is coming from in later years. Last week, the actuaries of the Social Security Administration and the Medicare trust fund came up with their estimates of unfunded liabilities, and that is what this chart shows. It should scare the heck out of us.

The Social Security and Medicare trustees have calculated that these programs have \$73.5 trillion in unfunded liabilities. Now, if you divide the population of the United States, which is roughly 290 million, into that \$73.5 trillion, you end up with over a quarter of a million dollars for every man, woman and child that somehow is going to be responsible for paying for these benefits over and above what we have promised because the money coming in from the FICA tax, and that FICA tax supports Social Security and Medicare, over and above the money coming in in revenues from that tax, we are still short \$73.5 trillion.

□ 1945

Medicare part A is short \$21.8 trillion; Medicare part B, \$23.2 trillion; Medicare part D, the drug program that we passed 4 months ago, \$16.6 trillion.

It is interesting on the prescription drug bill that Tom Savings, one of the actuaries, estimated at the time it was passed that the unfunded liability would be \$7 trillion. His estimate now is \$16.6 trillion.

The danger, of course, is that what we are doing in effect is acting like our problems are so important today that it justifies taking the money of our kids and our grandkids that they have not even earned yet. The unfunded liabilities, in addition to the debt that we are accumulating, now over \$7 trillion, is a huge liability to leave to our kids.

I am a farmer from Michigan. What we have traditionally tried to do is pay off the farm so that our kids had a little better chance than we did. Instead, we are now faced with a situation, and here is my political take on it. Right now roughly 50 percent of the working population pays less than 1 percent of the total income tax in this country. What we have done is become more and more progressive with the easy flow of language and justification to tax the rich, but here is 50 percent of the population that has little stake but to ask candidates that are running for Congress for more government services rather than less, and politically it has seemed to be to the advantage of politicians to make more and more promises. This represents how many prom-

ises we have made over and above our ability to pay for it.

I did this chart, this was also with Tom Savings' help, just to show that in 16 years it is going to take 28 percent of our general fund budget to pay for the makeup difference in Medicare and Social Security. By 2030, it is going to take almost 53 percent of the total budget.

So what do we do? How do we deal with this? Here is what this Congress, the House and the Senate and the White House has done in the past. This is when we run short of funds in Social Security.

It started out with 2 percent in 1940, 2 percent of the first \$3,000. It ran short of money, so in 1960 we raised it to 6 percent of the first \$4,800. In 1980, we ran short again, so we raised it to 10.16 percent of the first \$26,000; and then in 2000, 12.4 percent of the first \$76,000. In 2004, now, today, 12.4 percent of the first \$89,000. So what we have done is either reduced benefits, increased taxes or a combination of both. That is what we did in 1983.

I just call on my colleagues and I call on the American people, Madam Speaker, to ask their Members of Congress what bill have you written, what bill have you signed on to to make sure that we keep Social Security and Medicare solvent and not leave the total bill up to our kids?

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to replace the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) on the list.

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

There was no objection.

THE BUDGET

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, what would your nightmare budget look like? Can you imagine a budget that would cut support for homeland security and small business development, that would do virtually nothing to improve one of the most sluggish economic recoveries in American history, that would break the Contract with America by raising the debt ceiling under cover of a budget resolution, that would balloon the debt and the deficit to previously unimagined dimensions, and that would do all of

this less than 5 years before the first of the baby boom generation begins to retire?

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, that nightmare is a reality; and this reality has been created by the President and the House Republican leadership.

In the face of the worst fiscal reversal in this Nation's history, almost \$10 trillion since President Bush took office, the Republican response has been to propose more and more of the same failed policies. Finding themselves in a hole, their motto is, just keep digging. There is no clearer example of this than the phony pay-as-you-go proposal in the Republican budget that requires offsets for entitlement spending but not for tax cuts.

Yesterday, Democrats and moderate Republicans came together and voted to instruct the House-Senate budget conferees to institute a real pay-as-you-go proposal, akin to the one that brought us out of deficits and into surpluses in the 1990s. But, as has become standard operating procedure around the House lately, when the vote did not turn out the way the Republican leadership liked, they kept that vote open and began the arm-twisting; and after 28 minutes they had twisted enough arms to bring the vote to a tie and to defeat this effort at sound budget policy.

So now we are left with a budget in conference that would provide the worst of both worlds. It sends us over the cliff fiscally while at the same time radically reducing funding for education, the environment, transportation, health care and law enforcement.

Let me focus, Madam Speaker, for a moment on what may come as a surprise to many Americans who have listened to the Republican leadership and the President spend a lot of time talking about homeland security and the importance of our first responders. This budget shows that talking is about all they are willing to do for our first responders, our police, our fire departments, our medical personnel.

The Republican budget makes significant cuts in Homeland Security and Department of Justice funding for first responders that results in an overall reduction in funding for our police of 33 percent, with a 50 percent reduction in funding for police in smaller cities and rural areas. They also cut funding for firefighters by one-third at a time when the Federal Emergency Management Agency is reporting that over two-thirds of fire departments in this country operate with staffing levels that do not meet the minimum safe staffing levels required by OSHA and the National Fire Protection Association.

The Speaker yesterday concluded the debate on the budget resolution by saying the reason it was important to cut taxes for millionaires was because millionaires are the small business owners who are creating all the jobs in this country. Our friend, the gentleman

from Ohio, just repeated that argument on this floor tonight.

Some of those millionaires are small business owners, but again the Republican budget shows the true motivation of our friends on the other side of the aisle. The Bush administration and the Republican leadership have fought to zero out funding, in fact, for the Small Business Administration's flagship 7(a) loan program that provides close to 30 percent of the long-term loans for small businesses; and they zero out countless other small business programs like Microloans and others geared toward minority businesses. If, as the Speaker implied, the reason for tax cuts for millionaires was really to help small businesses, why did it take an extended press and letter-writing campaign orchestrated by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Small Business, to get the Republican leadership to finally back off of some of these cuts in Small Business Administration funding?

The answer, I am afraid, is obvious. The tax cuts were not meant to help small businesses or to spur the economy. They were meant to provide a windfall for the most fortunate among us.

Governing is about getting our priorities straight and taking the public trust seriously. Through the Spratt alternative budget resolution, fiscally responsible Democrats have made our priorities clear: fund the programs America needs like education, health care, housing, homeland security and safety net programs, balance our budget by freezing scheduled tax reductions for those making over \$500,000 a year, and target tax cuts in ways that benefit ordinary Americans and stimulate our economy.

There is still time, Madam Speaker, for our colleagues to wake up and reject the Republican nightmare budget and to pass a budget that points to a brighter future. House-Senate conferees could start by adopting real pay-as-you-go rules. I urge them to gauge the House's true sentiment and do just that.

IN HONOR OF SOCIAL WORK MONTH

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in observance of Social Work Month. Since 1984, March has officially been designated as a month to acknowledge and recognize that social workers make meaningful and humanitarian differences and contributions to people in communities all over the world.

According to government health statistics, 60 percent of the Nation's mental health services are delivered by social workers. Trained social workers

provide more than 40 percent of disaster-related mental health services for the American Red Cross. Roughly 600,000 social workers are dedicated to ensuring that people of all ages, creeds, sexual orientations and nationalities have access to information, resources and services. They often make all the difference in the world to individuals and families who might otherwise fall through the cracks into hopelessness and despair. Social workers measure success by helping all those in need of basic services to achieve their goals on their own terms.

Often working behind the scenes, social workers are trained to address problems that some cannot see or issues that others hope will simply go away, drug addiction, family violence, joblessness, homelessness, mental illness, prejudice and many other conditions which affect millions of people every day, leaving them with little hope and few options.

According to the National Association of Social Workers, social workers help to open the doors of access and opportunity to those in greatest need through training and dedication. Moreover, social workers also actively advocate for changes in policy and legislation that strengthen the social safety nets that make a critical difference to so many.

Social workers have been at the forefront of many social movements. Some of the pioneers who were actively involved in creating social change include Dr. Dorothy Height, Jane Addams and Whitney Young.

Dr. Height was not only a giant in the civil rights movement, she also developed several model programs to combat teenage pregnancy, to address hunger in rural areas, worked as a proponent for AIDS education, implemented a project to expand business ownership by women and to provide funds for vocational training, and much more. She received a Congressional Gold Medal last week in recognition of these works as one of the pre-eminent social and civil rights activists of her time. In addition, she was awarded the Medal of Freedom, the Nation's highest civilian distinction, by President Bill Clinton in 1994. In fact, she has been acknowledged for her leadership by every President since Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Jane Addams, another great social worker who built Hull House, which is in Chicago in my district; Whitney Young, former president of the National Urban League, and the list goes on and on and on.

In addition, there are several social workers who serve in our body, individuals who were engaged as social workers before being elected to Congress: Representatives SUSAN DAVIS, BARBARA LEE, CIRO RODRIGUEZ and ED TOWNS, as well as Senators BARBARA MIKULSKI and DEBBIE STABENOW. All of these individuals have made tremendous differences.

I simply come, Madam Speaker, to commend those who engage themselves