

So it is easier to say yes to them. It is easier to say yes to every person that comes into our office asking us for money for a certain project because they can make a great case. As long as I have been here, I can think of few times that I have been confronted by constituency groups or advocacy groups that do not make a good case for whatever it is they are trying to advance. They are, for the most part, I believe, very good people, all motivated by the best of intentions. And so it is so much easier to say to them, okay, I will do my best, yes, I will vote for an increase. And we all do it, and we have all got to reconsider it in light of what is happening in this country and in light of the very stark projections about where we go from here.

And the President needs to do this also. He has to provide the leadership so that we can look to him and the administration for guidance and for the example that he can provide for fiscal constraint. So I am just hoping again that things like that that reporters call to me about the increase in the National Endowment for the Arts are simply trial balloons, as we say around here, and that they put them out just to see if there is any hope and, of course, if they see that there is not, it goes down. I hope that that is the case. I hope he is not serious.

I certainly hope that the President comes to us with a budget more austere than the one I have been hearing about, and I hope those of us on the Committee on the Budget can muster the courage to present a budget resolution to this Congress that is austere, truly austere, that it does not just have the rhetorical flourish of budget freezes or restraints in the rate of growth and that sort of thing, but a true cut in spending because really this is the only way we will actually get to a balanced budget in the foreseeable future, or even if it is not a balanced budget, a more reasonable approach toward solving our fiscal crisis.

So I just want to keep emphasizing I know I am certainly not the purest of the pure on this and cannot come to everybody with a holier-than-thou attitude and say I never voted for an increase in the budget. I do not believe I ever voted for a tax increase. That is certainly true. But I cannot say I have never voted for an increase in the budget. I can tell the Members that there is little that I can think of today that would make me able to cast such a vote now in this budget cycle coming up, and I am going to do everything I can to make sure that the budget resolution that our committee reports is one that we can all be proud of from the standpoint that we can defend it, not just to our constituents but to our own consciences. That is a challenge for all of us.

#### THE FISCAL STATUS OF OUR NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced 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 this evening with my fellow members of the Congressional Black Caucus to address the dire fiscal status of our Nation.

Just this past Monday, the Congressional Budget Office released its annual report on the Federal budget and the economic outlook for the next 10 years. The staggering numbers included in this report should be startling to both Democrats and Republicans alike. More importantly, I want the American people to know that we must address this critical issue.

Mr. Speaker, since the mission and the purpose of the CBO is to be objective in its analysis and in its reporting to Congress, they have no interest in fudging the numbers to look better than they actually are. With that being said, the CBO projected that the government would accumulate \$2.4 trillion in additional debt over the next decade. And as of this moment, the outstanding public debt is well over \$7 trillion and is growing by the moment.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), one who has spent a phenomenal amount of time on this issue and has been at the forefront in trying to make sure that our tax dollars are spent effectively and efficiently.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for taking the leadership on this budget.

We have a difficult situation; and rather than use adjectives and slogans, I like to use charts so we can see what is going on year by year. If we look at the budget deficit, and this is the budget without the Social Security and Medicare, which is supposed to be saved for Social Security and Medicare when we need it, this is the deficit year by year. And we see that we have got the Johnson, Nixon, Ford administrations. It dropped a little bit under Nixon-Ford. Under Carter it stayed about the same. People remember that under Reagan and Bush, the first Bush administration, deficits came about. But not enough credit is being given to what happened under the Clinton administration because without a single Republican vote in the House and without a single Republican vote in the Senate, we passed a deficit reduction plan that resulted in not only an elimination of all of that deficit but an actual surplus, a surplus without counting the Social Security and the Medicare surplus. If we count those, it is even higher than that.

Some of the Republicans want to take credit for some of this. And they say in 1994 the Republicans took over Congress; so in 1995 when they were sworn in with the Republican Congress, they ought to get some credit for this. But let us remember history. When they came in, they passed massive tax

cuts, primarily for the wealthy, and President Clinton vetoed those budgets. They passed them again and threatened to close down the government if he did not sign them, and he vetoed them anyway. And they closed down the government, and he vetoed them anyway. Trying to take credit for a budget plan when their plans were vetoed, even with the closure of government, their plans were vetoed; and we were able to maintain this line by vetoing their bills. They cannot get any credit for the green.

□ 1615

However, we do see when President Bush was sworn in, they passed the same kinds of tax cuts, primarily for the wealthy, and what happened? We see what would have happened down here if President Clinton had signed it. We see exactly what would have happened. We have skyrocketing deficits.

Now, this is actually not quite as low as it ought to be. This is a couple of months ago, so it is actually a little worse than this.

The on-budget deficit for this year, the total deficit, the \$477 billion the gentleman mentioned, does not count about \$175 billion in Social Security and Medicare funds that were spent first before you went in debt another \$477 billion. Almost \$650 billion in total on-budget deficit, because we are supposed to be leaving Social Security and Medicare money for Social Security and Medicare.

Let me put these numbers in perspective. If you add up all of the money that we receive from the individual income tax, everybody's individual income tax, the total is less than \$800 billion this year. We are pushing \$700 billion in on-budget deficit. It is just totally out of control. This, I think, shows it.

I do not see how anybody who voted for the red can explain what is going on with the budget without starting off with an apology. And as far as we are concerned, we, the Congressional Black Caucus, voted for the green and against the red. So you cannot blame us for this.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman just said something that is just so incredible. Let me make sure I heard the gentleman right.

Is the gentleman saying that in the United States, when people go on April 15 and they go through their tax returns and they look at all this money that has been sent to the Federal Government over the last year, taken from their checks every 2 weeks or every month, whatever, the gentleman is saying out of all the people that pay taxes in the United States, it amounts to about \$800 billion?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Less than \$800 billion.

Mr. CUMMINGS. The gentleman is saying when you include the Social Security money—

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. They had to spend the Social Security and Medicare

surplus before they got to the \$477 billion that the gentleman mentioned as a unified deficit. Less than \$800 billion in individual income tax. That includes everybody.

Mr. CUMMINGS. That is incredible.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. To show how this deficit also looks, let us look at another way of looking at it, and that is, of the budget, how much of today's budget is paid for with borrowed money?

When President Clinton ran up a surplus, obviously we were not borrowing any money to pay for the operation of government. But when this administration came in, we started borrowing money, and in fact this year almost one-third, and with the new numbers, more than one-third of the on-budget spending is paid for with borrowed money. You borrow it from Medicare and Social Security, and then you borrow the rest, and over one-third is paid for with borrowed money.

You can see, we have not done that since World War II. We are in a peacetime economy, and we are borrowing a higher percentage of the Federal budget. The spending we have in the Federal budget, a higher percentage is paid for with borrowed money than at any time since World War II. This is irresponsible.

Now, how did we get in that mess? Well, we had tax cuts. Who got the tax cuts? I remember one candidate during the campaign, President Bush, said the vast majority of his tax cuts will go to those at the bottom. Let us see what that looks like on a chart.

The bottom 20 percent, the next 20 percent, the middle 20 percent, this is about what they got, the percentage of the tax cut they got. Then the fourth 20 percent. The upper 20 percent got 70 to 80 percent of the tax cut. In fact, the top 1 percent got more than half of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts. The top 1 percent got more than half.

Now, just in case people want to know what they got out of it, because people say, you got a lot, you got a little, in terms of those who made over \$1 million, that is what you got. If you made only \$500,000 to \$1 million, that is what you got. If you made \$200,000 to \$500,000, or \$100,000 to 200,000, or \$75,000 to \$100,000.

As you get to what most people actually make on average, all of them, some pay a little more tax, depending on the number of children and deductions and whatnot, but \$40,000 to \$50,000, you hardly need any ink to draw the bar. Millionaires, off the chart. That is who got the tax cut.

When you run up all this deficit, you have debt; and debt is somewhat esoteric, but interest on the national debt is cash money. You have got to pay it.

Now, this black line is the interest on the national debt which we would have paid if we had not messed up the budget in 2001 with all these tax cuts. Under the Clinton Administration, when they left office, the projections at that time, before we messed up the

budget in 2001, we would have paid off the entire national debt held by the public around 2008 to 2009. We were scheduled to pay zero interest on the national debt.

Instead, we offered those people the big tax cuts, ran up the debt, increased the debt and increased the interest on the national debt, so by 2008, 2009, 2010 we are going to be spending \$300 billion on interest on the national debt rather than zero, because we ran up the debt, we were fiscally irresponsible.

Now, again remember, less than \$800 billion, everybody's individual income tax; the first \$300 billion, gone, interest on the national debt that we would not have had to pay.

We were told that we needed to get into that mess, run up the debt, run up the interest on the national debt, to create jobs. Let us see how we did.

This is the number of jobs created every 4 years since Harry Truman was in office. Harry Truman created jobs. Eisenhower created more jobs than we had when he came in; this is about 4 million. Kennedy, Johnson, Johnson, second administration, about 6 million. Nixon and Ford, everybody creating jobs. Clinton, almost 10 million first term, another 10 million the second term.

From 40 yards away, with bad vision, you can tell who is the worst since the Truman administration.

Now, every time something goes wrong, it is always 9/11. Three million jobs lost since the President came in office. 9/11 could not possibly be the cause of this any more than the Korean War stopped Truman from creating jobs. The Vietnam War did not stop Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon from creating jobs. The hostage situation in Iran did not stop Carter from creating jobs. The Cold War was going on all this time, Reagan, Bush. Clinton had Somalia, Grenada. Everybody is still creating jobs until you get here.

One of the problems, however, as you get into this situation, is Social Security. This is the cash flow for the Social Security trust fund. These purple lines represent the surplus we talked about that is bringing more money into Social Security than we are spending today. That will go on until about 2017. Then we start going into deficit.

This line at about 2022, 2025, that is \$300 billion. That is about \$1,000 for every man, woman and child in America. For a family of four, \$4,000. Every man, woman and child, \$1,000. When you get around 2032, you are up to \$600 billion, or \$2,000 for every man, woman and child. By 2037, a \$1 trillion a year shortfall.

I admit if you look at this, you may conclude that there is nothing we could have done about that. \$800 billion for individual income tax, you would have to spend all of that just to maintain Social Security by 2037. So maybe it was a lost cause. Maybe Social Security was a good idea, but it could never work.

Until you look back. You remember this chart where the top 1 percent got

half the tax cut? The 2001, not 2003, just the 2001 tax cut, if you took the money that the top 1 percent got in the 2001 tax cut, and instead of giving a tax cut to the upper 1 percent, put that same amount of money into the Social Security trust fund, you would have run up the surplus to a point where you could have paid Social Security benefits without reducing benefits for 75 years. Or you can give the top 1 percent a tax cut and worry about this \$1 trillion deficit when you get to it.

We made the choice. Excuse me, they made the choice, because the gentleman and I opposed the tax cuts and would have preferred making Social Security secure for the future, would have preferred paying off the national debt so we would not have had \$300 billion a year to deal with in just a couple of years. We had other priorities: health care, Social Security, veterans benefits that this House voted to cut by \$19 billion last year. We had other priorities. But we could have solved this with just what the top 1 percent got in the 2001 tax cut. They could have gotten all they got in the 2003 tax cut, just the 2001.

So when we look at this chart, you cannot create a chart like this by accident. You cannot have every single year under the Clinton administration, without exception, being better than the last, and every year in the Bush administration being worse than the last.

Let me tell you a little bit about this up-tick. Things will continue to get worse. But by 2014, technically, we might be back in balance if we do not do anything. If we do not do anything; that is, if we do not change present law.

The President has suggested that we make the tax cuts permanent, do not let them expire. If we are to go back into balance, we have to reject that initiative. The President has said, let us go to Mars for \$1 trillion. If we want to get back into balance, we have to reject that initiative.

Let us privatize Social Security, take some money out, not put more money in the trust fund, for \$1 trillion, to privatize Social Security. If we expect to go back into balance, we have to reject that initiative.

In other words, we have to reject all of the President's initiatives just to get back to balance. And if we do, we would have run up the debt so much in the meanwhile that we will be paying over \$300 billion in interest on the national debt, rather than zero that we would have paid had we not messed up the budget.

Again, anyone who voted for the red and against the green ought to start off with an explanation of their vote and an apology.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his presentation. I think the gentleman said it best when he first started, that when you put it on charts, it really does make it very, very clear what is happening here.

I think one thing that is very sad though, as the gentleman went down one of those charts that shows who was getting the tax cuts, it says there the tax cuts go to the wealthiest Americans. One of the interesting things about that is that when you look at the folks who are not making a lot of money, some of them may have gotten \$300, some may have gotten \$400. But when you look at the reduction of services, say, for example, in my State of Maryland, tuition has gone up 10 or 20 percent for college kids and Pell grants have leveled off, I think in part because of our money problems.

Well, if a family got \$300, say they got \$400, the rise in tuition which they must pay if they are going to keep their kids in college, that wiped that out right there. That does not even go on to include all the other things that they will now have to pay for.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. And Maryland is suffering from the same budget crunch that Virginia is suffering from, all the States, virtually all the States are suffering from, where we are cutting back on services, cutting back on transportation, cutting back on health care, knocking people off of Medicaid. We are trying to provide more health care, and we are knocking people off. We are not creating jobs. We did not extend the unemployment benefits for those who are in areas of extremely high unemployment.

□ 1830

Tuition has gone up. Your property taxes have gone up. Education funding, we are underfunding No Child Left Behind by \$9 billion. And so the money that the States expected to get from No Child Left Behind they are not getting.

The State House of Delegates in Virginia voted 98 to one to reject the No Child Left Behind because they found that the unfunded mandates were not offset by the money that was supposed to come. Now, we knew when we passed that there were complicated mandates, expensive mandates in that bill, but the authorized spending would more than compensate for those mandates. Unfortunately, we did not send the money that we promised. We sent the mandates, did not send the money.

And so when you add up all those, would people rather have had decent public school education, would they rather have had decent health care, better roads, lower tuition? You add all those up, the little tax cut, and when you add it up, and unless we have a profound new direction, we will not be able to pay Social Security. You ask people whether they would rather have Social Security after 2017 or the \$300 tax cut today, I think most people would say let us take care of Social Security first. And if I can get a tax cut, I would like one; but let us take care of Social Security first. We did not do that. We took care of tax cuts first.

And we are going to look at that Social Security chart, and who knows

what we will be able to do in 2020 and 2025. Now, a lot of people pushed the ideas of personal responsibility. And the suggestion is that if there is no Social Security, your retirement will be your personal responsibility and we will not have Social Security. Like, what is the problem if you lose Social Security? You know, I got mine, I got investments. Is that the attitude?

Or should we adopt the philosophy that we have had since Franklin Roosevelt was President that senior citizens ought to be able to retire with some dignity. And whatever happens to their investments, whatever happens to the stock market, you ought to be able to have at least a minimum amount of money coming in for necessities, rent and food. And if all else goes badly, you ought to be able to have that.

And we are in a situation now where unless there is a profound change in direction, we will not be able to pay Social Security after it stops running a surplus. As a matter of fact, in this budget we have now, it is a 10-year budget, goes to 2014, we have, they say, it goes in the balance, but that includes a \$275 billion Social Security surplus. Just in 3 years in 2017, it goes from \$275 billion surplus to no surplus. We just had in 3 years a \$275 billion hole in the budget. What provisions have been made for that? None. None. We will worry about it. And the challenge, quite frankly, I would say to my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the challenge is getting someone to acknowledge that there is a problem.

We had a Committee on the Budget meeting yesterday. We heard that when you look at this chart the economy was good. Good? We heard that the budget deficit was manageable. You cannot get anyone to acknowledge that there is a problem. If we do not have a profound change in direction, we cannot pay Social Security. We cannot get anyone on the other side of the aisle to acknowledge that that constitutes a problem. If one does not acknowledge that there is a problem, one is certainly not going to come up with a painful solution. That is the problem that we have, this problem we have in this Congress today that making the tough choices is painful.

We made the tough choices in 1993 and suffered in the next campaign. Republicans picked up 50 seats with the budget vote, that responsible budget vote, as a primary issue in the campaign. And so we suffered because of that. But it was the right thing to do. I do not think anybody that voted for that budget, even those that lost their seats as a direct result of that vote, I do not think they think it was the wrong thing to do. When the 218th vote was cast, the Republicans started chanting bye-bye Marjorie. She had cast the 218th vote that passed the bill. And they waved bye-bye Marjorie and defeated her in the next election using that vote.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I think, certainly, when we come to this

House, we come here for the purpose of lifting up the people that we represent in making their lives better. And when you look at the jobless rate, which is 5.7 at the latest count, I think, it is 10.2 for African Americans, and then not counted in those figures are so many people that I am sure call your office quite often who have been out of work for so long, they basically are looking but they have pretty much given up hope, so their figures are not even in there.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. It is hard to put the magnitude of this mess into perspective; \$300 billion more interest on the national debt in 2008, 2009 than we should have paid. Should have been zero. \$300 billion. Do you know how many people you can hire at \$30,000 apiece with \$300 billion? 10 million. 10 million. Just deal out \$30,000 jobs. 10 million. Do you know how many people are listed as unemployed in America today? Nine million. You can hire every unemployed person in America, offer each and every one a \$30,000 job, and have money left over with the additional interest on the national debt that we are going to have to pay because the budget has been messed up, and we are going to be paying \$300 billion in interest on the national debt rather than zero if we had stuck to the fiscal responsibility that was exercised when President Clinton vetoed irresponsible bills.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) very much. We really appreciate it. He did an outstanding job.

Mr. Speaker, I would yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MAJETTE), one who has also put our budget concerns at the forefront of our Nation's mind and this Congress's mind and one who also believes in making sure that we spend the taxpayers' dollars effectively and efficiently and that we do those things that are reasonable to uplift all of the citizens of our great country.

Ms. MAJETTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) from the Committee on the Budget, for his excellent presentation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening because the President's lack of solutions and lack of vision brings me to the floor.

This President's economic policies have had a devastating effect and devastating impact on this country and on hardworking Americans. His tax cuts have tied our hands and prevent us from solving the major challenges that we face in education, in health care, and in job creation.

The people in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia and across this country are looking for the American Dream. They work hard. They follow the rules. They are trying to get a small piece of the American Dream, but it is getting further and further out of their reach.

Let us start with jobs. Now, I am not talking about the economy and stock

dividends and the stock market. I am talking about jobs, plain and simple. I am talking about replacing the 3 million jobs that have evaporated since this President took office. The American people want us to focus on creating more good-paying jobs, on providing a quality education for our children, on providing affordable and accessible health care for every American. These are the priorities of the hardworking people of Georgia's 4th Congressional District and the people of this Nation. But instead, this President talks about a mythical country where everyone is happy, healthy, well educated, and employed. But, obviously, he did not check in with the men and women who have been laid off from BellSouth in Atlanta and Brown & Williamson in Macon and General Electric in Stone Mountain or Delta or Coca Cola or Lord & Taylor, and the list goes on and on. Nor did he check in with the 1.4 million Americans who have lost their unemployment benefits and still cannot find a job and have been denied unemployment benefits because the Republicans insist they do not exist. But they do exist.

And we owe it to them, our husbands, our wives, our partners, our children, our friends, our neighbors. We owe it to them to make a real effort to create jobs.

We cannot afford to make tax cuts permanent for the very wealthy, and we absolutely cannot use Social Security money to pay for it. The American people deserve a leader who understands the meaning of a level playing field and has the vision and the will to make it happen.

Americans are hungry. They are hungry for a national strategy that focuses on providing good jobs, providing a strong public education system, and providing quality health care. And so we must keep the promises that we have made to the millions of Americans who have played by the rules, who have worked hard to find that piece of the American Dream. And it is just as important to keep the vision and the path clear for those who are still seeking that dream.

Abstinence education? A trip to Mars? Steroid use in professional sports? Those might be the priorities of this President; but, Mr. Speaker, I promise you those are not the priorities of most Americans.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MAJETTE) for her statement. I really appreciate the excellent statement addressing this issue to the Congressional Black Caucus.

I stood up again, and continue to stand up, with regard to the issues that affect all Americans. I have often said that a lot of times when people hear the words "Congressional Black Caucus" they just assume that the Congressional Black Caucus is only speaking for African American people. The fact is that the caucus, which represents collectively over 26 million

people, more than one-third of whom are white, the fact is that we speak for America.

And with that I just want to summarize some of the things that have been already said. But before I do that, I am very pleased to yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), who is, as I said in a speech just yesterday, one of the strongest fighters that I have ever met, constantly on the battlefield addressing the issues that can bring harm to our citizens, but at the same time in doing those things that uplift them.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for yielding to me. I particularly thank him for this Special Order and for the emphasis this Special Order has taken as I was watching it. I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), for focusing on his charts and his very lucid explication on what is happening, particularly to baby boomers who are the retirees, many of whom have begun, those who are 62, already begun to take their benefits.

The reason I value what is happening on the floor is that discussions of deficits quickly go off into the arcane about economics and the rest. And I, of course, applaud those who call attention to what deficits do to slowing economic growth, through raising interest rates, to crowding private investment. But I must say to the average American, until the interest rate goes up on his or her car, there may be little understanding of what that means. I am very concerned with what it means in particular for the baby boomers who seem to me are in dire risk because of the President's budget which is not even out yet. It is already controversial.

CBO's projections, as I understand them, do not even take into account at least two huge items that are almost inevitably going to be before us. One is the alternative minimum tax and another is, of course, the President's very explicit statement when he was right before us last week that he wants to make the tax cuts permanent. We do not even include that in your projections. They were not even looking at the real possibilities here assuming that what the President wishes for tax cuts, in fact, does happen.

We, of course, are looking at the worst deficit in our history. My good friends on the other side tell us, well, it is really because of spending. If they would only stop spending, things would be okay.

□ 1845

I have looked at the figures since 2001 and 9/11. Each year, 90 percent or more of the spending has been for defense and homeland security. In 2001, 95 percent of the funding increases were for defense and homeland security; 93 percent in 2002; 90 percent in 2003; 90 percent in 2004. It is not the spending, as they say, stupid. It is the tax cuts. And

we have got to come to grips with that and face that reality if we want to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, the baby boomers are those people who were born in 1946 or begin with those people born in 1946. They will begin to collect reduced Social Security payments in 2008 at 62 because you can do that. These same baby boomers are going to qualify for Medicare benefits when they get to be 65 in 2011. We already know what is happening to Medicare costs. They are rising so fast they have become an unbelievable figure.

What concerns me most is, what we are going to do now that we have already eaten up the surplus that we were putting into Social Security and Medicare trust funds. What are we going to do? We know that the Medicare bill says what we will do is, the Congress at a certain point in time will have to look at whether or not to cut benefits or to raise taxes.

Assuming we are in the same Congress we are in now, and I pray we are not, then, of course, what this Congress would look to do is to cut benefits. That would be a historic first. Therefore, when one begins to talk about the deficit, I have come to the floor to say that I think the Congressional Black Caucus tonight has put the emphasis where it belongs. Let us put it on some real bodies, the people who will suffer, the baby boomers who are already almost upon us.

For the moment, let us think of what the President already has proposed, the first step towards privatizing Social Security, which really sinks the whole thing and makes it impossible to even talk about where younger workers would be allowed to redirect part of their payroll taxes out of the Social Security trust funds and they themselves deal with private accounts. We have got to put all of this on the table and have an honest discussion about it.

I thank my good friends who have come to the floor tonight for beginning that very honest discussion.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her statement. We really appreciate it. The Congressional Black Caucus has looked at this budget situation, and I tell you there are some things that, the legal term is shocking to the conscience. When the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) presented those charts, I just hope America was listening and watching.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I just want to comment on one of things our colleague from Washington, D.C., said about cutting spending as the answer.

We had a hearing over on the Senate side a couple of days ago, and one of the witnesses suggested spending as the answer, but had to acknowledge that to get close to balancing, you would have to eliminate Federal funding for health care, Federal funding for transportation, totally eliminate Federal funding for education, and that

would only get you back to balancing, not enough to pay off any of the national debt.

So if you are not going to do that, you ought to be honest. Also, when you talk about job loss, everybody says, well, you know, it was not our fault, it was not our fault. The fact is, when we were fiscally responsible in the 1990s when President Clinton was vetoing the massive tax cuts, we created jobs. As soon as this budget passed, we started losing jobs. That is what happened. Now you can explain it one way or another.

Finally, let me say that we do not often discuss it, but there are national security implications running up a big deficit. When we had to come up with \$7 billion more dollars to continue the war in Iraq, we had to borrow the money. How much more money can you borrow? Suppose something else came up? When President Clinton left office, we had a \$250 billion surplus, counting the Social Security surplus; and if we needed \$87 billion, we could come up with \$87 billion. Now we have to find people to borrow \$87 billion from.

The fact is that many national governments are now holding hundreds of billions of dollars of our debt. Some are not our traditional allies. China, suppose we got into a negotiation with China over weapons of mass destruction, over trade policy, and in the middle of the negotiations they said, We are not going to buy a \$100 billion of your paper next year unless you agree with us, unless you let us produce weapons of mass destruction, unless you agree with us on the trade deal, what would we do? Because if they stopped buying the paper or, even worse, if they sold it, interest rates would go up to double digits overnight. There would be nobody to buy it. So there are national security implications in running up this kind of debt.

Finally, we just have to acknowledge that balancing the budget is tough. There are no easy solutions. You cannot produce popular tax cuts and popular spending and think you can end up with a balanced budget. You have to make the tough decisions. That is what we did in 1993. They were politically unpopular, but we did the right thing. And that is what we need to get back to today; otherwise, it will get worse before it gets better and we will be spending hundreds of billions of dollars more than we need to in interest on the national debt, and we will have no way to address the Social Security shortfall that is right around the corner.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MAJETTE) for being a part of this hour.

If I could summarize for a moment, Mr. Speaker, over the past several days some of my colleagues, and even the President himself, have come to the House floor and to this Chamber dis-

cussing the need to address the national debt. They have said that the accumulation of this monstrous debt is to be blamed on congressional spending, as the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) said.

As a result, these same colleagues have promised to slash the spending dragons in Congress. The President in his State of the Union address promised the Nation fiscal restraint in his effort to slash the deficit in half over the next 5 years. I am not quite sure if we were all reading from the same CBO report. But surely if we were, the spending slashers must have missed a part of the report that pointed to the decrease in Federal revenue as a result of the Bush tax cuts as the major culprit in this steadily increasing Federal deficit.

Mr. Speaker, the CBO noted that if we were to allow the tax cuts to expire, then the deficit would gradually decline until the books balance in 2004. But if we act to extend the tax cuts, as the President has urged the Congress to do in his State of the Union address, then we will run large deficits well into the next decade.

Again, Mr. Speaker, without any actions to further help Federal programs and agencies that are already fiscally deprived, the deficit would be non-existent in the next 10 years. But if Congress follows the lead of the President, then the deficit will continue to spiral out of control, and we will be sticking our children and grandchildren with this enormous bill.

But let there be no mistake, this is not a spending-driven deficit. In less than a week, President Bush will send to Congress his budget for fiscal year 2005. According to a recent article in the Washington Post, that forecast will go out only 5 years, in effect, omitting the cost of extending the tax cuts. Yet, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the President will keep his promise to increase domestic spending to only 1 percent. In order to ensure that our children and generations yet unborn are not forced to bear the brunt of this administration's fiscal mismanagement, sacrifices must be made; and that is what the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) said, hard decisions for hard times. But these sacrifices should not be endured by my children or yours, and they should not be shouldered by those who are already struggling to carry the load that is theirs to bear.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I hope the President will exercise the compassionate side of his conservative agenda to hold the domestic programs sacred that educate our children, that would ensure that the 43 million plus people who are uninsured get some health insurance, that we would provide our first responders the resources they need to protect our borders and ports, and that we would protect the basic freedoms of our society.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, domestic discretionary spending represented only

17 percent of all Federal spending in 2004. When we consider that the President's own No Child Left Behind legislation to ensure a quality education to all of our Nation's schoolchildren was underfunded by over \$7 billion in 2004, it begs the question, what is left to be cut?

When we further consider that in the land of wealth and opportunity, 43 million Americans have no health coverage, we must begin beg the question, what is left to be cut?

Mr. Speaker, these are critical issues that should be addressed in the President's budget. The Federal budget resolution is the blueprint for spending this Congress and our government will follow. What we do here will have a tremendous effect on the future of our country. We must get our fiscal house in order and bring our budget back into balance, and we must focus on investing in those things that will strengthen the basic needs of our fellow Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we will evaluate the President's budget closely and seek to determine whether he will make the right choices for America.

Mr. Speaker, it is simply irresponsible to mortgage our children's and our grandchildren's futures. When the President sends his budget to Congress next week, I hope it will reflect our national priorities and reflect an investment in our most important national interests, our children.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) has 13 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus. And I would like to inform him that I was tardy in arriving because I was informed that the Republicans would not be taking the next hour and that I would be taking the next hour instead.

So I want to continue the gentleman's discussion in the next hour, and I invite any Members who would like to come and join me in that endeavor.

I am going to talk about common-sense legislative priorities, and practically every priority I discuss will be related to budget and appropriations matters. And I want to thank those the three Members. I watched the presentations. And starting with the Technicolor presentation of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), I learned a great deal in terms of how you can graphically discuss what is happening in America. The chart with the Social Security was astounding.

I have a good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), who would like to make a speech that Social Security is not in jeopardy. It will go on for a long, long time, and in the

foreseeable future it will almost never reach a point where it would be out of money. But the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) made those calculations a couple of years ago and he is still making them. He never anticipated the tax cut. He never anticipated the kind of recklessness that this administration has undertaken with respect to taking revenue out of the pot and driving us to a crises with respect to budget matters.

□ 1900

It is hard for people with common sense or ordinary Americans to understand the excesses and extremes that are embodied in the policies of this administration.

I did not hear any mention, but I am sure someone mentioned the fact that the war in Iraq by the most conservative estimates is spending \$1 billion a week. That is a conservative estimate. A little arithmetic will let us know. A billion dollars a week, 52 weeks a year, that would be \$52 billion a year in Iraq. We have already appropriated \$87 billion and previously more than \$70 billion. So about three times that amount, the \$52 billion, has already been appropriated for the war. We are three times greater than \$1 billion a week.

That defies the imagination, when we look at the fact that in the President's State of the Union speech he talked about not allowing the domestic budget to go beyond a 4 percent increase, which means that many domestic programs would have to be cut, while on the other hand he did not attach a percentage or a figure to additional appropriations that he would be asking the Congress for with respect to the war in Iraq.

We ought to focus in on budget and appropriations matters from one hour of the day to the next and from one day of the week and all the weeks and all the months. That is the issue, how are we going to expend the taxpayers' money to make a better life for the American people. We cannot talk about it too much.

Let us focus on the fact that in the Constitution, the Preamble, they talk about promoting the general welfare. We provide for the common defense, but in that same Preamble, they discuss promoting the general welfare.

How do we spend \$1 billion a week in Iraq to promote the general welfare, or, really, three times that amount? It is \$3 billion being spent somewhere over there. I do not know whether Halliburton is getting the other \$2 billion or not. The estimates keep coming out. It is \$1 billion a week; but when we add up the arithmetic, we see we get more. So what is Halliburton getting? How are they skewing that?

Halliburton Company admitted that in one transaction two of their employees have gotten a \$6 million bribe. In one transaction, two of their employees have gotten \$6 million. So we can see how big the figures are and how big

the deals are and how corrupt and crooked the deals can become.

At the same time, over here, if we look at \$1 billion, we can build 100 state-of-the-art schools for \$10 million a piece with \$1 billion. Make the contrast.

I heard my colleague from Virginia say that the interest on the national debt over a period of time is going to be \$300 billion, and for \$300 billion we can create 10 million jobs. Ten million jobs at \$30,000 each, 10 million jobs for what we are going to pay in interest on the national debt because of the fact it is being recklessly racked up going forward.

So what is \$30,000 a year, you say? That is not enough to inject a mission crunch, but that is more than most Americans are making when we look at the income for families of four. Last week, I think, in Barbara Walters "20/20" show, they had a discussion of myths that need to be demythologized, and they talked about are people happy if they have more money. It is interesting that they said that people making less than \$30,000 a year, family of four, they are miserable, and between \$30,000 and \$50,000 they begin to rise, and at \$50,000 a year, a family of four can really be happy. The real happiness is not affected after \$50,000 on up, but between \$30,000 and \$50,000 people are miserable, unhappy and to reach a point where a family can really be happy.

I do not know how much science there is behind that. They do a lot of interviews, et cetera, but \$30,000 per year can provide 10 million jobs. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) said that before, and I think it is something we ought to take into consideration.

We are in a situation where common sense has been thrown out the window. Common sense is not driving policy in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to continue this discussion in a few minutes, and I appreciate the gentleman having started this, and he has cause to be congratulated for focusing on what matters most, this budget.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, let me just say this. I would hope that the American people will have listened to what has been said tonight. I have often said and stated the quote that our children are the living messages we send to a future we will never see, and the fact is that when I think about our children being saddled with this tremendous debt and at the same time many of their parents are not working now so they can support them and many of them have been unemployed for many, many weeks and not getting any help, and I see our college students at colleges like Morgan State University and Fam U, where I was just a few weeks ago asking for help so they can go to school and do well and do better than their parents did, it does concern me; and I would hope that all of America will pay attention to what is going on in this great House.

To close out, I will yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) to close out, a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to be heard. I want to congratulate my colleague on his leadership as the head of the Congressional Black Caucus. He has been doing a fantastic job, and all the people across America and across the world need to know that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is leading the charge on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Congressional Black Caucus and a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I rise to discuss our Nation's budget priorities. The Congressional Budget Office's most recent report identified an optimistic increase in economic growth, while the outlook deficit worsened by over \$1 trillion in fiscal year 2004. The administration's tax cutting agenda is largely responsible for that turnaround. Yet the administration will continue to push for making the tax cuts permanent. Under the administration's stewardship, the \$5.6 trillion surplus estimated by CBO in 2001 has entirely disappeared, replaced by \$2.4 trillion in deficits.

Please understand that our Nation's economic growth results from an increase in capital income while income from wages and salaries have decreased. Since this administration's policy taxes wages and income and affords tax breaks and shelters on capital income, much of our Nation's income and economic growth is removed from the tax base.

Under the administration's stewardship, that \$5.6 trillion surplus estimated in 2001 has entirely disappeared.

Budget deficits are harmful to longer-run economic growth for the simple reason they decrease national saving by directly reducing the public sector's contribution to saving. Given that the retirement of the baby boomers is now within the 10-year budget window, policy-makers should be focusing on ways to increase, not reduce, national saving. It is not at all clear that the stated deficit reduction goals of this administration are sufficient to prepare for this imminent increase in fiscal pressures.

Despite the economy's current "recovery," we have continued to lose jobs, over three-fourths of 1 million jobs, in fact, since the end of the recession in 2001. Of the 8.4 million unemployed workers, 1.9 million of them have been unemployed for more than 26 weeks. Moreover, the 8.4 million does not include about 4.4 million additional Americans who want a job but are not counted among the unemployed, nor the additional 4.7 million people who are underemployed.

The President unveiled a new job-training program in the State of the

Union, including grants to community colleges, but this is really a mere pittance compared to the job losses.

It is vital that we establish policy that will provide jobs to all of those citizens who have become unemployed in the previous 4 years. America's highways provide an opportunity to create jobs throughout communities nationwide. Every \$1 billion that we invest in transportation generates more than \$2 billion in economic activity. Our roads, ports, and rails are essential to America's economic success; but they are deteriorating.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to take a look at this budget that this administration has put forth and make statements that it is not sufficient, that it is not doing the things that we need.

I thank the gentleman for the opportunity.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues very much.

### BARBARISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue the discussion that we have just had in a slightly different vein. I would like to broaden it beyond numbers and figures and talk a little more of philosophy with the understanding that we decision-makers here in the Congress, all of us are very bright people. One does not get to Congress unless they are very bright. So whether it is Republican or Democrat, we have bright and educated people who are. If they make decisions that are wrong, it is not because they are not knowledgeable. So I am not going to question the knowledge of anyone.

I do want to question the fact that we have allowed ourselves to be swayed into a situation where we make some very irresponsible decisions; and beyond irresponsible, we make some barbaric decisions.

I have got barbarism on my mind because I am sort of a captive of a series running on the History Channel right now called "The Barbarians," and they got Attila and the Tartars. They have got all these different obvious barbaric groups that for a certain period of time captured the known civilized world at that time and held it as their own.

I was surprised to see they interjected into these obvious, understood to be barbaric groups that usually assign the concept of barbarism to, they have interjected the story of Hitler. "Tyrant of Terror" is the name of that series, and they also put the Japanese war crimes trials in another section.

So what we have is these barbarians who seem to be guys who ate raw meat and they scalped people and they burned cities to the ground. They raped any female in sight.

This series is also saying there are people who have risen to a new level of

culture, the people who listen to Beethoven and Bach and go to the opera and who have enjoyed the legacy of great writers, others and Shakespearean translation. Those people allowed themselves to be captured by a barbarian philosophy, to be led by a barbarian, probably the world's greatest war machine.

The German war machine was the world's greatest war machine that probably ever existed. Instead of being a war machine for defense and for the promotion of peace in the world, it was a war machine that was put to the spread of terror; and there are a few decisions, with one or two signatures, the Gestapo could send millions of people to their death.

Conan the Barbarian, Attila the Hun, and all the other barbarians together did not kill as many people as the terror of Hitler did, both in concentration camps, in the case of people they considered undesirable, Jews and weak people and disabled people, and on the battlefield. On the battlefield they slaughtered millions. Russia estimates that the Soviet Union lost about 18 million people in that war.

So here is a very well-advanced group in terms of art, music, literature and, most of all, in terms of science, military science; and they behaved and caused more damage than all the other barbarians put together.

What does this have to do with America? What does it have to do with this discussion? I want to talk about commonsense legislative priorities, and I want to talk about the other extreme away from common sense. There is in the middle irresponsibility, and at the extreme is barbarism. Barbaric decisions can be made in this House in this Capitol, a combination of Congress and the President, barbaric decisions with barbaric consequences.

□ 1915

And we ought to think deeply about that. We ought to think deeply about it because a few hundred years from now historians will be writing and looking back on the history of the world, and I think they would say that the American civilization brought mankind to a level never dreamed of before. Our constitutional civilization brought mankind to a point which is unrivaled anywhere else.

We have the promise to continue to take civilization forward. We have the promise to do what has never been done in the world before. We already have done more for ordinary people. The masses of people live better, with more hope and happiness and necessities being provided than in any other society that has ever existed in the history of the world. We are the United States of America. And I often say nothing else has ever existed like this in terms of wealth and power. The Roman Empire was a village compared to the United States of America.

I think we have great responsibilities as a consequence of that. I think that

God has blessed America. God has blessed America in so many ways in terms of just natural resources, land, periods of peace, and on and on it goes, with great leaders who have come forward at the right time to take care of crises and reestablished the Nation on the right route. We have so much that we can appreciate, and I think we are indebted to God as a result.

In fact, I am sure when God looks down on the kinds of things we propose sometimes and the number of children still hungry in America, he must weep; when he looks upon the kind of magnificent medical advances that we have made and still people in need die for lack of good medical treatment, with 40,000 people uninsured in the richest most powerful Nation that ever existed.

So we should stop at this point as we go into the year 2004, which is a Presidential election year, and in addition to considering the numbers and the revenue estimates and the expenditure estimates think very closely about what are we deciding to do with the available resources. Taxpayers should not say I am against big spending; I do not want to spend any more money. The question is what do we spend money for. Are we against big spending if it is going to provide prescription drug benefits for senior citizens or, in the final analysis, for all who need them; if prescription drug benefits are a part of our civilization?

There would be no magic drugs, no wonder drugs if it had not been for the group investment and the investment of government in research and the investment of the government in education. We invented constitutional civilization on the one hand, but we did a lot of great things after that. The Morrill Act, which is little known by most Americans, the Morrill Act established land grant colleges in every State.

Land grant colleges were pretty much patterned after Thomas Jefferson's University of Virginia. They were established to go beyond the study of philosophy and art and literature and study practical things. They were established to study agriculture and mechanics. The legacy of the land grant college is that it established throughout the whole United States centers of learning, which were not just centers of learning in the usual sense, but centers of learning which focused on everything there was to be learned about anything that existed in order to make life easier for all of us.

Out of those centers of learning came the production of agriculture. In the world today it is unparalleled what we do in agriculture. That was one of the priorities of land grant colleges. But also out of the land grant colleges engineering feats and devices and procedures and so forth have evolved. Out of the learned world that we created, not by accident but by legislation, we have a dynamic out there which has produced these marvels of science in every area, including the area of medicine.