

that today is making existing housing programs work better.

Of those enacted last year, the American Dream Downpayment Act and the proposal to raise the FHA multifamily loan limits are helping thousands of individuals and families realize the dream of homeownership. I am especially proud of the American Dream Downpayment Act, which will provide \$200 million in grants to help homebuyers with the downpayment and closing costs.

Sponsored by Ms. HARRIS and Mr. DAVIS, this bill will assist 40,000 families annually achieve the dream of homeownership and will make available subsidy assistance averaging \$5,000, to help low-income, first-time home buying families.

In an effort to continue the goal the increase minority homeownership, on June 3rd of this year the House Financial Services Committee approved HR 3755, the FHA Zero Down Payment Act. This bill, introduced by Congressmen TIBERI and SCOTT, would provide a program to eliminate the downpayment requirement for certain families and individuals who buy homes with FHA-insured mortgages.

During the enactment of the American Dream Downpayment Act last year, we learned that the biggest obstacle to homeownership for most families is the inability to save enough cash to meet down payment and closing costs. HR 3755 is a good bill that represents another important step forward in helping all Americans achieve the dream of homeownership.

In closing, let me say that the federal government, consumers, and the housing industry are linked by our mutual goal of creating housing opportunities for more Americans.

We have much to achieve together for the American people, and our best hope of being successful is to work in close concert with each other—guided by the same high standards and principles and motivated by the same goals.

In that way, we will continue to open up our communities to new opportunities for growth and prosperity.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 658, which recognizes National Homeownership Month. Owning a home is a central part of the American dream, and I am pleased that this dream is within reach of more families than ever before. Home ownership is now at a record high in the United States, with 68.6 percent of all American families and over half of all minority families owning their own home.

Buying a home is the largest personal investment many families will ever make. Homeownership provides economic security for American families by helping them build wealth over time. Expanding home ownership also helps strengthen communities, as owners feel a greater stake in their local schools, civic organizations, and churches.

We have a lot to be proud of in the expansion of home ownership throughout our communities, but there is still work to be done. We must recognize and strengthen the working partnerships between the public, private and non-profit sectors in promoting home ownership, and we must provide greater support to FHA and related programs which help provide the means for lower income families to buy their first homes.

Mr. Speaker, owning a home is becoming a reality for more American families, and we

must use National Homeownership Month to continue working towards providing this piece of the American dream to all Americans. I thank the gentleman from California for introducing this important resolution and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 658.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

COMMUNICATION FROM DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR OF HON. DALE E. KILDEE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Barbara Donnelly, Deputy District Director of the Honorable DALE E. KILDEE, Member of Congress:

DALE E. KILDEE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
5th District, MI, June 21, 2004.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a civil subpoena for documents issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

BARBARA DONNELLY,
Deputy District Director.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4613, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 683 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 683

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4613) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes. The first read-

ing of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment of the House and Senate during the month of July.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Committee on Rules met and granted an open rule for H.R. 4613, the Fiscal Year 2005 Department of Defense Appropriations Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule also ensures that the United States Government shall take all steps necessary to guarantee the full faith and credit of the government.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair and open rule for a very important bill. It cannot get any better than that. The rule allows any Member to offer any amendment to the bill as long as their amendment complies within the normal Rules of the House.

H.R. 4613 comes at a particularly crucial time for our Nation's Armed Forces. The Iraqi conflict and our continuing war on terrorism have brought a renewed and proper focus on national defense. In our global campaign against global terror, our military must have every resource, every tool, every weapon, and every advantage that they need for the missions to come.

This legislation addresses the needs of a Nation at war on multiple fronts.

It contains \$391.1 billion for the Department of Defense. It also provides an additional \$25 billion requested by the President for early fiscal year 2005 costs associated with operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The primary focus of the legislation is protecting our troops on the battlefield. Our men and women in uniform depend on having the necessary systems and equipment to be successful in accomplishing their mission.

Many of us have been concerned about the lack of armor available for our Humvees and other trucks. This bill addresses that concern by providing \$674 million for an additional 2,996 up-armored Humvees, and \$198 million for ballistic protection. These improved ballistic Humvees will protect our soldiers from anti-personnel armor-piercing munitions, and improvised explosive devices, or IEDs.

In the near term, the outcome of our war against terror depends on the courage of our personnel on the frontlines.

I am pleased that this bill makes significant improvements in the quality of life of the men and women who serve in the Armed Forces. These improvements include a 3.5 percent military personnel pay raise, and increased levels for basic allowances for housing by eliminating service members' average out-of-pocket expenses from 3.5 percent to zero in 2005. We can never pay our men and women in uniform on a scale that matches the magnitude of their sacrifice, but this bill reflects our respect for their selfless service.

Today, more than ever, we also owe those in uniform the resources they need to maintain a very high state of readiness. Our enemies rely upon surprise and deception. They used to rely upon the fact that they thought we were soft. Well, they have gotten the message that we are not. Our forces must be ready to deploy to any place around the globe on short notice, and this bill provides over \$120.6 billion for operation and maintenance. This Nation must have and will have ready forces that can bring victory to our country and safety to our people.

The world's best soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines also deserve the world's best weaponry. To ensure this, our Nation must invest in procurement. This defense bill contains \$77.3 billion for procurement.

The continued development and procurement of the M-Gator is also made a priority in this year's bill. The U.S. has deployed the M-Gator to the Balkans, Afghanistan, and Iraq, providing our troops with the support and the mobility they need to successfully wage war.

With the continued support and commitment from Congress, researchers will be able to enhance the M-Gator's capabilities with silent operation, precision control, and machine intelligence. These technological enhancements will continue to help make the United States military the most technologically advanced and best prepared force in the world.

This Nation must give our military the weapons it needs to meet future threats. If the war against terror means that we must find terror wherever it exists, pull it out by its roots and bring people to justice, our military must have the means to achieve that objective.

Now, more than any time in our Nation's history, we are relying on the men and women who so faithfully serve our country in the National Guard. H.R. 4613 contains language that will help us continue to provide strong support for our National Guard.

In my State of North Carolina, universities and community organizations are coming together to help develop a comprehensive program to effectively support our citizen soldiers. This bill recognizes the importance of this program and provides language to help integrate the National Program For Citizen Soldiers Support with the Defense Department's ongoing efforts to support our men and women in uniform.

Some of our greatest defense resources are found in the classrooms and the labs of our universities. This bill continues to recognize the important role our universities play in research and development for the Department of Defense. Funding in this year's bill will help researchers at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte study optoelectronics and superlattice nanotechnology, two technologies that are on the cutting edge of defense R&D. To that end, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and support the underlying bill. Now, more than ever, we must improve our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, the annual Department of Defense appropriation bill is one that can truly be called bipartisan. It is developed on a bipartisan basis in the Committee on Appropriations, and it usually enjoys bipartisan support on the floor of the House. It is a bipartisan bill because it is of importance to our country.

Providing for our national defense is one of our most important duties as Members of Congress. Providing funding for our troops to ensure their safety and success of the war on terror is our obligation.

□ 1315

This year's bill is no exception. The Committee on Appropriations has put together a good bill, one that provides vital support for our troops in times of war. This bill gives our troops a much deserved 3.5 percent pay raise. It gives the Department of Defense \$25 billion for emergency supplemental funding for the war on terror.

These funds directly and significantly aid our servicemen and women by providing them with the tools they

need to fight the war on terror and return home safely. It will provide every soldier with body armor, allow for more armored Humvees, and increase the size of the Army to relieve the burden on our overworked soldiers.

The Department of Defense appropriations bill not only aids our troops overseas, it also helps our communities here at home. The bill before us today funds several defense and weapons programs manufactured in north Texas. Lockheed Martin will receive \$4.1 billion for 24 F-22 Air Force fighter aircraft, and \$4.4 billion for the Joint Strike Fighter. Just over \$200 million is provided for three Global Hawk High Endurance Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, a program supported by Vought Aircraft Industries in Texas. And Bell-Textron will receive over \$1.1 billion for 11 V-22 aircraft.

By funding the continued development of these weapons systems, we are not only providing for the long-term support and protection of our troops, we are preserving good jobs for hard working Americans in my part of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of Congress for more than 25 years. And each and every one of these years I voted in favor of the Department of Defense appropriations bill and its rule. But this year, Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership has snuck a last minute provision to raise the debt limit into the bill.

The so-called "full faith and credit" clause will allow this House to raise the debt limit by nearly \$700 billion as part of the conference report on the Department of Defense appropriations bill. \$700 billion is almost twice as much as we are spending on the entire Department of Defense under this bill.

Some Members on the other sides of the aisle will tell you that this clause does not mean anything, it is just a procedural item. But I have been here long enough to know when someone is trying to pull the wool over your eyes. And this House leadership is trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the American people.

So this year, Mr. Speaker, although I will vote in favor of the underlying bill, I will vote against the rule. I am incensed at this underhanded move to raise the debt limit, and shortly I will attempt to defeat the previous question by offering a motion to strip this deceptive provision from this important bill. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me.

The defense appropriations bill has always been a bipartisan initiative. Introducing partisanship into the war on terror is absolutely unacceptable. I resent that anyone would use this bill as a political tool to raise the national debt and threaten the possibility of its passage. Shame on all of you.

A vote on the debt limit deserves a separate vote. If consideration of the defense appropriations bill is rejected or delayed because you insisted on playing petty political games, you will

be held accountable by the American people and by our troops.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. I thank the Committee on Rules for quickly getting the fiscal year 2005 defense appropriations bill to the floor. I strongly support the defense appropriations bill.

I want to commend the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the ranking member the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), and the entire Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense for their outstanding work during this critical time for America. They had to balance many difficult needs and did a great job.

The last several months have been very difficult for our military. First the actions of a few at Abu Ghraib prison, and then the barbaric murders of Nicholas Berg and Paul Johnson. They have reminded us of the true nature of our enemy and why we must win this war.

Our troops are on the front line fighting this war for each of us, and they deserve our full support and gratitude.

The bill contains \$416 billion in discretionary spending for the Department of Defense. It includes many important provisions for our troops and our military operations. More specifically, the bill increases the intelligence budget, supports national missile defenses, provides program increases to support the military transformation process.

The bill also provides \$25 billion in supplemental funding to ensure that our men and women fighting in Iraq have all the resources they need.

Finally, it funds many important weapons programs that will ensure our military strength for decades to come. Some of those critical weapons programs are the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, the V-22 Osprey, and the FA-22 Raptor.

This bill provides funding levels at \$4.4 billion for the Joint Strike Fighter, \$1.9 billion for the V-22 and \$4.6 billion for the FA-22. These programs are critical to military transformation. And I want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman Lewis), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ranking Member MURTHA) and all committee members for supporting these programs.

I want to conclude my remarks by offering sincere appreciation to our armed services for their service and sacrifice to bring freedom to the oppressed and protection for our Nation. For this they deserve the very best we can give them for the quality of life and their protection and their support.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the majority is currently planning to include a provision in this rule that will effectively allow an increase in the Nation's debt ceiling. In my view, this procedural gimmick is an abuse of the troops that this bill is meant to support. It abuses the troops in order to hide responsibility. It epitomizes the total lack of shared sacrifice that this administration and the Republican majority have hoisted on the American people.

This administration has taken action in Iraq on the basis of misguided, misinformed, and manipulated intelligence. It has exposed American troops to greater risk than necessary because of poor post-war planning. It has so stretched the Army that it has effectively reinstituted the draft for those in the Guard and Reserve who are now being told that they will have to extend their service in Iraq beyond their original hitch.

While this administration has been asking for so much sacrifice from those servicemen and women, it has asked for virtually no sacrifice from the most well off and the most well connected members of this society. The administration has run up huge additional debts in order to give those people supersized tax cuts averaging over \$80,000 for people that make \$1 million or more.

The majority is then using the defense appropriations bill as a vehicle to enable them to continue the reckless additions to this debt brought on by those tax cuts. It is a cynical game that should shame even those who run this Congress.

A vote for the previous question on the rule is most certainly a vote to increase the debt ceiling by almost \$1 trillion. People ought to vote no. You ought to strip this rule of the extraneous material and allow us to vote up or down on the defense bill if we are indeed trying to accomplish the purposes which the defense bill is presented to us to accomplish.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule that will provide consideration for H.R. 4613, the defense appropriations bill. This legislation focuses on force protection and personnel benefits for the soldiers and airmen in my district at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base. The ability to adequately execute the mission for which they are called and to care for their families are the two issues that are second to none.

I believe this legislation makes significant progress in these areas and will enable our men and women in uniform to continue successfully prosecuting the war on terrorism.

My trip to Iraq this past March, the second I made, did nothing but reinforce my admiration and pride in our Nation's warfighters. These brave men and women serve with honor and distinction as they have liberated a Nation.

Troops from the 8th District of North Carolina have been at the very tip of the spear that ended the dark reign of Saddam Hussein and continue to lead the way in post-conflict resolution in Iraq and Afghan span.

This legislation first and foremost takes care of our most vital asset of our military: Our people. It provides every service member with an across the board 3.5 percent pay raise. It also includes \$2.3 billion for individual soldier equipment and critical force protection requirements. It also funds and restructures Army brigades which will be rotated into theater.

I would also like to take this opportunity to highlight two very important projects at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. H.R. 4613 funds the completion of the Optoelectronics Center, a project which will focus on the development of fiberoptic devices and interconnects necessary for chip-to-chip and board-to-board optical connection needs to achieve the high-speed, low-powered devices.

This will enable miniaturization and integration of optical transceivers and sensors. Additionally, H.R. 4613 provides funds for superlattice nanotechnology that will enable a next generation of wide band, high power, and digital systems to become a reality.

I appreciate the committee's recognition of the great work and research that UNCC performs and look forward to bringing these technological advances to the battlefield.

Currently about 3,500 members of North Carolina's National Guard are deployed in support of operation Iraqi freedom. It is the largest deployment in our State's history. And it is vital that we take every measure to care for their families while they are away.

I am happy that this legislation funds efforts designed to help ease some of the hardships of these families. Mr. Speaker, it is a gross injustice and misfortune that it took the tragedy on September 11 to focus the public eye on the needs for a more robust defense budget.

I feel the legislation in front of us today will help our troops accomplish their mission, establishing a clear and strong course of support for our troops and continue to successfully prosecute the war on terror. I encourage my colleagues to send a message loud and clear to our soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, coasties and terrorists that we will strongly support our troops and give them the resources necessary to perform the mission at hand. I urge strong support of this legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago, the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), stood on this House floor and here is what he said: "Here we are being asked this week to raise the debt ceiling so that this government can go on borrowing

money to take care of its spending habits, and I think that is outrageous. I hope Members of the House will vote against raising the debt ceiling." So said the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) the majority leader.

He went on to say, "And I hope the American people will contact the Members of this House, Mr. Speaker, and urge them to vote against raising the debt ceiling."

Now, the Chair of the conference, Republican conference said this: "You see, certain lawmakers around this place have hopes of hiding a debt limit increase in a jungle of budget resolutions and conference reports. Mr. Speaker," said the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) chairman of the Republican conference, "before we give them license to start construction, we must demand a separate vote on increasing the debt limit."

I ask the distinguished lady from the Committee on Rules, are we doing that?

Well, my friends, the Republican leadership, is that your position today? Are you urging Members to vote against raising the debt ceiling for the third time in three years under your watch? Under Bill Clinton's watch in the last 4 years of his Presidency, we raised the debt limit not once. Not once. Under Ronald Reagan we raised it 17 times. In the 4 years of George Bush 1 we raised it 10 times. Under this president, this is the fourth increase and it is going to be probably somewhere in the neighborhood of \$2 trillion additional debt that the children of America will be called upon to pay. And we do it without a vote.

This rule is a good rule. It should be passed unanimously. But just as they did last week in trying to pass their awful tax bill, they put things in to try to sweeten the pot. But this time you put it in to try to hide it.

Contrary to what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said, contrary to what the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) said, contrary to what the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has said, you are going to hide this vote because you do not have the courage to stand up and say I want to increase the debt, I want to undermine Social Security, I want to undermine Medicare. I do not want to be honest with the American public.

□ 1330

It is called situational ethics. It is not about ethics; it is about the situation. It is about whether we think it works. We ought to reject this rule. It is not right. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said vote "no." The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) said no. Let us vote "no."

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for the time.

Now, there is a lot of concern here about the mechanics of what we are

about to do: pass a rule, increase the debt limit, provide for the welfare of our young men and women in uniform. But I think when we are moving forward, mostly through all this rhetoric, we need to step back and look at the history of our economy, see how we got into this position and why it is important that we move forward.

I know a lot of my colleagues remember back in the late 1990s, we had an overheated economy. The Federal Reserve reacted by raising interest rates. Then we had the tech bust of 1999, followed by the beginnings of a recession in November of 2000. Then September 11, 2001, hit. We saw a huge blow to our economy. In my hometown of Wichita, Kansas, we had the highest percentage of jobs lost in the total community compared with any other city in the United States. Our aerospace community, the air capital of the world, saw more layoffs in aerospace than we have seen in a short amount of time since World War II.

During that period of time, the Federal revenue has dropped 14 percent. There have been increased demands on the Federal budget. We have increased homeland security to make our Nation safe. We have increased our spending on defense to fight the worldwide war on terrorism; but when our revenues dropped, nobody down here complaining today about how we are doing business said, well, let us cut Medicare by 14 percent so we do not have to raise the debt. Nobody came down here and said let us cut Social Security by 14 percent so we do not have to raise the debt. Nobody came down here and said let us cut education by 14 percent so we do not have to raise the debt.

Well, let us do the math: decreasing revenue because of the impact of terrorism and a recession that started around the year 2000, increasing demand on the battle to fight terrorism around the world and a higher Federal debt. So if we do not address this problem, if we do not use the most expedient means available, we will not be able to fund Social Security. The threat of not having checks going to seniors in America would become reality. No one wants that.

So where is the grief here? Where is the contrary opinion? Do those who advocate a different solution here want to come down and say let us not raise the debt? I think they know the practicality of what we have to do.

We have to move forward and conduct the business of the United States Government, and that includes addressing an issue that is very difficult for many of us to address. I did not come to Washington to raise the debt. I doubt if anybody came to Washington for the purpose of raising the debt, but we are pragmatic. We are realists. We know that there have been attacks by terrorists against our very culture, using our own technology against us. We know that we are being sabotaged around the world. We know that there is an increased demand on what the

Federal Government is trying to protect our Nation.

Now, there has been some implication on the floor that there has been some misleading of Americans that perhaps we are not telling the truth. This is a free and open society. Everything we do is a matter of public record. There is no deceit here on the floor of the House, not when it comes to this issue, this bill, raising the Federal debt limit.

So I do not want to leave anybody with the impression that we are trying to hide a thing. It is all a matter of public record, and I think it is very important that as Americans we acknowledge that we have some tasks that are not easy to handle, but, yet, this is something necessary. The circumstances demand it.

So Mr. Speaker, I say that we should vote for this rule and that we should move forward with this legislation to continue the function of the government.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the refreshingly honest statement of the gentleman from Kansas and what he just said because he stated quite clearly this is a vote to increase the debt ceiling.

I want to ask the gentlewoman from North Carolina if she concurs with that statement, that by voting for the previous question and this rule it is a vote to increase the debt ceiling through \$8 trillion?

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, this really is a very simple procedure to add language to the bill and that will allow for the possible future consideration of an increase in the national debt limit. That is what this does is allow for that to happen in the future. It is the same language that was done in 2002 in the supplemental.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman and I thank the gentleman from Kansas for making it very clear by voting for this rule, by voting for the previous question my colleagues are, in fact, voting to increase the debt ceiling. That is critical because there are those that want to avoid that at all costs.

Now, we should not be using this Defense bill for this purpose because it is an open rule. There is strong bipartisan support for supporting the troops. We should not be mixing politics up in this issue.

My friends on the other side would like folks to believe that the debate we are having today is simply about partisan politics and procedural tactics. That could not be more wrong.

The only thing I disagree with the gentleman from Kansas, if my colleague wants to say all of these things

that happened in the past created the deficit and that, therefore, we have to increase the debt ceiling, my colleague could persuade me if we were setting in place a policy that would do something about the deficit next year and the year after that and as we prepare for the baby boomers. But to continue the economic policy that has driven this country to borrowing \$2 trillion in a period of 4 years and then to come on and say, well, we are trying to put it in the Defense bill, that is wrong.

It is wrong for those that we prepare to spend the money to back our young men and women who are over in Iraq and Afghanistan today. It is wrong for us to say we want you to win, we pray every day you are going to be safe, but by the way, we are going to keep borrowing \$500 billion a year under the economic policy that we have not got the guts to change on this floor and then add it to a Defense appropriation bill.

But it is nice to have somebody to come on this floor and to clearly identify for all 435 of us, if my colleagues vote for this previous question, they are voting to increase the debt ceiling. That is why I will vote "no," and I will encourage all of my colleagues to vote "no."

Separate the two issues. Let us support the troops with a rule that could pass unanimously, but let us deal with the economic policy of this country by having an honest debate on how we are going to do something about these deficits that we are talking about.

I rise in opposition to this rule which will allow Congress to increase our national debt limit to more than \$8 trillion without a separate vote on this issue. We should not use a spending bill intended to support our troops to hide a long-term increase in the debt ceiling so we can leave more debt for our troops and other young men and women to repay in the future.

My friends on the other side of the aisle would like folks to believe that the debate we are having today is simply about partisan politics and procedural tactics. They could not be more wrong. This debate is not about politics or procedure. Rather it is about the financial condition of our nation and whether we will continue piling on more and more debt on our children and grandchildren.

A vote for the rule is a vote for using parliamentary tricks to sneak through an increase in our national debt more than \$8 trillion. I would say to my Republican colleagues that if you honestly believe that tax cuts with borrowed money is good economic policy, you should be willing to stand up and vote to borrow the money to pay for their tax cuts instead of relying on undercover parliamentary tricks. While an increase in the debt limit is necessary to avoid a default, it would be irresponsible to provide a blank check for increased borrowing authority without taking action to stem the tide of red ink.

Before Congress votes to approve a substantial increase in the debt limit, the President must work with Congress to put the fiscal house back in order, just as a family facing financial problems must work with the bank to establish a financial plan in order to get approval to refinance their debts.

Congress has an obligation to re-examine our long-term budget policies in light of the dramatic reversal in our nation's fiscal condition before approving a substantial increase in our borrowing authority. At a minimum Congress should restore discipline and accountability in the budget process by reinstating budget enforcement rules which make it harder to pass legislation which would put us further into debt. Adoption of this rule approving an increase in the debt limit will allow the government to continue on the path of deficit spending, borrowing from the Social Security trust fund and a ballooning national debt.

I urge members to vote against the previous question and against this rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just remind the gentleman, when we passed the bill through the House recently for the budget, we did put a freeze on discretionary spending for the first time in a long time which is the beginning of paying that down.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

I think it is very interesting that the gentleman from Texas would like us to do something about what is going on. Well, we have done something. It is hard to ignore that when we look at the economy today.

We passed tax relief that did one of three things for Americans, when putting money in their pocket. They either spent it, which was demand for goods and demand for more jobs; or they saved it, which made money available in the form of home mortgages, which drove the home building industry and created more jobs; or they invested it, which has allowed many American corporations to expand.

Right now, in the State of Kansas, unemployment just dropped three-tenths of a percent because we have an expansion in our economy. Well, what happens when we have an expansion in the economy is we have more Federal revenue, and our Federal revenue is going up. We are doing something about Federal revenue, but right here on the floor of the House we also passed a Republican budget that froze domestic spending. The results are that we now have more Americans working than we have ever had in the history of our country. We have the lowest unemployment and lower than average of the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s; and we have one of the fastest growing economies, growing so fast that the Federal Reserve is now considering raising interest rates so they can slow it down a little bit.

We are doing something about this Federal debt. We are very proactive in that, but the gentleman from Texas said he was willing to do anything at any cost. He said at any cost. Is he willing to cut Social Security? Is the gentleman willing to cut even education? Is the gentleman willing to cut Defense? What does "any cost" mean?

I think a vote against this rule is a vote against funding the government

and threatening Social Security, veterans benefits, and all of those things that we are doing right to protect our young men and women in uniform.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my fellow Blue Dog, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), that votes on the debt ceiling should not be part of the rule and will oppose it; but the underlying legislation, the fiscal year 2005 Defense Department appropriations bill, is worthy of support. Given Congress' constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense, this is perhaps the most important appropriations legislation we consider each year.

We could not ask for two more capable colleagues to have as managers of the bill. As in previous years, the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ranking Member MURTHA) have risen above partisan politics and brought a Defense bill to the House floor that reflects America's defense priorities.

Specifically, I applaud the committee's work in funding the Future Imageries Architecture program, the Arrow Weapon System, and in fully funding the F-15C radar upgrade. I also appreciate the committee's robust support for missile procurement. I am concerned that the bill reduces funding for some important classified satellite programs, but remain hopeful that any issues can be resolved prior to conference with the Senate.

The centerpiece of the Defense appropriations bill is, of course, \$25 billion for the war in Iraq. Unfortunately, the administration only requested funds to get us through the first quarter of fiscal year 2005. They say additional funds will be requested after the November election. Nonetheless, the Committee on Appropriations is working on a bipartisan basis to make sure that our soldiers are well-trained and -equipped.

In contrast, the Intelligence authorization bill, which we will consider later this week, significantly underfunds critical counterterrorism programs. We need an authorization bill that fully funds the intelligence community's requirements. The bill voted out of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on a party-line vote last week funds less than one-third of the American counterterrorism needs.

Mr. Speaker, this continuing practice of funding the intelligence community in bits and pieces has been roundly criticized by Members on both sides of the aisle. The intelligence agencies tell us this practice makes it impossible to plan, forcing them to rob Peter to pay Paul until additional funding is available.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge support for the Defense authorization bill

and hope that later this week we will do better to build a bipartisan Intelligence authorization bill that fully funds our counterterrorism needs.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

(Mr. SPRATT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen it all. When it comes to the deficit, I have seen this House duck, and I have seen this House dodge; but this rule takes the cake. They pull out at a must-pass bill, Defense appropriations, and deep within the rule they bury some vague language on our national debt. Later, when the doors are shut, the conference is started, the cigars are lit, this language will be transformed into a \$690 billion increase in the ceiling of our national debt. No audit trail, no fingerprints, no responsibility.

Our Republican friends cut taxes, they raise spending, they run up the debt; and if that were not bad enough, now they want to escape responsibility for the actions they have taken.

Let me say to our children and grandchildren, when they ask who left us with this mountainous debt, on President Clinton's watch in the years 1998, 1999 and 2000, we ran a surplus in 1998 of \$236 billion, a surplus in each of those years and we paid off debt. We paid off \$362 billion of debt on his watch.

In 2001, when President Bush came to office, he inherited a budget in surplus; and he predicted that under his policies there would be no need for a debt ceiling increase, that was the President's prediction, until 2008. That was a prediction of what the debt would be in 2008. He also predicted in this book called a "Blueprint For New Beginnings," page 201, Table S-16, that in the year 2011 there would be no statutory debt of the United States left. It would all be paid off.

□ 1345

Well, here we are in 2004, and the Bush administration has had to raise the debt ceiling two times already. One to go. Three increases in 4 years that total \$2.124. Three increases in 4 years that total \$2.124 trillion. And if you take the Congressional Budget Office's projection of the President's budget, done last March, you will see this is another in a series of debt ceiling increases; not by any means the last.

In fact, CBO projects that the President's budgets will require the Federal Government to incur, get this, \$5.571 trillion of additional debt between now and 2014. As a result, this will bring our total debt, these numbers are too hard to even imagine, to \$13.645 trillion. That is the course this administration has put us on.

This is some legacy to leave our children. And it is a cruel irony that it comes to us wrapped in the flag, buried inside a defense bill, to which it has no relation, provided we pass this rule and put it there. And we should not pass this rule. This rule is a travesty. We should not pass it. There is no difference between this rule and the off-balance sheet financing that Enron did to hide its liabilities.

If we want to stand up for the House, stand up for the process, stand up for self-respect in this institution, we should start by voting down this rule. Be on notice, however, if you vote for this rule, this rule, make no mistake about it, will raise the debt ceiling of the United States to \$8.074 trillion. Remove the smoke, remove the mirrors, and that is what this rule will do. It will increase the statutory debt ceiling by \$690 billion. Vote against the rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor to raise my objections to taking the bill that is supposed to be funding the most honorable and the bravest Americans, buying the weapons they need, paying their salaries, taking care of their families, and being used by the sneakiest and the most cowardly Americans to sneak through a \$700 billion increase in our Nation's national debt. At some point, even my most hard core Republican friends have to ask themselves: Is there any shame left? Is there anything that you won't foul, by taking a bill that is meant to see to it that fewer American lives are lost in combat and seeing to it that those people, if they make it home, are straddled with the bill?

Now, I notice the gentleman from Kansas made a point of saying, no, the problem is Social Security. Sir, I beg to differ. In the past few years, this administration, this Congress, of which you are in the majority party, has taken \$1.580 trillion out of the Social Security Trust Fund, and what folks back home know already is that Social Security more than pays itself. In fact, some of the tax breaks you have been giving to the wealthiest of Americans have been paid for by excess social security taxes, monies that should have been set aside for future needs but instead have been borrowed and spent.

You have done the same thing with the Federal Employees Retirement System, with \$612 billion taken out of the system. If a private sector employer had done that, they would go to jail. The Medicare trust funds, \$287 billion of money that was collected should have been set-aside for Medicare, but spent so that you can give your wealthy contributors a tax break.

So I would ask any of the people of the 228 who are probably going to vote for this, tell me it is not cowardly. Tell

me it is not sleazy to take what is probably the most important, what is undoubtedly the most important function of this Nation, which is providing for its defense, and using that in a cynical attempt to hide an increase in the national debt.

See, I happen to have watched the speech where the President said he could cut taxes, increase spending and pay down the national debt. I would remind my colleagues that since he made that speech, and since May 9, 2001, when your side passed that budget with those tax decreases, with those spending increases you have added \$1,567,995,916,652.32 to the debt.

But that is not enough, because your intention is, obviously, to bankrupt this Nation. There can not be any other purpose for running up this much debt. And someone is going to say, well, we have a war to pay for. That is right, but I would remind you if you took the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican American War, the American Civil War, the Spanish-American War, the first World War, World War II, Korea and Vietnam, the Nation borrowed \$1 trillion for all of those wars and everything else that happened in the first 200 years of our Nation. In the past 3 years, you have borrowed \$1.5 trillion.

So, again, I ask the question: Have you no shame? Is there nothing that you will stoop to in an effort to hide your sneaky agenda?

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I am a little amazed by the comments made by the gentleman from Mississippi. He said that we were cowardly Americans. Now, I know that words have been taken down for a lot less than that, and I think that that kind of language does not have any place on the floor of the House.

We have a free and open society. Everything we do is a matter of public record. There is nothing cowardly about what we are doing here. To try to turn this into something to be called a cowardly act, I think, is really incredible and it is grounds for taking someone's words down.

Let us talk about this Federal debt a little so we can define what Federal debt is. There are two parts to Federal debt: One is the public instruments held by people, like treasury bonds, like savings bonds. Those are financial instruments with a financial obligation that is hard and fast. It is in writing. It is black and white. The rest of the public debt is projections on the future; about how much we are going to need for my Social Security, for your Social Security, for my children's Social Security, for Medicare for all of us, for Medicaid for all of us that require it in the United States. It is a future projection.

Now, if you wanted to do something about the Federal debt, we could change the law. We could cut the benefits for Social Security. Are any of you

suggesting that we should cut the benefits for Social Security to manage the Federal debt? It is just a future obligation. Well I don't hear any of that. In fact, I hear zero solutions.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIAHRT. No, I will not yield. I think you referred to me as cowardly, so I do not think I am going to give you any time.

Cowardly Americans. I cannot believe it, Mr. Speaker. I think it was something that should not be tolerated on the floor. And as a warning, if I hear it again, I will ask for the words to be taken down.

Now, another allegation was made that we had cigars lit; that when it was time for the Committee on Rules to meet, that cigars were lit. Well, I was not in the Committee on Rules room. There were people here that were in that room. The last time I was in the Committee on Rules room, it was a no smoking policy. I saw no cigars being lit. In fact, there is a no smoking policy in the Capitol. We have places outside for people to smoke, but there are no cigars lit in here.

I think it is a little misleading to say we are in some dark room in the dark of night lighting cigars and dreaming up ways we can gouge people. Nothing of the sort is going on. We are conducting the business of government. And sometimes it is difficult. There is an old saying about how you do not want to see sausage, or laws being made. Well, this is the part they are talking about. Now. Right now. This is the difficult part.

If we do not address this issue, the rule happens to be the most convenient vehicle, but if we do not address this issue, there will be a shortage of funds in the United States Treasury. Now, what does that mean? The gentleman from Mississippi before me talked about funding the needs of our young men and women in uniform. And he is right, we have to do that. We have to provide them with the bullets and the backup and the vests and the hardened Humvees. All those things we have to provide for them but we cannot if there is nothing in the Treasury.

What we are doing here are the hard cold facts of trying to protect Americans, trying to keep the lights on in this government, trying to make sure that we are safe in our homes, where our kids are going to school, where we shop, where we go to church. And the way we do that is by addressing these tough issues. It is not cowardly. It is the furthest thing from cowardly. It is up front.

People are saying do not vote for the rule because it has this in it. Of all the Members I have heard speak, I do not think any of them have voted for any of the rules this year. It is standard practice for the opposition to vote against the rule. It is standard policy for the majority side to vote for the rule. That is not a reason to call somebody cowardly or to suggest cigars

were lit in a dark room. That has not occurred around here.

What has occurred is we have moved forward on carrying out the business of the United States Government.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire about the time remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

(Mr. TANNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I hope that people are paying attention in this country to what is going on here today. Let us review the records of many here. We have collectively in this body borrowed with this bill, or this rule passing, over \$2 trillion since July of 2002.

Now, let me say one or two things. When this administration came to town with a Republican House and a Republican Senate, all we heard is less government, lower taxes. And everybody agrees to that. But what have we gotten? We have gotten reduced revenues, more spending, and we are hocking this country to anybody in the world that will buy our debt.

The gentleman a while ago said we have to provide for the troops. You are not providing for the troops. What you are doing is borrowing the money from them and giving them the bill for it with interest when they get home from fighting the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. We are not providing anything because we do not have the courage to do what every administration and every Congress has done since the War of 1812; and that is when we are in war, we have at least had the courage, we have at least had the honor, we have at least had the decency to ask people that are not risking their lives and dying and having their arms and legs blown off to help pay for it. You will not do that.

You come here, you borrow \$450 billion in July of 2002, \$980 billion in May of 2003, and today you want to borrow another \$690 billion. Two trillion dollars. Interest at 5 percent is a tax increase on the American people of \$100 billion a year every year. In the name of cutting taxes, you have increased taxes more than any Congress in the history of this country. One hundred billion dollars a year every year that has to come right off the top, for which we get nothing and for which we are sending checks, interest checks overseas.

Right now, we owe in hard money, not Social Security money, not anything, in hard money, \$4-plus trillion. Since you have taken over the economic lifeline of this country, you have increased the debt that we owe foreigners from 31 to 37 percent of that.

You know who is financing the war in Afghanistan, the war in Iraq? It is the Chinese, the Japanese, OPEC themselves, Caribbean banking centers, \$70 billion. Just Beijing alone has increased their holdings of American paper, that our taxpayers pay into the Treasury and then we send an interest check to Beijing, over 100 percent in the last 20 months. And you come down here with no plan to get out of it except to cut revenue, increase spending, borrow it all, and put this country in hock to anybody in the world that will buy our paper.

□ 1400

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate many of the concerns of the previous speaker; but I think everybody should be very aware that for the 8 years under the previous administration, there was not one year that we reduced the debt held by the public as defined by law. Not one year. We have increased spending every year two and three and sometimes almost four times the rate of inflation, so a decision has to be made. Do you want to start cutting down spending, or do you want to increase taxes? If we increase taxes, what we do is we put our business at a greater economic disadvantage, competitive disadvantage with businesses that we are trying to compete with in other countries.

I agree with the previous speaker that there is a danger of going deeper and deeper into debt. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I ask people to guess what percentage of our marketable debt is now held by foreign interests. The answer is 45 percent. I just finished a meeting with the Canadian Parliament. The Canadian Parliament now for the last several years has paid down their total debt, not just paid down part of it but paid down so that their net debt has been decreasing. At the same time over the last 10 years in the United States our debt has been continuing to increase.

Let me just say that the language in this legislation that opens the door in conference committee to increase the debt limit might be acceptable. I would be adamantly against it if it set the debt limit in this bill. It does not set the debt limit in this bill. Sometime we are going to have to face up to our overspending and that means discussing increasing the debt of this country. Today, interest on the debt of this country, what it costs to service this debt, the interest on the debt, is \$300 billion plus this year. It represents a little over 14 percent of our total Federal spending.

I think both sides should agree, let us start balancing spending with the revenues coming in. Let us not make promises as far as unfunded mandates and unfunded liabilities in Social Security and Medicaid and Medicare.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this House is entitled to have an open debate and an open vote on raising the debt ceiling. Any family or any business or corporation that applies for debt or to be able to borrow money is going to have to apply for the credit and going to have to make the case. This Congress should do the same.

The truth of the matter is our Republican colleagues do not want to have an open debate or an open vote on raising the debt ceiling because it points to the failed fiscal policies of this administration which has placed this country in the worst financial condition that we have been in our history. We are going to pass 13 appropriations bills to fund the government this year. We are going to borrow an amount equal to 60 percent of all of the appropriations that we vote on this year to run our government. We are in a ditch. We need to face up to it. We need to get honest.

It is particularly objectionable to me to try to hide it in the defense appropriations bill because the truth of the matter is we have sent young men and women to fight in Iraq and Afghanistan; and we are telling them that someday when they come home, they will have to pay for the war that they have been sent to fight. That has never happened in the history of this country. We have always paid our bills in time of war. It is time to do the moral thing, the right thing by our troops and pay for this war with current dollars and not pass it on to the next generation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I will be urging Members to vote "no" on the previous question in order to strike from this rule a provision that the Republican leadership would rather Members did not know about. When the Committee on Rules voted to report this rule last night, they slipped in an unrelated self-executing provision that allows for an increase in the debt ceiling. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) made a motion in committee to strike this provision, but it was defeated.

So Members of this House should be aware that when they vote for this rule, they will be voting to increase the statutory debt limit by almost \$700 billion for the next fiscal year. It is no wonder that they do not want Members to know about this. They would rather not have a separate vote or even a debate on the inescapable fact that their budget raises our national statutory debt limit to the highest level in history, to a staggering \$8 trillion, an amount that is almost incomprehensible to most of us.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that there is an honest disagreement in this House over our Nation's fiscal priorities. Many of us believe that, with record deficits and the high cost of the war on

terror, we need to reevaluate our budget priorities and find a better way to match our revenues with our spending needs. It seems as though my Republican colleagues do not think there is a problem. They think it is just fine to continue on with the budgetary policies that have brought us into our current fiscal mess. They seem to think it is fine to keep driving up our national debt and let our children and grandchildren figure out how to pay for it.

If that is how my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to proceed, they should at least have the political courage to vote up or down on this issue instead of relying on undercover parliamentary tricks. If you truly favor the fiscal policies that are sending the national debt through the ceiling, you should be willing to stand up on the floor of the House and vote for them.

I want to emphasize that a "no" vote will not stop the House from taking up the Defense appropriations bill. I do not oppose that portion of this rule. A "no" vote will simply strip this self-executing smoke screen from the rule so that we do not slip the debt increase through the House with no debate and no separate vote. However, a "yes" vote will allow this record-breaking increase to be enacted without a separate up-or-down vote.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FROST. Again, vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my profound opposition to House Resolution 683, a piece of legislation that should be limited to providing for consideration of the FY 2005 Defense Appropriations Act. However, true to form, the Rules Committee has reported a rule under cover of darkness that goes well beyond the normal procedural provision.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership of this House talks a lot about fiscal discipline. It talks a lot about the success of its economic policy. The chairman of the Budget Committee boasts about the success of his budget, about reining in spending, and about reducing the deficit.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, as this rule makes clear, all that talk and stated pride is little more than smoke and mirrors, and this rule is a shameful abuse of the prerogatives of the People's House.

I am appalled that the Republican leadership of this House would try to hide its budgetary shortcomings by sneaking an increase in our Nation's debt limit into a bill to provide for our national defense and the needs of our Nation's service men and women. The leadership of this House should not use such an important legislative vehicle to mask its failings, and that is exactly what this rule attempts to do. It's just wrong.

Mr. Speaker, there are few pieces of legislation that the Congress considers each year that are as important as the annual Department of Defense Appropriations Act. This legislation is vital to ensuring that the brave men and women who put their lives on the line for this country have the resources they need to protect our Nation against its enemies at home and abroad and to preserve our Nation's most precious resource—freedom—for posterity.

I heartily support the Defense Department appropriations bill to which this rule applies and will join with the vast majority of my colleagues in voting for it.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one issue about which all of us can agree, it is that we must provide all the resources necessary to a robust national defense. Our national security—and the very security of our families and homes—depend on it. This legislation is almost never—and should never be—a partisan measure. In Congress, despite frequent partisan rancor, we historically stand united behind our nation's armed services. Speaking with one voice on such a critically important matter has extraordinary value for friends and foes alike—at home and abroad. It makes clear that our resolve is firm and our commitment sure.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, it is especially appalling that this legislation, on which we should be united, is being cluttered with a completely unrelated provision increasing our nation's debt limit beyond its already crippling size. This is among the most cynical acts undertaken by the Republican leadership of this House during my time in Congress, and that says a lot.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to anyone observing this debate why the leadership of the House has been forced to do this. The Republican leadership of this House does not want a simple up-or-down vote on increasing the debt limit. They do not want to admit to the budgetary woes that our nation feels as a consequence of their failures to live up to the promises of their press releases.

Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress, I have advocated an open and honest budget process, an open and honest debate on the economic choices before the country in the light of day. The cynical and covert tactics we are witnessing today fully vindicate my view. And so I say to the supposed fiscal conservatives on the other side of the aisle, "Come out! Come out, wherever you are." You should be disgusted by this rule, by this process, as I am.

Just last year, the Republican leadership pushed through an increase in the debt limit of almost \$1 trillion, by far the largest increase in the debt limit in history, without an up or down vote in the House of Representatives. Appallingly, this sneak attack on our children and grandchildren came less than 8 months after we raised the federal debt ceiling by a whopping \$450 billion.

Well, Mr. Speaker, once again, the spirit of Yogi Berra appears to be guiding the leadership of the House. "It's déjà vu all over again." Today, we launch another sneak attack on future generations—hiding behind the brave men and women who put their lives on the line to preserve freedom for our children and grandchildren—by slipping through another \$700 billion increase in the debt limit without any debate.

The Congressional Budget Office projects that the national debt will exceed \$10 trillion in just over 4 years under the budget policies of which the House leadership claims to be so proud. What better way to underline the sacrifice of our Nation's service men and women, than to compromise their and their children's futures with an ever-increasing, staggering "debt tax."

Mr. Speaker, this House should have a full and open debate and vote up or down any increase of our national debt limit. It is a breach of the compact we have with the American people to hide behind parliamentary maneuvers to statutorily increase the debt limit without addressing the grave, structural budgetary problems our nation confronts.

If the Republican leadership honestly believes that tax cuts with borrowed money is a good economic policy, they should be willing to stand up and vote to increase the national debt to pay for their tax cuts instead of relying on undercover parliamentary tricks.

Mr. Speaker, today should have been a day to discuss our national defense priorities and to send a clear signal to the rest of the world that the United States is strong and will not shrink from challenges to its security. However, this rule has cast a cloud over that message, and that is a shame.

I will proudly stand up for our national defense and the brave men and women who risk their lives every day to protect us and our families. I will proudly cast a vote for the Defense Department Appropriations Act because of its critical importance to our national security.

But, Mr. Speaker, I deplore this rule, urge my colleagues to oppose this underhanded abuse of the procedures of this House, and urge the Rules Committee to report a clean rule for the consideration of this vitally important legislation. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines deserve better.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, well, here they go again. The Republican Leadership in the House is once again attempting to sneak through a back-door increase in the federal debt limit. Hidden within the resolution before the House is a provision that would allow the debt limit to rise without even requiring Members to have an up-or-down vote on it. This is the same procedural sleight-of-hand the Majority attempted last month in the budget resolution.

Actions have consequences. What it is it about the consequences of their economic policy that members of the Majority Party are afraid to confront? When the Bush Administration took office, the federal government was looking at a projected ten-year budget surplus of \$5.6 trillion. In less than four years, the Majority's economic policies have turned that record surplus into a projected deficit of nearly \$2.9 trillion. That's a fiscal reversal of over eight trillion dollars.

Instead of gradually paying down the public debt as we were during the Clinton Administration, the policies of the current Administration have resulted in record budget deficits that require Congress to once again raise the limit on the nation's credit card and pass even more red ink along to our children.

To all my colleague who voted to adopt these unsustainable budget-busting policies over the last four years, I would ask why you are so reluctant to face up to the consequences of your actions. You should at

least have the courage to hold a separate up-or-down vote to raise the ceiling on the debt you helped create. Instead, you try to sneak the debt increase into the defense budget without a vote. The defense bill should be about protecting our troops on the battlefield, not protecting politicians from the consequences of their votes. This is the height of fiscal irresponsibility and I urge my colleagues to vote down this rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. FROST is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 683—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FY05

In the resolution strike the following:

"The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole."

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 683 will be followed by 5-minute votes as ordered on adopting H. Res. 683, and on the first two motions to suspend the rules postponed earlier today.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 196, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

YEAS—220

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Everett
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp

Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes

Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter

Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick

Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Sensenbrenner

NAYS—196

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Case
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans

Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klecza
Kucinich
Lampson
Roybal-Allard
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Malette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson

Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton

Slaughter Taylor (MS) Waters
Smith (WA) Thompson (CA) Watson
Snyder Thompson (MS) Watt
Solis Tierney Waxman
Spratt Towns Weiner
Stark Turner (TX) Wexler
Stenholm Udall (CO) Woolsey
Strickland Udall (NM) Wu
Stupak Van Hollen Wynn
Tanner Velázquez
Tauscher Visclosky

NOT VOTING—17

Bereuter Dreier Mollohan
Berman Gephardt Rangel
Carson (IN) Hastings (FL) Reyes
Collins Jones (OH) Schrock
DeMint McInnis Tauzin
Deutsch Miller, George

□ 1431

Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, ORTIZ and DOOLEY of California changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 197, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

AYES—221

Aderholt Cunningham Herger
Akin Davis, Jo Ann Hobson
Bachus Davis, Tom Hoekstra
Baker Deal (GA) Hostettler
Ballenger DeLay Houghton
Barrett (SC) Diaz-Balart, L. Hulshof
Barton (TX) Diaz-Balart, M. Hunter
Bass Doolittle Hyde
Beauprez Dreier Isakson
Biggart Duncan Issa
Billirakis Dunn Istook
Bishop (UT) Ehlers Jenkins
Blackburn Emerson Johnson (CT)
Blunt English Johnson (IL)
Boehlert Everett Johnson, Sam
Boehner Feeney Jones (NC)
Bonilla Ferguson Keller
Bonner Flake Kelly
Bono Foley Kennedy (MN)
Boozman Forbes King (IA)
Bradley (NH) Fossella King (NY)
Brady (TX) Franks (AZ) Kingston
Brown (SC) Frelinghuysen Kirk
Brown-Waite, Gallegly Kline
Ginny Garrett (NJ) Knollenberg
Burgess Gerlach Kolbe
Burns Gibbons LaHood
Burr Gilchrest Latham
Burton (IN) Gillmor LaTourette
Buyer Gingrey Leach
Calvert Goode Lewis (CA)
Camp Goodlatte Lewis (KY)
Cannon Goss Linder
Cantor Granger LoBiondo
Capito Graves Lucas (OK)
Carter Green (WI) Manzullo
Castle Greenwood McCotter
Chabot Gutknecht McCrery
Chocola Hall McHugh
Coble Harris McKeon
Cole Hart Mica
Cox Hastings (WA) Miller (FL)
Crane Hayes Miller (MI)
Crenshaw Miller, Gary
Cubin Hefley Moran (KS)
Culberson Hensarling Murphy

Murtha Radanovich Souder
Musgrave Ramstad Stearns
Myrick Regula Sullivan
Nethercutt Rehberg Sweeney
Neugebauer Renzi Tancredo
Ney Reynolds Taylor (NC)
Northup Rogers (AL) Terry
Norwood Rogers (KY) Thomas
Nunes Rogers (MI) Thornberry
Nussle Rohrabacher Tiahrt
Osborne Ros-Lehtinen Tiberi
Ose Royce Toomey
Otter Ryan (WI) Turner (OH)
Oxley Ryun (KS) Upton
Paul Saxton Vitter
Pearce Sensenbrenner Walden (OR)
Pence Sessions Walsh
Peterson (PA) Shadegg Wamp
Petri Shaw Weldon (FL)
Pickering Shays Weldon (PA)
Pitts Sherwood Weller
Platts Shimkus Whitfield
Pombo Shuster Wicker
Porter Simmons Wilson (NM)
Portman Simpson Wilson (SC)
Pryce (OH) Smith (MI) Wolf
Putnam Smith (NJ) Young (AK)
Quinn Smith (TX) Young (FL)

NOES—197

Abercrombie Harman Neal (MA)
Ackerman Herseth Oberstar
Alexander Hill Obey
Allen Hinchey Oliver
Andrews Hinojosa Ortiz
Baca Hoeft Owens
Baird Holden Pallone
Baldwin Holt Pascarell
Bartlett (MD) Honda Pastor
Becerra Hooley (OR) Payne
Bell Hoyer Pelosi
Berkley Inslee Peterson (MN)
Berry Israel Pomeroy
Bishop (GA) Jackson (IL) Price (NC)
Bishop (NY) Jackson-Lee Rahall
Blumenauer (TX) Rodriguez
Boswell Jefferson Ross
Boucher John Rothman
Boyd Johnson, E. B. Roybal-Allard
Brady (PA) Jones (OH) Ruppersberger
Brown (OH) Kanjorski Rush
Brown, Corrine Kaptur Ryan (OH)
Capps Kennedy (RI) Sabo
Capuano Kildee Sanchez, Linda
Cardin Kilpatrick T.
Cardoza Kind Sanchez, Loretta
Carson (OK) Kleczka Sanders
Case Kucinich Sandlin
Chandler Lampson Schakowsky
Clay Langevin Schiff
Clyburn Lantos Scott (GA)
Conyers Larsen (WA) Scott (VA)
Cooper Larson (CT) Serrano
Costello Lee Sherman
Cramer Levin Skelton
Crowley Lewis (GA) Slaughter
Cummings Lipinski Smith (WA)
Davis (AL) Lofgren Snyder
Davis (CA) Lowey Spratt
Davis (FL) Lucas (KY) Stark
Davis (IL) Lynch Stenholm
Davis (TN) Majette Strickland
DeFazio Maloney Stupak
DeGette Markey Tanner
DeLauro Marshall Tauscher
Dicks Matheson Taylor (MS)
Dingell Matsui McCarthy (MO)
Doggett McCarthy (NY) Thompson (CA)
Dooley (CA) McColium Thompson (MS)
Doyle McDermott Tierney
Edwards McGovern Towns
Emanuel McIntyre Turner (TX)
Engel McNulty Udall (CO)
Eshoo Meehan Udall (NM)
Etheridge Meek (FL) Van Hollen
Evans Meeks (NY) Velázquez
Farr Menendez Visclosky
Fattah Michaud Waters
Flanner McHugh Watson
Ford McDonald Watt
Frank (MA) Miller (NC) Waxman
Frost Miller, George Weiner
Gonzalez Moore Wexler
Gordon Moran (VA) Woolsey
Grijalva Nadler Wu
Gutierrez Napolitano Wynn

NOT VOTING—15

Bereuter Deutsch Mollohan
Berman Gephardt Rangel
Carson (IN) Green (TX) Reyes
Collins Hastings (FL) Schrock
DeMint McInnis Tauzin

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1439

Ms. KAPTUR changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF RAY CHARLES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 449.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 449, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

YEAS—419

Abercrombie Brown-Waite, Davis, Tom
Ackerman Ginny Deal (GA)
Aderholt Burgess DeFazio
Akin Burns DeGette
Alexander Burr Delahunt
Allen Burton (IN) DeLauro
Andrews Buyer DeLay
Baca Calvert Diaz-Balart, L.
Bachus Camp Diaz-Balart, M.
Baird Cannon Dicks
Baker Cantor Dingell
Baldwin Capito Doggett
Ballenger Capps Dooley (CA)
Barrett (SC) Capuano Doolittle
Bartlett (MD) Cardin Doyle
Barton (TX) Cardoza Dreier
Bass Carson (OK) Duncan
Beauprez Carter Dunn
Becerra Case Edwards
Bell Castle Ehlers
Berkley Chabot Emanuel
Berry Chandler Emerson
Biggart Chocola Engel
Billirakis Clay English
Bishop (GA) Clyburn Eshoo
Bishop (NY) Coble Etheridge
Blackburn Cole Evans
Blumenauer Cooper Everett
Blunt Costello Farr
Boehlert Cox Fattah
Boehner Cramer Feeney
Bonilla Crane Ferguson
Bonner Crenshaw Filner
Bono Crowley Flake
Boozman Cubin Foley
Boswell Culberson Forbes
Boucher Cummings Fossella
Boyd Cunningham Frank (MA)
Bradley (NH) Davis (AL) Franks (AZ)
Brady (PA) Davis (CA) Frelinghuysen
Brady (TX) Davis (FL) Frost
Brown (OH) Davis (IL) Gallegly
Brown (SC) Davis (TN) Garrett (NJ)
Brown, Corrine Davis, Jo Ann Gerlach
Gibbons