

taxpayers \$400 billion for a prescription drug benefit; and before a single benefit has been issued, which is questionable, but before a single benefit has been issued to a single senior citizen, the taxpayers were charged another \$150 billion, and the administration knew all about it all along. We did nothing to bring down the price of prescription drugs, which are going up next year 15 percent and are going up the following year another 15 percent. Yet they knew all along, while we were debating a prescription drug benefit that will not be seen by a single senior citizen for another 2 years, they knew the bill was actually \$550 billion. That is what our seniors and our taxpayers are going to be charged, and we did nothing to drive down or bring down the prices, which will continue to go up. That was the beginning of a credibility deficit.

Now, the President has submitted a budget with a \$500 billion to \$520 billion deficit that his administration calls "manageable," "within acceptable range." Yet the International Monetary Fund said it is the single largest drag on the economy. Goldman Sachs, the respected firm of Goldman Sachs where the President's Director of the Office of Management and Budget comes from, referred to the budget that the President submitted as "not credible" and "an accounting fiction."

And we learned recently in Ron Suskind's book on "The Price of Loyalty" that the President of the United States knew all along the reason for the deficit. Mitch Daniels said, Mr. President, if you pass this tax cut, you are going to have deficits for the entire first and second terms of your administration. Yet now he wants to blame it on 9-11. He wants to blame it on an inherited recession, which was not a recession, and he wants to blame it on corporate scandals. Yet he was told by his own Director of the Office of Management and Budget that the reason for deficits are his tax cuts, which have nothing to do with economic recovery. But the President of the United States had the wisdom to ask, appropriately: Have we not done enough for the top rate? Have we not taken care of the very wealthy yet?

He knew that his economic program and his first tax cut had taken care of the wealthy, but he went along and decided to once again repeat a tax cut to the very wealthy in this country at the expense of middle-class families who are seeing no increases in assistance in college education, who are seeing no increases in health care, 33 million Americans who work and who have no health care. And he knew that that tax cut was going to take care of the wealthy and drive us into a deficit. Yet he went along and tried to pass it for something it was not, and then accused every Democrat who raised the same question the President of the United States raised as waging class warfare. The President of the United States went along with a tax cut that was skewed to the wealthiest.

On the issue of weapons of mass destruction, the issue is not whether Saddam Hussein was developing weapons of mass destruction. The issue was whether he was an imminent threat, and we were told he was an imminent threat. Now we learn, after having derided and belittled the United Nations, that the President of the United States went out on TV and said one thing, knowing the facts to be something else.

That is why this President now has with the American people, for the first time in his Presidency, when he had the benefit of the doubt from what happened to this country, to all Americans after 9-11, he has a growing credibility deficit. If we listen to what he says and we see what he does, the two things are not the same, from tax cuts to the deficit to Medicare, to weapons of mass destruction. Let us take the issue of the weapons of mass destruction. We will have to have the countries of the world be on our side when we face North Korea and our word must be important.

Then, and let me read one last thing and I will finish, as Time Magazine reported, "Any of those challenges might have been manageable alone. The problem was that each news cycle brought a new question about Bush's judgment and candor, which Democrats lost no time exploiting. Fiscal conservatives have been howling for months about a budget that seemed totally out of control."

Mr. President, this country now is facing a credibility gap, not only around the world, but your administration is, because of its words and its actions.

#### BUSH BUDGET LACKS CREDIBILITY, AND BALLOONING DEFICIT LEFT TO FUTURE GENERATIONS IS IMMORAL

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, back in the 1980s, a budgetary theory was advanced called "supply side economics." Some called it voodoo economics back in those days. It was the theory that you cut taxes, increase spending and, somehow, you get more money in. It did not work back then, and it has not worked again, because we have supply side economics all over again.

On January 28, 2003, during the State of the Union last year, the President said, "This country has many challenges. We will not deny, we will not ignore, we will not pass along our problems to other Congresses, to other Presidents, and other generations."

Last week, Members of Congress received copies of the President's proposed budget, and it is already clear this budget fails to meet the standards the President outlined last year. Today, my friends in the Blue Dog Coalition, a group that is well-known in Washington for our work on balancing

the budget and reducing the deficit, are going to join me here to outline the dangerous course this budget outlines for our Nation.

This budget makes it clear to my constituents in southern Indiana and Americans across this country that this White House and Congress are mortgaging our future to pay for today. As this chart shows, we are backsliding into a deficit ditch, and there is no end in sight. Look at this: 1989. These are figures where in the year 2000; we had an actual surplus of \$236 billion. We had an election in the year 2000, and look what has happened in the last 3 years. We have gone from a \$236 billion surplus to this year, a projected \$520 billion deficit. It is incredible that this could happen so quickly. In only a few short years, we have gone from record surpluses to these record deficits.

By 2009, the national debt will have eclipsed \$10 trillion. Put it another way, that is nearly \$40,000 for every man, woman, and child living in the United States today. It is simply immoral to strap future generations with trillions of dollars of debt that they did not create. It is immoral to increase the debt tax, the mandatory costs we must pay up front every year to cover the interest of the national debt, that every family is going to have to pay on the debt.

I have a second chart. The President's budget raises the debt tax dramatically. In 2004, right here, a family of four will owe \$4,367. As my colleagues can see, over the next 10 years, each family will go from \$4,367 of our national debt to \$10,368 of our national debt.

Ballooning deficits are going to impose some impossible choices on future generations. Without a show of fiscal responsibility, we will squander away any hope for future generations to address pressing needs of their time because they will be stuck cleaning up the multitrillion-dollar mess we are making for them today. Leaving future generations with huge debts is immoral, but that is not the only problem with this budget. This budget simply lacks credibility.

The President proposes to limit spending this year. That is good. I agree with the President that Congress should limit spending, but that is not the whole truth. Spending in Congress is out of control today. In 3 years, with almost complete control of the Congress and the White House, this side of the aisle has increased spending as a percentage of the GDP every single year. And in 8 years, under the prior administration, spending decreased in relation to the Gross Domestic Product 8 years in a row.

So, yes, we must control spending, but we have to do more than that. We must mean it.

This budget fails to include a dime of spending for troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, and we should make it clear to the troops stationed overseas on 12-

month rotations that we will provide the resources they need, rather than playing games with the budget to artificially hold down the size of this deficit on paper.

As my colleagues in the Blue Dog Coalition have said, we believe everyone, Democrats and Republicans, Congress and the White House need to sit down, put everything on the table, and get our economic house in order, not mortgage our future to pay for today.

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

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

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

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

There was no objection.

#### THE PERFECT STORM

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

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day when we have to come to the well of this House and talk about the credibility gap of the President of the United States. It is the most disappointing thing to have the President issue a budget that is just simply fantasy. He just simply made up numbers.

Mr. Speaker, there is no funding in the budget for Iraq and Afghanistan, and we know that that is going to have to be done. It fails to address the repeal of the AMT, which we know is going to have to happen if there is going to be any fairness left in the Tax Code. Then, he puts out an economic report on this Nation and talks about how good it is to outsource jobs, to shift our jobs overseas. Where is the credibility?

□ 2000

Over and over and over again, we are presented with a report or a request or a budget or appropriations bills that just simply do not have any credibility.

Our Nation is facing the perfect economic storm in a very short period of time. We just saw the charts. The deficit is in a nose dive, and nobody knows what to do about it. The cost of the interest that each family will have to pay in this country in the next 10 years is going to reach over \$10,000 per family, a tax that cannot be repealed. We have the President's own economists talking about what a good thing it is that we are outsourcing high-tech jobs from this country.

Where is the credibility? None of this makes any sense.

The President just the other day in New Hampshire made a speech and said the Federal Government's got plenty of money. We do not need any more money. We have got plenty of money.

Where is the credibility? If we have got so much money, if the economy is doing so well, why are we broke? Why are we losing jobs? Why are the prospects for the next generation so dismal?

When this generation came into office, the Blue Dog Coalition that I am a member of met with the Vice President first. And we said, Mr. Vice President, we want to work with you. If you want to cut taxes, let us talk about it. Let us figure out a way to cut spending so we can make this work and we do not get back in the deficit ditch, because many of the people in that room at that time had dealt with this before, and they knew how tough it was. And he said, You do not understand. We have the majority. We do not need you. We think you are nice people, but we just do not need you. And we are going to do what we want to do, and what we want to do is have massive tax cuts and let somebody else worry about the deficit.

This is the same man that said in a meeting in the White House with the President, Deficits do not matter.

Well, tell that to these families that are going to have to come up with \$10,000 to pay the interest on the national debt as their part. But, again, where is the credibility? Over and over we see this.

Then the Blue Dogs met with Mitch Daniels, the head of the Office of Management and Budget, and he explained it another way. Also, again, we did not understand. We had these massive surpluses. There was money flowing in the street, and he said this to us, You do not understand. We are going to have so much money, and after we cut taxes we are going to have even more. We are going to have so much money that we are going to pay off all of the national debt, and there will not be a safe place to invest your money. There will not be a U.S. Treasury bond anymore.

I remember him saying that so well. I wish Mr. Daniels was here tonight to face this perfect economic storm that we are about to pass on to our children and grandchildren because I think it is a terrible, terrible thing; and I think it is time that there be some credibility introduced into the national debate, and it needs to be brought to the table by the President.

#### TELL US THE TRUTH

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to make one very simple point. Sometimes the simplest points are the most powerful.

Families across America are probably eating supper about this time, a little worried about the future of the country, wondering whom they can trust.

Well, just a few weeks ago in this Chamber, we had the great speech of the year, the President's State of the Union message. And the President walked down this aisle in a crowded Chamber, most of the House and the Senate and the Supreme Court and other dignitaries were here. It was broadcast, of course, live on national television. And at this podium right here the President spoke and delivered a powerful message. There were many lines where there was applause; and one of them was this one, because we knew on that day, on January 20, that the President would be delivering his budget. That is a very complicated document. It is thousands of pages long. It takes months to prepare, and probably on that very night it was already at the printers, the type being set.

Well, perhaps the President was poorly served by one of his speech writers, but one of the lines in the President's important message was this one: the President said on the night of January 20 in this Chamber, he said that "in two weeks I will send you a budget that funds the war, protects the homeland, and meets important domestic needs."

Well, in 2 weeks he did send us a budget. It arrived here on February 2. Most of us have had a chance, especially those of us who have the privilege of serving on the Committee on the Budget, to dig through that budget and find what is in and what is not there. And to our surprise and disappointment, especially after the President's remarks just a few weeks ago in this Chamber on live national television, the budget does not fund the war. In fact, to read the President's budget, you would think that we are not at war at all.

Now, the President's budget does include over \$400 billion to fund our Defense Department, and that is good; and most of this Chamber will support it and support it strongly. But that is largely a peace-time budget. That number would have been the same whether we were involved in fighting in Afghanistan or Iraq or not. So the budget that the President promised us that funds the war, and presumably he meant here the war on terrorism, the war where 120,000 of our troops are currently serving in Iraq and 10,000 of our troops are currently serving in Afghanistan, presumably the President meant the war most Americans worry about when they go to bed and pray about when they wake up in the morning because almost every day there is a casualty.

I think American families want the truth. We support our President. We want him to succeed. We want our Nation to succeed. We want our troops to win in Iraq and Afghanistan, but we need to be told the truth. We need to be