

other words, all of these behaviors certainly impact all of us as tax payers and certainly break down the culture.

I worked closely with young people for 40 years and personally witnessed the emotional pain and dysfunctional behavior brought about by the destruction of marriages. Most of this dysfunction was caused by the absence of fathers. Fathers contribute to a child's well-being in a unique way. Mothers also obviously make a unique contribution. It takes both.

Opponents of traditional marriage will refer to studies refuting this data. However, these studies almost always compare families where no father at all is present, are not longitudinal, and are poorly designed. Several countries, notably in Scandinavia, have changed the traditional definition of marriage. The result has been a decline in traditional marriage and a surge in out-of-wedlock births in these countries. Children born in such circumstances on average suffer significant dysfunction and distress.

The strength of a culture can be measured by how it treats its most vulnerable citizens: its children. So the question before us today is this: Do we allow a small number of members of the judiciary to alter an institution which has been the backbone of this Nation? Do we allow these same jurists to do so with the great majority of our citizens in our cities and our States firmly opposed to a change? Forty-four of 50 States have laws defining marriage in a traditional manner.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that speaks directly to the welfare of our children and our Nation. Same-sex marriage issues such as survivor benefits and health care benefits for adults can be addressed without doing violence to a time-honored institution which is vital to our national well-being and particularly to our children.

BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, an earlier speaker tonight said the economy is showing signs of some considerable improvement. Jobs are being created, GDP is increasing. Well, it should. We have borrowed \$2.5 trillion in the last 3½ years and spent it. We should get the kind of results with that amount of borrowing.

Last week, the administration failed to meet the deadline to release the mid-session review of the budget. If the administration had released the mid-session review, it would have shown that our budget is in a deep hole. As my colleagues have heard me say many times, when you find yourself in a hole, the first rule is to quit digging. Soon we will have an announcement of another record deficit, somewhere between \$425 billion and \$500 billion.

Under the simple concept of pay-as-you-go, if we want to pass a tax cut or

spending increase, we need to say how we would pay for it. We need to take two shovels away from Congress and the President to stop us from digging the hole deeper. The original PAYGO legislation was part of the bipartisan 1990 budget agreement between President George Herbert Walker Bush and the Democratic Congress. It was subsequently extended in 1993 and 1997, but was allowed to expire in 2002 by President Bush and the Republican Congress.

We should be spending our time trying to find a bipartisan solution to balance our budget, but that may be too much to expect from this do-nothing 108th Congress. Not only has this Congress failed to make any serious efforts to reduce the deficit, we have allowed the budget enforcement tools, which we have proven the track record of in controlling the deficit, to expire. Last month, the House spent 7 hours on this floor debating 19 amendments on budget process reform, but the House leadership would not even allow an up-and-down vote on the Blue Dog budget enforcement proposals because the leadership knew that it would have enough bipartisan support to pass.

□ 1945

Now, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska who just spoke regarding marriage. I strongly support middle-class tax relief. I support extending the marriage penalty relief, the \$1,000 per child tax credit and the 10 percent tax bracket. What I oppose is passing these tax cuts with borrowed money and leaving our children and grandchildren to pay our bills.

Those who want to extend expiring tax cuts or make the tax cuts permanent, which they will try to do again this week, adding another \$120 to \$180 billion to our deficit, should be willing to put forward the spending cuts or the offsetting necessary to pay for them.

Applying pay-as-you-go rules to tax cuts does not prevent Congress from passing more tax cuts. All it says is that if we are going to reduce our revenues, we need to reduce our spending by the same amount so the deficit does not get deeper.

If Republicans actually meant what they say about controlling spending, they would have no problem with applying pay-as-you-go to tax cuts, because it would force Congress to actually control spending when we pass tax cuts instead of just promising to do so in the future.

The problem is the actions of Republicans have not matched their rhetoric. They cut taxes without cutting spending and charge the difference to our children and grandchildren.

Last year we increased the debt limit by \$984 billion. The current debt limit is \$7.384 trillion. At the close of business last Friday, our total national debt stood at \$7,273,792,456,490.62. It appears very likely the debt limit will be reached sometime in late September or

October, with the most likely date being early October.

It is time for Congress to deal seriously with our Nation's fiscal affairs. We cannot keep having 70 percent of our debt being bought by foreigners and not paying the bill sooner or later.

LEWIS AND CLARK NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK DESIGNATION ACT OF 2004

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

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that H.R. 3819, the Lewis and Clark National Historic Park Designation Act of 2004, passed the House earlier today.

From Jamestown to the Cumberland Gap, Virginia has been a land of pioneers. Virginians have explored the New World and established America, and two of her most adventurous sons are Meriwether Lewis and William Clark.

While the western trail of the Lewis and Clark Expedition is well-recognized, less known is the route taken in the preparation phase and return phase of the expedition. I thank my colleagues for joining me in support of H.R. 3819 and in recognition of the Eastern Legacy of the Lewis and Clark Expedition during this bicentennial commemoration.

On January 18, 1803, President Thomas Jefferson sent a confidential letter to Congress requesting an appropriation of \$2,500 to fund an expedition of exploration to the Pacific Ocean by route of the Missouri and Columbia Rivers with the hope of discovering a continuous water passage to the Pacific for the purpose of commerce. It was from Monticello that Jefferson conceived this idea, and he chose Captain Meriwether Lewis to lead the exploration. Thus began what would become the Lewis and Clark Expedition.

On March 15, 1803, Meriwether Lewis left the President's House in Washington, D.C. and began preparations for his adventures toward the Pacific. He stopped at the arsenal in Harper's Ferry with an authorizing letter from the Secretary of War and purchased items. He proceeded to Philadelphia, where he studied a wide range of scientific topics. Lewis returned to Washington when he wrote to Captain William Clark to enlist his aid and to share command of the expedition.

In Pittsburgh, Lewis had a keelboat constructed and recruited boatmen to man the vessel that would enable him and Clark to make the long journey. Preparations for the expedition, beginning at Monticello and ending in Wood River, Illinois and the return phase beginning in St. Louis and ending in Washington, D.C., included visiting sites in ten States in the East. These States include Virginia, Maryland,

Delaware, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, Indiana and Illinois, as well as the District of Columbia.

Currently, no sites visited in these States are recognized as Lewis and Clark National Historic Landmarks nor are they locations along the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail. I am pleased that Title II of H.R. 3819 implements a study that begins the process towards obtaining recognition for these sites east of the Mississippi.

On January 18, Jefferson's Monticello hosted the commencement of the National Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Commemoration that will continue through 2006. This was the first signature event of the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial, and hopefully, once the study has been completed, the National Park Service will designate Monticello and other parts of the Eastern Legacy as official Lewis and Clark trail sites.

I believe that it is appropriate to include the route followed by Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, whether independently or together, in the preparation and return phases of the expedition. The Eastern Legacy should rightfully be included in the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail. H.R. 3819 is a positive step towards properly recognizing and honoring the Eastern Legacy of the Lewis and Clark Expedition.

THE FAILINGS OF CONGRESS

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, if Congress were to receive a fiscal responsibility report card, there would not be a single passing grade. Congress should receive an "F" for failing when it comes to taking care of our Nation's fiscal security. Congress should receive an "F" for failing to pass a budget resolution conference report.

Both the Senate and the House are controlled by the same party, and yet no agreement was reached on simply setting a budget that Congress should stick to. So much for taking fiscal responsibility seriously.

Congress should receive an "F" for so poorly managing the taxpayers' money that the debt ceiling will have to be raised by over \$8 trillion in just a few short months.

For the third time in 3 years, the majority party needs to increase the debt limit. Last year we saw the largest debt limit increase in history, \$984 billion, Mr. Speaker, and now we are looking at another \$690 billion increase just to keep the Federal Government running.

Congress should receive an "F" for failing to pass spending caps and pay-as-you-go legislation, or PAYGO. Pay-as-you-go is a common-sense piece of legislation that Congress ought to pass if we are going to be serious about putting this fiscal House back in order. Simply put, PAYGO provides the blue-

print for getting our Nation out of the red ink that we are swimming in.

The PAYGO rules Congress and the President enacted in 1990 were an important part in getting a handle on the deficits in the early 1990s and getting the budget back into balance. The pay-as-you-go rules enacted in 1990 have been tested, and they have passed. There is no question that significantly improved the responsibility and accountability of the budget process and were instrumental in getting from large deficits in the 1980s and early 1990s to budget surpluses in the late 1990s.

The one area that this Congress and administration has excelled in is its ability to run up massive amounts of debt. This year alone we are expected to run approximately a \$425 billion deficit, just this year alone, the worst deficit in the United States history, every dime of which must be paid back.

Had Congress and the administration worked in a bipartisan manner with the Blue Dog Coalition, they could have passed a budget and PAYGO. Instead, they forged a partisan path, and the American people are left with neither. The American people deserve a better grade than failure on fiscal responsibility from their elected officials. The President is fond of saying it is the people's money, and he is correct. It is the people's money. And I believe that the people deserve to have our Nation managed in a fiscally responsible manner.

Let us stop playing politics with our financial security. Instead, pass real, meaningful PAYGO legislation and get our Nation's fiscal health back in order.

WERE WE RIGHT TO REMOVE SADDAM?

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, recent reports have done much to identify the mistakes, shortcomings and gaps in U.S. intelligence about Iraq. There is no doubt that the information we had about the weapons programs of Saddam Hussein was incomplete and, to some degree, inaccurate. However, these reports also demonstrate that in a number of respects, U.S. intelligence got it right. Saddam Hussein did possess forbidden weapons, particularly missiles. Saddam and his cronies did indeed have contact and discussions at some level with al Qaeda and various terrorist groups. Terrorists did in fact use Iraq as a sanctuary for training and as a source of supply.

Finally, if British reports are to be believed, President Bush was correct when he warned that Saddam was seeking nuclear material in Africa.

The real question, Mr. Speaker, is not whether U.S. intelligence was perfect, but whether America was right to remove Saddam Hussein from power.

Not so long ago, few Americans professed doubts about removing Saddam. In 1998, President Clinton made regime change in Iraq the goal of U.S. policy. In doing so, he received bipartisan congressional support. When President Bush made the case for war against Saddam in 2002, he, too, received bipartisan support in Congress.

Lest we forget who and what Saddam Hussein was, we should remind ourselves of his actions over the course of his political career. Saddam is a man who launched two regional wars in the Middle East. One cost nearly a million lives. The other required an international military coalition led by the United States to free the victim. Saddam Hussein has actively pursued and employed weapons of mass destruction since the 1980s. He has trained, armed and patronized terrorists of various sorts. He attempted to assassinate a United States President, and his forces routinely tried to down U.S. and allied planes that were responsible for enforcing U.S. sanctioned no-fly zones.

Saddam's crimes and atrocities were not just directed against his neighbors in the international community. The 20-year-plus reign of terror he unleashed against his fellow Iraqis almost defies belief. The countless murders, torture sessions and rapes made him one of the 20th century's most feared and ferocious dictators. He gassed thousands of his own Kurdish citizens, poisoned the environment of those Arab marsh tribes that opposed his rule and looted the country of its wealth. When Saddam's own people rose up against him in 1991 at our urging, he butchered them by the tens of thousands.

When American and Coalition forces finally came to Iraq 12 years later, what did they find? Not, at least yet, stockpiles of WMD. They found something far worse. Dozens of mass graves containing an estimated 400,000 men, women and children murdered by the minions of Saddam Hussein.

I invite my colleagues who so quickly and correctly condemn every shortcoming in the Coalition occupation of Iraq to spend equal time cataloging and criticizing the atrocities of the Hussein regime. If they need any help finding the information, they should talk to the lucky survivors and visit with the thousands of grieving family members who can acquaint them with the full scope of Saddam's crimes.

Once they do, I suspect they will agree with one young American soldier I met while in Iraq. He said, "The real question is not why we came to Iraq but why the whole world was not here years ago."

Would it have been better to leave Saddam in power? In power to do what? To resume his unending efforts to acquire and develop WMDs, to expand, develop and formalize his evolving relationship with al Qaeda and other terrorist groups, to continue murdering his domestic opponents by the thousands?