

The House has voted overwhelmingly to make these tax cuts permanent and has done so without offsets. These votes show that the House does not want to increase taxes on middle-class American families.

Now, if we are serious about looking for a way of balancing this, if we are serious about addressing the deficit, first we need to stimulate the economy to bring down the deficit. We have done that, and it has succeeded. But second of all, if there is an argument here that we should be tying tax cuts to other reductions in spending, or closing some unsubstantial loopholes, then I think that the burden is on the other side as they lay out the instructions to tell us specifically how they think this could be done without pain or without a drag on the economy.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE). Members are reminded to refrain from improper references to the Senate.

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we talk so much in this institution about values; and, specifically, we talk about family values. Fiscal responsibility is a family value. It is a family value we should teach our children; it is a family value we should practice ourselves here in Congress as we do in our homes around the country.

When we stand up here, and I am here in support of the gentleman from Indiana's motion to instruct on H.R. 1308, what this would do is extend tax cuts, extend tax cuts, not raise taxes; so the debate tonight is partially mischaracterizing what this is all about. All we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is that when we extend these tax cuts, we want to employ what Chairman Greenspan recommended the House reinstitute and that is budget rules that say pay for these, find some way to offset these or pay for these tax cuts. That is all we want to do. We want to extend tax cuts, not raise taxes; but we want to do it in a fiscally responsible manner.

As my colleagues know, we have a \$7.3 trillion debt, the highest in our Nation's history; we have a \$422 billion deficit, the highest in our Nation's history. We are paying almost \$1 billion a day in what I call the debt tax, which is the interest on our national debt. It is money that could be used for more tax cuts if we were not paying interest on this huge national debt.

We have got to get back to fiscal responsibility. We have to get back to fiscal sanity. We have to start living like American families do, within a budget. And this should not be about

Democrats and Republicans. This should not be partisan. This should be about the future of our country and not placing a huge unsustainable, unpayable mortgage on the future of our children and grandchildren.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I retain the balance of my time.

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

I will say that when this side of the aisle at one time subscribed to spending caps and pay-as-you-go, now they have abandoned that idea for some reason; but when we did have them in place, we actually went into a surplus. Now that we have abandoned that discipline, we are looking at deficits as far as the eye can see. Mr. Greenspan, his name was evoked tonight, and it was evoked because he believes in pay-as-you-go and spending caps. We have to get real with our budget deficits.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I find this debate we are having this evening most amazing. I was eating breakfast Monday morning with a dear friend of mine. He is a farmer and lives on the bank of the St. Francis River in Clay County, Arkansas. He is full of wisdom. He knows that if you do not make a crop, you cannot pay the bank off. He understands that. We were sitting there eating breakfast just at daylight looking out across some beautiful cotton; and he said, MARION, those guys are not going to know they are broke until they have sold their last chicken. We have already sold our last chicken, and you guys want to just keep borrowing money and borrowing money and piling the debt on top of debt on top of debt on top of my grandchildren.

Like everyone that has grandchildren, I think they are the most special thing, and it breaks my heart to see what you all are doing to them and this country. I do not see how you can continue to deceive yourselves and try to deceive this great Nation by doing that. And you can talk about raising taxes and you can talk about whatever you want to. The bottom line is, you cannot hide from that debt. You got to pay it. You got to pay the interest on it. There is no place to go when it gets so high that nobody can afford it, and we are already there. Yet you want to keep playing these little games. There are lots of things you can say about this, but one thing is for sure: it is irresponsible.

I do not think anybody has children or grandchildren that they do not care a lot about and they love them deeply and they do not want to leave them in debt.

I remember so well when President Bush first came into office and the Blue Dogs reached out to him and said we know you want to cut taxes. We will work with you. We will help you. But let us not get back into that deficit ditch. He sent Vice President CHENEY to the Blue Dog meeting and it took him about 3 minutes to say we

think you are pretty good folks, but we do not need you and we do not care whether you like it or not, we are going to do this, and they did. And they took a \$5 trillion surplus and squandered it. It is gone. There is not a dime left in the trust funds of Medicare, Social Security. They are all gone. It has been spent. And we are deeper in debt today than we have ever been.

Then they sent this little fellow, Mitch Daniels, to explain to the poor, ignorant Blue Dogs that these tax cuts were going to create so much prosperity that our greatest danger in this country was going to be that we would not have any bonds to sell because we were going to be out of debt and we would not have to borrow any money. Not a more ridiculous idea has ever been presented in this building, and there have been some real dandies brought forth.

The fact is, the Nation is bankrupt, the \$5 trillion surplus is squandered, the ability to deal with Medicare and Social Security is gravely threatened, and nobody wants to acknowledge it. It is like, oh, just say it does not matter. Just tell them anything. The American people are smarter than that.

Some day, you guys will figure that out. I hope I am still around when that happens, but I hope my children and grandchildren do not have to pay the bill for it.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I retain the balance of my time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me this time this evening to talk about a very important issue.

Thinking back, it is hard to believe that from 1997 through 2001, this country was running on a balanced budget. It is hard to believe, because in 2002, this country ran a \$155 billion deficit. In 2003, it was \$374 billion. In 2004, it is \$422 billion. Guess what? If you subtract out the money they are borrowing from the Social Security trust fund, it is actually a \$574 billion deficit for fiscal year 2004. It is hard to believe that our Nation today is spending \$900,000 more than it is taking in.

For years, ever since I was a small child I have heard the Republicans talk about how it is the Democrats that spend the money. This is the first time in 50 years that the Republicans have controlled the White House, the House, and the Senate; and for the second year in a row, they have given us the largest budget deficit ever in our Nation's history. The debt today is \$7.3 trillion. By 2009 it will be \$10 trillion, and by 2013, it will be \$13 trillion. A trillion here, a trillion there, and before long we are talking about some real money.

Let me tell my colleagues this. This motion to instruct conferees simply says this: we support tax cuts for working families; we simply want them to be paid for. In other words, if you are

going to cut taxes, cut spending. This Nation today is spending nearly \$1 billion a day simply paying interest on the national debt. It is what I call the debt tax, D-E-B-T, and that is one tax that can never go away until we get fiscal responsibility and fiscal discipline restored to our Nation's government.

We could build 200 brand-new elementary schools every single day in America just with the interest we are paying on the national debt. These tax cuts may make for good politics for the wealthiest 2 percent of the people in the country. The 2003 tax cuts, 60 percent of the people that I represent received less than \$2 a week. A tax cut for the wealthiest people in this country with borrowed money, and, I might add, every single dime of the tax cuts of 2003 were with borrowed money. The money came directly from the Social Security trust fund and what did not come from there came from the Bank of China. That is right. Seventy percent of our deficit in 2003 came from foreigners; 70 percent.

A tax cut for the wealthiest people in this country with borrowed money, money that is coming from Japan, Hong Kong, and the Bank of China and from the Social Security trust fund is nothing more than a tax increase on our children and grandchildren; and it is wrong, and that is why I am pleased to stand here tonight and rise in support of this motion to instruct.

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

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I have only one more speaker, myself, to close; and I would like an understanding from the gentleman how many more speakers he might have.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, we have one more speaker, but that speaker will be making the closing remarks.

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

Mr. Speaker, it has been with great interest that I have listened to the debate tonight. I guess my reaction, in listening to some of the rhetoric from the other side, is that I do not mind much if they steal our clothes when we go in bathing, if they want to look and sound like fiscal conservatives, look and sound like Republicans; that is an understandable thing in today's political climate.

□ 1915

Although I must say, if I were actually to go in swimming and they were to steal my clothes, they might need a little clever tailoring, and, in fact, I think the rhetoric suggests they may need a little clever tailoring if they are to pass themselves off.

I feel very strongly myself that under most circumstances the United States should have a balanced budget, but history tells us, whether Republicans were in charge or whether Democrats were in charge, there is no real example of the United States having maintained a balanced budget during a significant recession.

Second of all, there is no real example of the United States having run a balanced budget during wartime, and over the last few years, as the gentlemen undoubtedly are aware, we have not only been fighting a slowdown, which began during the Clinton administration, which cut into our revenues and began to create the deficit over a couple of years' time, but also, we engaged in the war on terror.

Now, I realize it is controversial on the other side. They are sometimes for the war in Iraq, sometimes against it, even sometimes having misgivings about Afghanistan, but the fact remains, we have made a major investment in our efforts not only to improve homeland security, but also to challenge our adversaries elsewhere in the world. In my view, that has been an investment worth making.

The fact that we have run a deficit does not alarm me as much as some of the rhetoric on the other side seems to suggest alarm. For example, when I came to Congress in 1994, we were approaching a point where our national debt, which was smaller in those days in absolute numbers, but larger relative to the economy, was approaching 44 percent of GDP. Even in that context, realizing that what we needed to do was stimulate the economy, we cut taxes, and we were able to trim spending, and over time the Republican Congress, grappling with a Democratic administration, winning some, losing some, we were able to get to a balanced budget, and we brought down the deficit in relative terms to the economy.

Today, in real terms, our national debt is lower than 40 percent of GDP. It has grown over the last year. Well, we might expect that under the circumstances, but also, the Republican budget has made a commitment to lower the deficit to one-half of what it is currently relative to the economy. That is a powerful commitment that gives us confidence to go forward and cut taxes, which is what we need to do to stimulate the economy and generate more revenues.

There will always be some who would prefer to raise taxes during a slowdown, and we remember the intellectual genesis of their philosophy. This was the argument being made by the Hoover administration. It is odd that we hear some conservative Democrats, or who are wanting to be conservative Democrats, tonight adopting some of the same rhetoric that the Hoover administration embraced during the Depression. Hoover Democrats I do not think is the solution tonight.

I do think what we need to do is continue to stimulate the economy and make permanent the President's tax program. It has been criticized tonight for allegedly giving most of the benefits to the wealthy. Yet the folks on the other side will have difficulty explaining that in the context of the studies which have shown that now the wealthy, since the tax cut, pay a higher proportion of the tax share.

We have increased the progressivity of the American Tax Code in the wake of the tax programs that have passed this House. That is something that is not grasped well on the other side, but it is one of those stubborn facts that takes the sting out of their rhetoric.

The fact is a little more of the share has gone to working families, and this is important. Some families, I realize, may be only \$2 a day, but that means something to them, and I believe it is important that we continue to have that relief in place.

This is, I think, a very important debate. I think it is worth noting that there is fresh evidence that the way to get the deficit down is to grow the economy, because with new estimates, we have found that the deficit has actually shrunk by \$75 billion, \$75 billion over the past few months as we have begun to take into account the recovery of the economy and the growth in revenues.

These, I think, are facts which rebut the argument being made on the other side, but if they were serious about these arguments, I think we would hear some more specifics. We would hear some specifics about the tax shelters that the gentleman from Indiana alluded to, and I am hoping in his close he will perhaps give us some specifics of tax shelters that can be closed, real ones that can generate real revenue or reduce spending. Surely we can have some suggestions from the other side. If they do, contrary to my impression, want to cut spending, perhaps they will prove me wrong and identify some areas where we can save money.

But, at any rate, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Indiana tonight for raising this debate. It has been, from my standpoint, edifying. I have enjoyed it, and I believe also that the House has had an opportunity to see a clear difference here, and I believe as they examine it, they will have an opportunity to vote down this perhaps well-intentioned motion to instruct, but one that I think would be counterproductive at a time when we are trying to get our economy back on the growth path.

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

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

This debate is about to close. In response to my friend from Pennsylvania's comments about the specifics, I would simply say that the Blue Dogs did offer a specific plan. I will not go into that specific plan now for the sake of time, but we put it on the line and asked the House to do it exactly like we have asked them to do it. So we would make the tough choices, and in our budget proposal we made those tough choices.

In many ways I am a little saddened by the debate tonight because I heard my good friend from Pennsylvania talk about the fact that he is not as concerned about the deficit. It did not used to be that way on the other side of the

aisle. This side of the aisle used to be very concerned about the budget deficit. Now it seems like it is less concerned about the budget deficit.

All we are asking for here is to make sure that we pay for these tax cuts as we extend them. That is all we are asking. This side used to believe that. Now they do not. I think they ought to revisit their philosophy because it did produce budget surpluses.

Finally, I would say to the American people who might be listening tonight that I do not think anybody at their kitchen table would ask Congress to borrow the money for tax cuts, and that is what this motion to instruct prevents us from doing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), my good friend.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and my friend from Pennsylvania asked for the specifics.

The Blue Dog budget this year proposed to spend no more than President Bush recommended that the Congress spend, and we intend to stick with that. When my colleague talks about spending and he talks about revising history, in the 8 years prior to the last 3½, spending went up 3.4 percent per year on the average. In the last 3½ years, spending has gone up 10.4 percent.

The gentleman keeps asking for specifics from the minority side. Last time I checked, the minority does not even get recognized for amendments so that we can do some of things that we talked about doing. We were denied having even a vote on some of our budgets over the last 3½ years. The gentleman keeps talking about specifics and rhetoric. His rhetoric does not match the specifics.

We are going to prove unequivocally sometime in the next 2 or 3 months that the economic game plan we are under is not working because we are going to have to vote to increase the credit card limit of the United States of America for the third time in 3 years, this time through \$8 trillion. Yes, the war is expensive and we must pay for the war, but this is the first war in the history of our country that is being fought at the same time we are asking to reduce the amount of money available to make sure the troops have the material that they need in order to fight the war.

If my colleague wants to make that argument, be my guest. All we are suggesting with this simple motion is go back to what worked in 1994, pay-as-you-go. It worked when we were bipartisan working on it. It worked in 1997 when we worked together as Democrats and Republicans. What has happened in the last 3½ years to suggest that, in a bipartisan way, we do not want to follow that which has worked?

That is the fundamental question for this body. I ask for a vote in favor of the gentleman from Indiana's motion. It is returning common sense, pay-as-

you-go, making tough choices; does not raise taxes on anyone. It just says if we are going to increase spending for any worthwhile project, we have got to pay for it; if we are going to cut taxes and increase the deficit, we have got to cut the spending first, not rhetorically, after the next election. Do it now, and my colleagues will find there will be some Blue Dogs working with them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

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

Mr. HILL. 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, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on any motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken tomorrow.

GARRETT LEE SMITH MEMORIAL ACT

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2634) to amend the Public Health Service Act to support the planning, implementation, and evaluation of organized activities involving statewide youth suicide early intervention and prevention strategies, to provide funds for campus mental and behavioral health service centers, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2634

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) More children and young adults die from suicide each year than from cancer, heart disease, AIDS, birth defects, stroke, and chronic lung disease combined.

(2) Over 4,000 children and young adults tragically take their lives every year, making suicide the third overall cause of death between the ages of 10 and 24. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, suicide is the third overall cause of death among college-age students.

(3) According to the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, children and young adults accounted for 15 percent of all suicides completed in 2000.

(4) From 1952 to 1995, the rate of suicide in children and young adults tripled.

(5) From 1980 to 1997, the rate of suicide among young adults ages 15 to 19 increased 11 percent.

(6) From 1980 to 1997, the rate of suicide among children ages 10 to 14 increased 109 percent.

(7) According to the National Center of Health Statistics, suicide rates among Native Americans range from 1.5 to 3 times the national average for other groups, with young people ages 15 to 34 making up 64 percent of all suicides.

(8) Congress has recognized that youth suicide is a public health tragedy linked to underlying mental health problems and that youth suicide early intervention and prevention activities are national priorities.

(9) Youth suicide early intervention and prevention have been listed as urgent public health priorities by the President's New Freedom Commission in Mental Health (2002), the Institute of Medicine's Reducing Suicide: A National Imperative (2002), the National Strategy for Suicide Prevention: Goals and Objectives for Action (2001), and the Surgeon General's Call to Action To Prevent Suicide (1999).

(10) Many States have already developed comprehensive statewide youth suicide early intervention and prevention strategies that seek to provide effective early intervention and prevention services.

(11) In a recent report, a startling 85 percent of college counseling centers revealed an increase in the number of students they see with psychological problems. Furthermore, the American College Health Association found that 61 percent of college students reported feeling hopeless, 45 percent said they felt so depressed they could barely function, and 9 percent felt suicidal.

(12) There is clear evidence of an increased incidence of depression among college students. According to a survey described in the Chronicle of Higher Education (February 1, 2002), depression among freshmen has nearly doubled (from 8.2 percent to 16.3 percent). Without treatment, researchers recently noted that "depressed adolescents are at risk for school failure, social isolation, promiscuity, self-medication with drugs and alcohol, and suicide—now the third leading cause of death among 10–24 year olds."

(13) Researchers who conducted the study "Changes in Counseling Center Client Problems Across 13 Years" (1989–2001) at Kansas State University stated that "students are experiencing more stress, more anxiety, more depression than they were a decade ago." (The Chronicle of Higher Education, February 14, 2003).

(14) According to the 2001 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, 20 percent of full-time undergraduate college students use illicit drugs.

(15) The 2001 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse also reported that 18.4 percent of adults aged 18 to 24 are dependent on or abusing illicit drugs or alcohol. In addition, the study found that "serious mental illness is highly correlated with substance dependence or abuse. Among adults with serious mental illness in 2001, 20.3 percent were dependent on or abused alcohol or illicit drugs, while the rate among adults without serious mental illness was only 6.3 percent."

(16) A 2003 Gallagher's Survey of Counseling Center Directors found that 81 percent were concerned about the increasing number of students with more serious psychological problems, 67 percent reported a need for