

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 353, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 372 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 372

*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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 353) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2003 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2007. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed three hours, with two hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Saxton of New Jersey and Representative Stark of California or their designees. The amendment in the nature of a substitute 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. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. After general debate the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution, as amended, to the House. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 72, noes 333, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

AYES—72

Ackerman Baird Bentsen  
Allen Baldwin Berkley

Bonior  
Boyd  
Brown (FL)  
Carson (OK)  
Clay  
Clyburn  
Conyers  
Coyne  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
Dicks  
Doggett  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Filner  
Frank  
Frost  
Gephardt  
Hastings (FL)  
Hilliard  
Hinchev  
Honda  
Jackson (IL)

Abercrombie  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Andrews  
Armye  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baker  
Balducci  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Becerra  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggart  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Boozman  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown (SC)  
Bryant  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Clayton  
Clement  
Coble  
Collins  
Combest  
Condit  
Cooksey  
Costello  
Cox  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom

NOES—333

Deal  
DeGette  
DeLahunt  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Engel  
English  
Etheridge  
Everett  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fossella  
Frelinghuysen  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Grucci  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hart  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Hooley  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof

Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rodriguez  
Roybal-Allard  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Schakowsky  
Scott  
Slaughter  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Towns  
Velazquez  
Waters  
Watson (CA)  
Woolsey  
Wynn

Hunter  
Hyde  
Inslee  
Isakson  
Israel  
Istook  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (IL)  
Jones (NC)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kerns  
Kildee  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
LaHood  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Lynch  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Mascara  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
Meehan  
Menendez  
Mica  
Miller, Dan  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, Jeff  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney

Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obeyes  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Paul  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Portman  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ross  
Roukema

Blagojevich  
Carson (IN)  
Dooley  
Emerson  
Evans  
Gutierrez  
Issa  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Klecicka

Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schaffer  
Schiff  
Schrock  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stump  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sununu  
Sweeney  
Tancredo

NOT VOTING—29

Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller, George  
Moran (VA)  
Oxley  
Platts  
Riley  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rothman  
Rush

□ 1316

Mr. WEXLER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 353, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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 on the matter before us.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 372 is a closed rule which has been crafted to bring forward the annual Congressional budget resolution. While this differs in some ways from years past, it does reflect the fact that the previous 6 months has been anything but typical in the United States of America. As with all legislation considered by this body in the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks, we have found ourselves in a unique situation where the traditional way of doing things has

been modified by both sides to meet the more important priorities of a Nation fighting a war.

I am very pleased that the motion to adjourn and the one that preceded it both showed that even though there were 77 Members, or 72 Members in the second vote of the loyal opposition who do want to adjourn, that on a large bipartisan basis, most of this body wants to get on with this important work of the budget, and I think it is in that bipartisan spirit that we present this rule.

For a number of years, we have gotten into the admirable habit of managing debate on the budget by asking that all amendments be drafted in the form of substitutes so that Members could consider the whole picture as we debate and weigh spending priorities, which is, after all, our first mission here. Although we set out to continue that practice this year, unfortunately no real alternatives were offered.

While some may claim and some will claim that some near substitutes were offered, the proposals were actually modifications to process rather than substance, and they in no way qualified as full substitutes.

Despite rhetoric that I am sure we will hear as we always do in this particular debate that states otherwise, this rule provides a healthy forum for debate of our Nation's budget, and that is what we will be about this afternoon. It provides for 3 hours of general debate with 2 hours confined to the Congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. Additionally, 1 hour of what we call Humphrey-Hawkins debate on the subject of economic goals and policies will be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), the House chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Joint Economics respectively.

The rule further waives all points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution and provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole, and the rule permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to offer amendments in the House to achieve mathematical consistency.

Finally, the rule provides that the concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for a or division the question of its adoption. So this is a fair rule. It is a practical rule and it fits the circumstances that we have today very well.

Mr. Speaker, in previous years the beginning of the budget season was a time when Members of this body would show the full color of their beliefs. Like in that other great rite of spring, the growth of the cherry blossoms, Washington explodes with new life and

vividness as the great budgetary debates began, and we heard lots of good ideas. We argued over what programs should grow, what should prosper, what should be cut. We disagreed about how much money should be used to pay down debts and how much should be given back to the citizens, and we debated about lockboxes and highway funds, and in short, we argued about what are the proper responsibilities of the government, how do we go about our spending.

In all my years on Capitol Hill I have seldom met a Member of this body who did not believe that security and defense are among the most basic and essential duties of government, and that is what this budget is about, our national security. In fact, this budget is about three types of security.

First, it is about fiscal security for the Nation. This budget increases our defense spending by 13 percent so that well-paid, well-trained and well-equipped soldiers can defeat and deter all those who wish to harm the United States of America and its citizens at home and abroad.

The budget also provides \$38 billion for new homeland defense spending. This money will be used to monitor our borders, improve intelligence collection, secure airports and better equip first responders for acts of terrorism, and indeed, we have seen some amazing heroic acts from those first responders.

Second, this budget is about economic security. It continues to pay down the national debt and retains important tax cuts for families and businesses. Additionally, this budget provides money for investments in energy, transportation and agriculture. Collectively, these measures will ensure that our economy continues to turn the corner away from recession and towards sustained prosperity.

Thirdly, this budget is about personal security. It secures the commitments that our government has made to its citizens. It increases spending for veterans programs, and in my district that is particularly welcome news. It increases spending for education funding, for Medicare costs and environmental needs, and of course, Social Security is protected.

All of America's most important social spending programs are maintained and increased under this budget. In total this \$2.1 trillion budget the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has put together meets all of America's long-standing commitments while it greatly increases funds for programs that will safeguard the lives of our families, our neighbors, our fellow citizens in this time of unusual peril.

Many may try to argue that this is the first deficit budget in recent years or that some favorite project of theirs is not sufficiently funded. Many will even try to claim both of these at the same time, and it is true that some projections show we will run a modest deficit this year, but in the last 6 months our Nation has been through

war and recession. The small deficit we may face this year is a minor cost considering the urgency of defense needs and given the fact that all major social programs are fully funded.

Further, most budget experts agree that for the rest of the decade after this emergency year we can expect increasing budget surpluses.

When I speak to my constituents back home in southwest Florida, the last thing in the world they are concerned about is which political party scored points in this debate today. What matters to them now is that their government steps up and does the job that it was created to do to protect their lives and their liberty. It is our duty to give the American people a budget that does precisely that.

This is a fair rule to bring forward, an excellent budget. I urge passage of the rule.

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

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this closed rule. I oppose the cynicism it embraces and the contempt it demonstrates for honest debate. With this rule, the Republican leadership has blocked amendments offered by Democrats, all in an effort to adapt a flawed and disingenuous budget.

Our side of the aisle has made clear that the President has the firm support of this caucus when it comes to waging war on terrorism, and as a ninth generation American whose ancestors have fought in every United States conflict since the Revolutionary War, I am keenly aware of the sacrifices that war calls for.

I am also keenly aware that national security does not abrogate us from pursuing the priorities important to the country. Mr. Speaker, we have promised to keep. Generations of Americans have poured billions of dollars into Social Security and Medicare with the promise that these vital programs would be there for them when they and their loved ones retired. This body has voted five separate times to put Social Security and Medicare in a lockbox and throw away the key. Yet this budget resolution breaks that promise.

Indeed, the measure before us wipes out most of the Social Security surplus and decimates all of the Medicare surplus over the next 5 years. Thirty-two million retirees rely on Social Security income, and that number is increasing every day.

Mr. Speaker, I am still stunned that we have fallen so far so fast. In less than a year a surplus of \$5.6 trillion shrank by \$4 trillion. This is the worst fiscal reversal in American history and

for what? A single-minded obsession with tax cuts that overwhelmingly benefit the very wealthy in this Nation, and do not be fooled by today's rhetoric. The negative impact of the budget priorities of the majority were already stinging many Americans well before the tragedy that unfolded September 11. In fact, 43 percent of the surplus was already gone by then due to the tax cut.

Why then in the midst of this fiscal problem do we now hear that the leadership in the House is demanding further tax cuts a month from now? Why are we jeopardizing the Nation's future for a press hit during tax time?

This administration and leadership of the body has squandered an extraordinary opportunity for reasons largely unrelated to the war. The budget reverses a decade of fiscal progress and takes the country back down a perilous path of unending deficits. From 2002 through 2012, budget surpluses are converted into budget deficits, and Social Security and Medicare trust funds are raided with abandon.

Mr. Speaker, virtually every independent analysis of this budget has dubbed it a sham. It omits numbers in the second 5 years even though we have employed 10-year projections since Congress passed the Balanced Budget Act. Even more ominously this resolution uses OMB rather than CBO estimates in an effort to hide the real impact of the budget. Instead of relying on Congress' nonpartisan CBO estimates, the majority chose to use the much rosier estimates provided by the administration's political appointees at OMB.

My colleagues may recall that in 1995 the other side shut down the government to insist on the use of CBO estimates. If CBO should prove correct rather than OMB, virtually the entire Social Security surplus will be gone for the next 10 years.

At the very least the Committee on Rules should have allowed an amendment by Mr. MORAN to pull in the reins on deficit spending to allow us to return to fiscal responsibility. The committee should have allowed the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) to offer his substitute, which simply used realistic CBO cost estimates to shape the Nation's budget.

Moreover, Democrats had hoped to offer amendments on a host of issues. In addition to undermining Social Security and Medicare, the resolution woefully underfunds education, a prescription drug benefit, efforts to fight HIV and AIDS. The list goes on and on.

This close ruled kills honest debate on these and other issues.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), a member of the committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) for allowing me a few minutes to talk

about the budget, the Republican budget, that has run through committee.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) in that committee has done a fabulous job and I want to talk about some of the great things that this budget does.

First of all, as the parent of a child with Down's syndrome, I am very pleased to know that we are going to continue providing schools with money for IDEA. It is important that this Congress understand that IDEA and the education of our children is important. We have increased funding.

We have made sure that as we go through this budget that we make sure that not one penny has been taken from Medicare, Medicaid or Social Security. Last night in the Committee on Rules, I had an opportunity to speak with not only the chairman of the Committee on the Budget but also the ranking member and asked the question specifically, is there one penny that we have taken out? That answer is no.

We have continued to make sure we pay down debt. We have continued to make sure that veterans receive not only an increase of the money we give them but that we continue to focus on the efficiency of those programs.

We make sure in this budget that not only do we talk about homeland security, which is probably the number one issue combined with winning the war, but we fully fund those requests that come from our President to make sure that those things happen with making sure the military and homeland security gets their money.

We are making sure that we do things to support funding of not only education and homeland security but we are also making sure that we are giving the money to NIH. NIH funding has doubled now since 1996. We are making sure that we take care of the needs of a growing Nation, a Nation that needs NIH to solve and give us cures related to medicine.

□ 1330

So what we are doing in this budget is going through and making sure that the priorities of this Nation are taken care of. We are increasing funding some places, but we are making sure that homeland security and the defense of this country is taken care of. At a time when we are at war, what we are doing is not having deficit spending. We are making sure that we end with a balance here. And at a time when increasingly it is more and more difficult to find enough money to keep spending, we are making sure that priorities are taken care of.

I am proud of not only what this Republican bill does, but last night we heard from the other side, the Democrats, that they do not intend to offer a budget. I think it is very insincere for someone to come and attack you for doing the heavy lifting when in fact they do not present their own budget. It is easy to attack one piece or another,

one place or another, but when you put together an entire budget, which is what we have done, I think it deserves the support of this House, and that is what I support.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. I speak as the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, and I speak with those who wear the uniform of our country in mind.

The vote on this resolution might well be the most important national defense vote cast this year. In my opinion, the rule that is being offered today shortchanges national defense. Let me explain.

The top line that is recommended is a \$48 billion increase. I think that is fine. We have needed that for some time. However, there is a \$10 billion so-called reserve fund that we are not allowed to appropriate. My amendment that was offered at the Committee on Rules, and that was denied, would fix that flaw and fix that error. So what this amounts to is a \$10 billion zero, a cut in the proposed figure of \$48 billion down to a \$38 billion increase.

Under the Constitution, our duty is clear: article one, section 8 requires that the Congress of the United States raise and maintain the military. We cannot delegate that duty, as is proposed in this rule and in this resolution. We cannot give it to anyone else, the Secretary of Defense, though he is a fine man; the President, or anyone else. As Harry Truman once said, and the little sign said on his desk: "The buck stops here." The buck stops on national security and national defense right with us.

I cannot offer, as a result of the Committee on Rules' denial of my amendment, a pay increase that should equal the pay increase that the soldiers and those in uniform received last year. They cannot receive the military construction money that is needed. And just today, General Joe Ralston revealed in testimony and showed us in pictures the dilapidated family housing that our people live in in Europe. We need more Navy ships, ammunition, and unfunded requirements.

It is our duty. It is not a political thing; it is our duty under the Constitution to vote against this rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time that remains on either side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 20 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York has 22½ minutes remaining.

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

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Since September 11, Americans have united in historic fashion, pulling together as a national family to face down the new dangers of terrorism, and Democrats remain committed to ensuring our troops have all the resources they need to win the war on terrorism. There is no partisan debate over defending America. But that is not the only challenge facing us right now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I can only assume that my friends on the other side of the aisle are great fans of Lewis Carroll. You remember Lewis Carroll. He is the fellow who wrote "Alice in Wonderland." We have a situation where down is up and up is down. Republicans say, oh, we do not touch the Social Security surplus. We do not take a penny out of Social Security. Well, down is up and up is down, my colleagues, because, in fact, this budget uses \$1 trillion of the Social Security and Medicare surplus the first 5 years and \$2 trillion over a 10-year period.

Over the past 12 years, America has fallen into a very deep and dangerous budgetary hole, one that poses a great threat to Social Security and other priorities like education, prescription drugs, and homeland security. Since Republicans passed their budget last year, America has lost \$5 trillion of the proposed surplus. That is nearly 90 percent of our national nest egg down the drain.

Mr. Speaker, last year, we were planning to pay off America's national debt. This year, the Bush administration wants to increase the debt ceiling so all Americans can go deeper into debt. Before last year, we were using the Social Security surplus to strengthen Social Security. In fact, this House overwhelmingly passed five different lock boxes, pledging not to spend Social Security on other government programs. But this year, Republicans have broken their promise to America and offered a budget that raids Social Security in each of the next 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one way to dig ourselves out of this hole and that is by working together as a national family to restore fiscal responsibility and honest budgeting. That is how families across the country operate. They sit down at the kitchen table and take an honest look at their expenses, their debts, and their income. Mr. Speaker, that is why Democrats have repeatedly urged Republicans to forget politics as usual and join us at the negotiating table to work out a bipartisan budget.

Unfortunately, Republicans refuse to even acknowledge the mess they have made or the threat it poses to Social Security. Instead, their budget cooks the books yet again and tries to pass off another bad check on the American people. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are hiding behind budget gimmicks and accounting tricks that no self-respecting accountant would stomach, unless he worked for Enron.

Republicans are desperate, Mr. Speaker. They are desperate to hide

the fact that the Republican budget is a trillion dollar raid on Social Security, one that still increases the debt and shortchanges priorities like education and prescription drugs. Additionally, as the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) have pointed out, Republicans are seriously shortchanging health care for veterans and military retirees.

Vote "no" on the rule and "no" on the budget.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Charlotte, North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), the hub of most good flights going to Florida these days, and a member who does great work on our Committee on Rules.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I think over this next period of hours we are going to be hearing a lot of rhetoric about Social Security and what is happening to Social Security. It seems to be the keynote of the day.

I just wanted to commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for what he has done in bringing this budget forward.

I came here, like a lot of others, in 1995, with the commitment that we are going to balance the budget; and in 1997 we were able to achieve that, and we have been doing that every year since. And Chairman NUSSLE is keeping us on that path.

We have paid down debt; and, yes, we can move the numbers around, people seem to be good at that, but we have paid down almost a half trillion dollars in debt so far, and that is really a good start. We are going to be paying down more, and we have a commitment to continue to do that as well as protecting Social Security over these next few years.

And I will say that anybody who is receiving Social Security today, or is close to receiving Social Security or Medicare, should not be misled in any way by people saying, oh well, it is not going to be there for them. They are perfectly fine. We are talking about the future, which we are going to be working on.

I cannot help but make the comment that if previous leaderships over the past 30 years, before we took over in 1995, had not spent the Social Security surplus specifically for other government programs, they used it every year, if that had not happened, that money would still be there and we would not be having any argument whatsoever of whether there was enough money for Social Security. That point seems to get lost when we are doing debate.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to bring that to everyone's attention and again commend Chairman NUSSLE for the good job he has done in protecting our future with the war and our homeland defense and our economic security; and I urge my colleagues to vote

"yes" on the rule and "yes" on the budget.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) my colleague on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this budget is a case study in poor leadership and fiscal management. It serves as an example of what goes wrong when you fail to think ahead.

Mr. Speaker, the general theme of this year's budget resolution is a reckless disregard for the obvious. After all, the resolution does not account for the last 5 years of last year's tax cut, and it certainly does not account for real CBO numbers.

What the majority's figures do account for is a more than 5 percent cut in nondefense related spending and an additional \$28 billion in tax cuts. They account for a 16 percent shortchanging of "leave no child behind," and they account for the elimination of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

The resolution also accounts for cuts in health care, law enforcement, energy production, environmental protection, not enough money for election reform, housing for the elderly, the capital fund for housing, homeless assistance cuts; and all the way across the board we find this.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, what has happened is the lock box has been unlocked, thrown away, retooled, and made into an ATM machine.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for the purpose of a colloquy with a colleague.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to engage in a short colloquy with the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget.

It is my desire to clarify where the increase in the money authorized for health-related spending will go. I would like to stress the importance of providing funding for the Center for Disease Control buildings and facilities in respect to winning the war on terrorism.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would be pleased to enter into that colloquy with the very distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

One of today's most serious potential threats to our national security is bioterrorism. The CDC is a major and integral part of the homeland defense because of its ability to identify, classify, and recommend courses of action in dealing with biological and chemical threats.

In addition to working in asbestos-laden facilities, many highly trained

scientists perform their research in facilities that lack safety features, such as sprinkler systems and adequate electrical and air flow systems, and, as a result, limits the agency's ability to recruit and retain the world-class scientists.

The multiyear master plan, put together by the CDC for adding to and replacing infrastructure at its Atlanta location, has received wide bipartisan support in the House and the Senate. Addressing the deficiencies will greatly benefit all Americans. It will enhance CDC's ability to respond to emergencies as well as provide the desperately needed facilities required for day-to-day public health and research activities.

Last year, we provided \$250 million for upgrading out-of-date equipment and restore dilapidated facilities at CDC. The CDC needs an additional \$300 million to provide the 4th year of construction funding for a new infectious disease laboratory, which will include greatly needed bio-safety level-four hot labs, construction of a new environmental toxicology lab, and greatly needed security updates.

The budget resolution for fiscal year 2003 calls for \$223.5 billion in health-related spending, which is a \$22.8 billion increase from the \$200.7 billion in fiscal year 2002. It is my understanding that fiscal year 2003 total spending for HHS's bioterrorism efforts would rise to \$4.3 billion, an increase of \$1.3 billion above the 2002 level. These funding levels will support critical homeland security initiatives. This includes funding for improvement to buildings and facilities at CDC.

Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman clarify that the increase in health funding would include improvements and modernization of facilities at CDC?

□ 1345

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. The budget resolution assumes \$4.3 billion to counter the threat of bioterrorism. Emphasis, I believe, should be given to hospitals and other public health facilities, research and development, and it does accommodate the Georgia CDC lab in Atlanta.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, can the gentleman clarify that the budget resolution will accommodate at least \$300 million of the \$4.3 billion for improvements to the buildings and facilities at the CDC in Atlanta, Georgia, an amount that was authorized in the bioterrorism bill passed by the House and the Senate last year?

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct, it would accommodate for a facility such as the gentleman has described in Atlanta, Georgia, \$300 million for CDC.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his clarification of this matter.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all, whatever this Congress does, we have to respect funding for national security. But while protecting ourselves from foreign enemies, we should fund programs that protect seniors and children, too. This budget fails to protect children or senior citizens.

In fact, according to this chart, this budget spends the Social Security surplus and the Medicare surplus for the next 10 years. For the next 3 years, we go into deficit spending over and above the surpluses in Medicare and Social Security. More than 40 million Americans are without health insurance, and yet there is nothing in this budget that does anything for them. There is no prescription drug benefit for seniors. The expectation of the cost is \$750 billion. This budget does not even make a down payment on that.

Many States like Texas have trouble funding its SCHIP program which provides health care for children. There is nothing in this budget that allows the \$3 billion for our States to have insurance for our children. To cap this off, the government is backing deficit spending for 3 years, and for the next 10 with Medicare and Social Security, as Members can see from this chart.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and would like to identify another reason for opposing this rule. We need to have a credible plan to get back to the balanced budget without relying on the Social Security Trust Fund once we have gotten control over this war on terrorism that the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has alluded to and pulled out of this recession.

This budget resolution provides no such credible plan. A trigger, which a number of us offered which received a Republican vote in the Committee on the Budget, stated that next year the House had to produce a budget resolution that put the budget in balance without using the Social Security Trust Fund, and it had to be a 5-year plan. There is no such provision in this bill today. We are headed down a path without regard to how we are going to debate spending and tax cut proposals as far as how it impacts our ability to get back to a balanced budget, to pay down the debt, to help keep interest rates low, to prepare Medicare and Social Security for its future solvency when the baby boomers begin to retire in 2006.

Mr. Speaker, we need a plan. This budget resolution does not do it. The trigger is such a plan, and it ought to be part of a debate we have today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to speak against this rule. I and my moderate Blue Dog colleagues sought to present

a reasonable, bipartisan alternative that would have adopted the majority's budget, but would have required us in Congress to do what every American with a bank book is required to do, and that is to keep it balanced.

This rule does not allow for discussion of a bipartisan alternative. It does not allow for discussion about prescription drugs for seniors. It does not allow for discussion about squandering our surplus, or allow for a full debate on avoiding a raid on the Social Security and Medicare trust funds every year for the next 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly voted with my Republican friends and with the President when I felt that they were reaching across party lines to develop bipartisan consensus on real problems. I had hoped that we would be able to do that with this budget and this rule, but this rule does not provide for that. It is unfair. It is undemocratic. It is the majority's way or no way; and on that basis we should defeat this rule and come back and develop true bipartisan consensus on a balanced budget, a strong defense and meets the needs of working families.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this budget. We have led on our side. We have a plan to protect Social Security. We have a plan to prosecute the war and provide for tax relief for Americans.

The other side's leadership has ordered them not to produce a budget. The gentleman from South Carolina is a very fine Member of Congress who would have been able to put together a good alternative had he been allowed to. But instead, there is no plan on the other side. When we look at the options, the options are to raise taxes, cut defense spending, go further into debt. We have no leadership on the other side. Thank goodness our majority has led on this topic.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I take a back seat to no one in support of a strong budget and increased intelligence spending, but these priorities can and should be met in the context of a balanced budget with balanced priorities. I voted for such a budget over a decade, and each time that budget has been supported by the Blue Dogs, of which I am a Member. One does not have to be from the South, unless we count southern California, or a male, to be a Blue Dog, and I proudly am one and proudly support a fiscally responsible budget.

This time, for the first time, the Blue Dog proposal has not been made in order, and so we do not have on the table and we will not be able to vote for a balanced budget proposal with balanced priorities.

I strongly oppose this rule. I strongly oppose the notion that many of us on a

bipartisan basis are not in favor of balanced budgets. I think as we talk about homeland security, we can only achieve that in a context of economic security which we risk destroying by this vote today. Vote "no" on this rule.

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am here to oppose the rule. The President has asked for bipartisanship, and I have bent over backwards to be bipartisan. In fact, I voted for the President's tax cut last year. When we were asked to be bipartisan, we have tried. In fact, a group of us, the Blue Dogs, submitted a substitute budget using all of the numbers in the Republican budget with two differences: One, that we used Congressional Budget Office numbers, the same numbers used for the last 10 years, not switching numbers; number two, that we added a midyear review in August in case the projections do not come out the way that we hope they will.

So when we hear a Member on the other side say there was not an alternative or substitute budget submitted, it is not true. They can say black is white, but it does not make it true. They have the votes, and they denied our substitute budget. They denied us the opportunity to present a substitute budget. They know that the numbers do not add up.

Mr. Speaker, why is a review important? Because Congress right now is in the Social Security funds and will be in \$200 billion by the end of the next fiscal year, and \$1 trillion over the next 10 years if things are not changed. Under the present budget and the proposal, it is a trillion dollars into Social Security funds over the next 10 years. I voted for the tax cut. I want a chance to work with the other side on a bipartisan manner, but it is not happening. We reached out to them and basically were slapped in the face.

I wish we could start this over because we could work together given half an even and fair chance. The President and the Secretary of Treasury has asked for a \$750 billion increase in the debt limit. That is a \$750 billion blank check. I think Congress has a responsibility to make sure that we oversee the use of that money and not write blank checks or provide blank checks to any person.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) invoked my name, and let me assure the gentleman, I am a free agent. I am comfortable with the decision that our caucus has made and our leadership has made. Frankly, we tried to produce a budget resolution, and we found to have a competing resolution on the floor and an apples-to-apples comparison, we would have to use the gimmicks and the devices the other side used to get the results they achieve. We did not want to do that for a couple

of reasons, not the least of which we did not want to go to 5 years. We think a 10-year budget is proper. We did not want to use OMB, as complacent as they can be sometimes in helping Members get the bottom line that they want. We wanted to stick with the Congressional Budget Office, the neutral and nonpartisan group.

Mr. Speaker, for these and many other reasons, we decided not to do a budget resolution; but there will be a Democratic resolution. It will be presented in the other body by Senator CONRAD.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying legislation. As a member of the Committee on Rules and the Committee on the Budget, I congratulate the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) on a fair rule, for allowing for open debate, and for the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for producing a wartime budget that recognizes the need to secure our homeland, win the war on terror, and bolster our economy.

By providing record increases in defense spending, providing for greater intelligence networking and funding antiterrorism measures, our budget takes a comprehensive approach to winning the war on terror.

By including funds for aviation security, defending against biological attacks, and securing America's borders, our budget makes homeland defense our highest priority. By allowing American taxpayers to keep \$66 billion more of their own money during the next 5 years through economic stimulus tax relief, our budget helps stabilize and secure our economy.

Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion lately about the importance of a balanced budget. I have always been a strong proponent of balanced budgets; but even proponents of proposals for balanced budget constitutional amendments like we addressed several years ago, those allow flexibilities when emergencies occur. Surely this time of national emergency, war and economic distress more than justifies temporary budget flexibility.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight four aspects of this resolution which are of particular interest to my area of the Pacific Northwest: First, as chairman of the House Nuclear Cleanup Caucus, I am pleased that the Committee on the Budget has included my provision to set the Department of Energy's nuclear cleanup budget at \$6.7 billion for next year, and a total of \$1.1 billion to be available to fully implement the Department of Energy's accelerated cleanup effort.

Second, by including bipartisan language authored by myself and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY),

our budget highlights local fish recovery efforts in the Pacific Northwest. People in central Washington and throughout the region are dedicated to ensuring the survival of our salmon. It is crucial that the Federal Government and Pacific Northwest residents continue to work together to address the entire range of factors impacting fish populations.

Further, this budget serves our growers and farmers by fully providing for the expansion of the Market Access Program included in the House farm bill. Funding for this program will more than double from \$90 million to \$200 million in order to open new markets and expand trade opportunities for American agricultural products.

Finally, the budget resolution provides \$700 million in additional borrowing authority for the Bonneville Power Administration. This additional borrowing authority is supported on a bipartisan basis by all Members from the Pacific Northwest.

□ 1400

This increase will be used to assist the BPA in upgrading and building transmission lines that are urgently needed. I am pleased that this resolution fully funds the President's request for additional borrowing authority.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and the underlying resolution.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, if there is anything bipartisan about this budget resolution, it is probably our mutual displeasure with it. I do not think anyone is satisfied with this budget. And even if my colleagues on the other side accept the bottom line, that this budget resolution will run a real deficit and then continue to spend Social Security and Medicare dollars to pay for general government for years to come, I would say this year's partisan budget process does not permit a single substantive amendment, not in the Budget Committee, not in the Rules Committee, not on the House floor.

I mention only one. Yesterday, I asked the Rules Committee to make in order an amendment that would have made improvements to this budget, specifically to increase our investment in research and development. It was not allowed. This budget resolution does provide increased funding for the National Institutes of Health, but it does not provide enough funding for general scientific research and development through the National Science Foundation and other agencies. The NSF, the National Science Foundation, provides the backbone for the science and the scientists that are necessary to ensure that this Nation remains a leader. In other words, if the NIH investment is going to pay off, we need to make an investment in the other areas of science research and development.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 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 thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I take to the floor in the strongest possible opposition to this unfair rule. I cannot believe my colleagues on this side that can stand up and say, "Support this fair rule."

But the first thing I want to say today is let the record clearly state, and I could not agree more, that Congress must join the President to provide for the security of our Nation, our troops, our law enforcement officials, and everyone else who is fighting the war on terrorism. We agree. However, it is cowardly, not patriotic, to use this vitally important priority for all of us as a scapegoat for abandoning all fiscal responsibility and the budget process in the pursuit of this unfair rule.

As a member of the minority, I do not expect I am going to win very often on the floor. But I do expect the majority to show a modicum of respect for the democratic process, if not for Democrats. To have every single Democratic amendment, both a complete substitute as well as numerous single bullet amendments, completely shut out of the debate is outrageous. What really bothers me about this, I remember the times in the last 23 years in which I have stood up with you on this side of the aisle when you were in the minority and demanded that you have an opportunity to have your amendments on the floor and debated and usually I was with you.

But yesterday the Rules Committee said "no" to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), and myself when under the rules that you sent to us, we brought you a complete substitute and you said, "No, we do not wish to allow you to have 1 hour of debate on a substitute." We offered the good hand of friendship to you and you said "no." That is your privilege. That is your privilege. You can do so. But it is not just a few Blue Dogs or the Democrats who have a problem. The majority seems determined to ignore it, but they have the same problem that needs to be solved and that is a deficit.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, that denied me an opportunity to have debate.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that in the testimony that the gentleman from Texas gave yesterday before the Committee on Rules, he made it very clear that what he was offering was, and this is a direct quote, "a perfecting amendment to the chairman's budget." That is how he described what did come forward, he said as a substitute. He described it as a

perfecting amendment to the chairman's budget. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. STENHOLM. I take back my time from the chairman and say that these are the rules of the House. The Rules Committee said to all people who brought a rule, "Bring a budget that is scored by CBO." We did. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) did not bring a budget to the Committee on Rules scored by CBO. You ignored your own rules in allowing the gentleman from Iowa to come forward with an OMB-scored when your rules and what you instructed me to do is come CBO-scored. You chose to ignore it, which you can do. You can waive any rule any time you want to in the majority. But let me remind the gentleman that the chickens will come home to roost.

You are going to have to vote to borrow \$750 billion, and it is going to be more than that with the economic game plan you folks are on. You are going to get to stand up and provide 218 votes to increase the debt ceiling when we could have been with you and we offered to be with you in a bipartisan way to the President saying, We do not have to resort to games; we can do it under the rules of the House and we can do it bipartisanship. But no thanks, you did not want any part of that.

There is justice in this world, and you are going to get a chance pretty soon to borrow that money in an up and down vote and explain why you are doing it when you could have had something better.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield again such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for a colloquy.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa on H. Con. Res. 353, the fiscal year 2003 House budget resolution.

Mr. NUSSLE. I am pleased to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. First of all, I would like to commend Chairman NUSSLE of the Committee on the Budget for bringing this resolution to the floor. I am very pleased with the cooperative working relationship that has developed between our two committees.

As you know, the President's budget proposes an \$8.6 billion, or 27 percent, reduction in highway funding, from \$31.8 billion in fiscal year 2002 to \$23.2 billion in fiscal year 2003. Most of this proposed decrease in funding is based on the revenue-aligned budget authority provision of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, otherwise known as TEA-21, which I continue to support in principle. However,

it is simply too harmful to our State transportation budgets and our economy to allow such a dramatic funding cut to take place next year. Therefore, my goal has been to restore the highway program to a reasonable, sustainable funding level of at least \$27.7 billion, which is the funding level envisioned by fiscal year 2003 in TEA-21. Any language to the contrary in the report accompanying H. Con. Res. 353 does not accurately reflect my views on this subject.

My position on this issue is made clear in H.R. 3694, the Highway Funding Restoration Act. H.R. 3694 calls for highway funding of not less than \$27.7 billion in fiscal year 2003. The words "not less than" are profoundly important to me and the 315 cosponsors of the legislation. This is a fluid process, and I reserve the right of my committee to move this bill or some version of it in the future if necessary. If it becomes clear to me that the highway trust fund can sustain a higher funding level and at that time there is significant support for restoring more than \$4.4 billion in fiscal year 2003, then I will actively support a further increase in highway funding. The budget resolution adds \$4.4 billion for highways and highway safety, thereby increasing funding for the highway program to \$27.7 billion. This is a significant improvement over the President's budget. For that and other reasons, I support the resolution and urge my colleagues, on my committee especially, to do likewise.

I would like to clarify my views with the gentleman from Iowa and ask if there is anything in H. Con. Res. 353 that would preclude adding more than \$4.4 billion to the highway program at some point in the future.

Mr. NUSSLE. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and also for the cooperation between our committees. I agree with the gentleman from Alaska that there is nothing in this resolution that would preclude adding more than \$4.4 billion to the highway program under certain circumstances. For instance, such a further increase could be possible if conference negotiations with the Senate result in a higher funding level for highways or if the Appropriations Committee, as an example, would allocate additional outlays to its transportation subcommittee by reducing outlays in some other function.

I understand the gentleman will continue to work with the Budget Committee to help modify the caps, including those for highways and transit to, among other things, accommodate the additional transportation spending and to smooth out the year-to-year fluctuations in the revenue adjustments made under the RABA provision of TEA-21. I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on this.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I will

work with him as I have told him before not only on the floor but in private to provide both the general purpose and transportation caps to, among other things, reflect the increase in highway spending. I want to thank the gentleman again for his good work.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, all of us have to vote against this rule, because all of us have voted to do so. Unless you were just elected in the past year, every single one of us have voted to protect Social Security and Medicare if at all possible. I offered the most reasonable amendment you could imagine, a trigger amendment. All it said was that we will give you a pass this year but beginning next year, if the Congressional Budget Office tells us that we are operating at a deficit, that we will have to dip into Social Security trust funds, then the Budget Committee has to produce a path, a budget plan over 5 years to bring us back into balance without using Social Security. That is all it does. If you vote against the rule, you are saying that you are letting off the Budget Committee from coming up with a 5-year plan that is not based upon raiding Social Security trust funds. And this budget does do that. That is the problem with this budget.

There is a \$224 billion deficit in this year's budget that is paid for by Social Security Trust Funds. Over the next 5 years, \$830 billion comes out of the Social Security trust funds. Over the next 10 years, \$1.6 trillion is going to come from Social Security trust funds. All we are saying is that as of next year, if you find that we are still operating at a deficit, give us a plan, a 5-year plan that will enable us to be good to our word, because five times we have voted for the lock box. Five times. 228 Republicans have voted for the lock box, saying we are not going to use Social Security to balance the budget. Yet here we are today, about to do exactly what we promised never to do.

If you vote for the rule, you are rejecting an amendment that simply said give us a 5-year plan to get out of the reliance upon Social Security trust funds. Let us balance this budget with general funds revenue, not take it from the trust funds, not put the burden on our children to have to come up with our retirement and our Medicare health funds. That is all we are asking for, to be good to our word. We are on record. We gave allowances if we are at a time of war. Or in a weak economy, it does not apply. But all things being equal, the Budget Committee has a responsibility to bring us to balance over 5 years without depending upon the trust funds. And if for no other reason, you need to support that and vote against this rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I again yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the very distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee for yielding.

I rise to engage the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee in a colloquy.

Mr. NUSSLE. I am pleased to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the budget resolution includes a reserve fund for highways and highway safety. My reading of the relevant provisions indicates to me that if the Appropriations Committee reports a bill with obligation limitations for programs within the highway category in excess of \$23.864 billion, then you as the chairman of the Budget Committee may increase the allocation for outlays for the highway program if the Appropriations Committee bill allocates the additional funding in accordance with TEA-21.

□ 1415

In addition, the outlays from the reserve fund cannot exceed \$1.18 billion. Is that correct?

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. It is also my understanding that the budget resolution does not require the Committee on Appropriations to report a bill containing obligation limitation for programs within the highway category in excess of \$23.864 billion. Is that correct?

Mr. NUSSLE. That is also correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. In the course of my review of the budget resolution before us today, I see no provision that establishes discretionary caps in fiscal year 2003 or extends the highway and transit guarantees beyond 2003. Is that accurate?

Mr. NUSSLE. That is also accurate. As a concurrent resolution, the budget before us today does not establish discretionary caps or continue the highway or transit firewalls beyond fiscal year 2003.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Would the chairman also agree that discussions on establishing discretionary caps in fiscal year 2003 and beyond and extending the highway and transit firewalls beyond the current fiscal year should include the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. NUSSLE. I most definitely agree with that. The Committee on the Budget has exclusive jurisdiction over the Budget Enforcement Act, but the chairman and I, I think, have established a good working relationship, and I will continue to consult with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as you have just said, you and I have established great communica-

tions. We have had numerous discussions about the need of the Committee on Appropriations to be able to determine the appropriate balance of competing needs and priorities within the discretionary segment of the budget. The needs are great for the prosecution of the war against terrorism, homeland security and other critically important Federal programs. We both recognize that the cuts anticipated in the highway program are too great to be sustained this year, though these reductions in the highway program are required by provisions of existing law in TEA21 in which expenditures must equal receipts. Those provisions were supported by a majority of the House and had the full backing of the highway lobby at the time. Nevertheless, there is a great deal of support to increase spending for highways beyond the collections of the trust fund this year.

By contrast, the resources to fund all these unmet needs are limited. That is why the gentleman from Wisconsin and I introduced legislation that would ensure that any increase for the highway program not come at the expense of other Federal programs. H.R. 3900 adjusts the highway category. It ensures that additional spending is guaranteed for highways in fiscal year 2003.

H.R. 3900 has been referred to your committee. Is your committee expected to report favorably this legislation to ensure that the highway firewalls are increased above the \$23.864 billion this year?

Mr. NUSSLE. It is my expectation that my committee will be reporting legislation to ensure that the highway category is increased.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the commitments of the gentleman from Iowa and the clarity that he has provided to me and to the House today. I would like to add that his job is not the easiest job in the Congress. It is a difficult job to bring all of the divergent views together. I applaud the gentleman for the good job he has done. He can count on my vote for this resolution.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. There is only one more difficult job than mine, and that is to do it 13 times. I certainly respect and admire the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for his good work.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote against this rule. The rule is unfair. It does not allow an adequate debate on the most important issue we will decide on the floor of this House this year. It is a travesty that we have 3 hours to talk about the most important set of decisions we will make perhaps in a generation.

We should be talking about a different budget today. The budget should be based on values, on opportunity, responsibility and community. But this Republican budget, which is the only thing we are able to consider today, fails on all counts.

It is not honest. It shows deficits as far as the eye can see, in large part because of the Republican economic program that we passed about 9 months ago.

First of all, we have squandered the surplus, squandered the surplus, \$4.5 trillion, gone in the flash of an eye. Gone. \$4.5 trillion, gone in the flash of an eye. Twelve months ago we had it; now it is gone. Of course, the loss of that surplus means that we cannot fulfill our promise to the lockbox. Five times in this House 220-plus Members of the Republican Party voted solidly for the lockbox. By voting today for this budget, they are breaking into the lockbox. We are not keeping our word.

Let us look at the words. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) declared the House of Representatives is not going to go back to raiding the lockbox. He said, "Not a dime's worth of Social Security or Medicare money will be spent on anything other than Social Security and Medicare."

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the distinguished chair of the committee, said, "This Congress will protect 100 percent of Social Security and Medicare trust funds. Period. No speculation. No supposition. No projections."

These are words that mean something. They are being broken.

The Speaker of the House in the same month said, "Since I have been Speaker, we have not spent a penny of the Social Security Trust Fund, and," he said, "we don't intend to."

Promises are being broken. The contract is being broken. The word, our collective word, is being broken by what we are trying to do here today with this budget.

\$1.8 trillion will be spent from Social Security in the next 10 years with this budget. We do not even have time to talk about it, to debate it, to worry about it. We said a number of years ago, let us put Social Security first. This budget puts Social Security last. We are in essence taking money out of the Social Security Trust Fund and we are spending it on everything else. It is last. That is not what we said to the American people.

Then there is prescription drugs. Oh, we all ran ads on prescription drugs. Oh, we are going to take care of prescription drugs.

Where are the prescription drugs in this bill? The program that is described in this Republican budget is paltry. It does not affect most of the senior citizens who thought they were going to get something out of this program, because, once again, I guess it is prescription drugs last in Medicare. We are going to put it behind everything else.

Let me just finally say this: I guess my greatest worry is that we are doing

this without anybody in the country much knowing about it. How many people in the country actually know what happened to Social Security in this budget? It is 3 hours, I fear, because we do not want them to know what is happening to their Social Security.

This bill has real live consequences for people, millions of people all over this country. Let me just tell you my story as kind of a symbol or an analogy of what is happening to lots of other people.

My mother called me a week ago and she said, "I bounced some checks." She is 94-years-old and she still keeps her own checkbook. She lives in independent living in St. Louis. She said, "I bounced some checks. It is the first time I have ever done it in my life. Please, when you come home next, sit down with me. We have to figure this out."

So I sat down with her and we went over all of her checks. She lives in independent living. The cost is \$2,500 a month. She has got a prescription drug bill of about \$600 over that. So her monthly outgo before she gets to spending money is about \$3,100 a month. Her Social Security is \$1,200 a month. My brother and I, we are lucky. We are fine and we can help her with the difference.

But as we were going over her checks, she kept saying to me, "Dick, what if the Social Security check were to stop coming? How would we do this?" She even suggested to me, "Maybe I ought to move out of this place because we cannot afford it," because her prescription drug bill has been going up every month.

She is 94. She and millions like her and their families should not have to be worrying about all this. What if she were in a family that did not have people like my brother and me who could help her? We are fortunate. What if she did not have that money coming in to take care of her prescription drugs, to pay her monthly bills?

This budget has real live consequences for the people that we represent. Are we going to privatize Social Security? Are we going to cut the benefits? Because that is the logical conclusion of this budget. The President has said he wants to privatize it, which means you have got to come up with a lot of money that is not in this budget. The only way you are going to get it is to cut the benefits. Is that what we are saying to the American people today? I hope it is not.

This is the most important budget that you will vote on probably in your time in this Congress. A year ago we had surpluses; today we are breaking the lockbox. A year ago we had taken care of Social Security first; this budget puts Social Security last. A year ago we had the money for prescription drugs; today we are not going to have a decent prescription drug program.

It is a travesty that we have 3 hours to talk about the most important fiscal

decisions that will have consequences in everybody's life in this country.

I urge Members to vote no on a ridiculous rule and vote no if we have to vote on this budget today. Let us get to a summit. Let us get to a discussion. Let us get to a family discussion with the President. Let us work out a budget for America that is a real compromise, that will keep the word and the promise of the United States Congress to the people of this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Chair would advise both sides that each side has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and I am opposed to this budget resolution. It is a budget, unfortunately, that only Enron could love. It is using 5-year numbers instead of 10 years, obviously hiding the impact of the tax cuts exploding in the second 5 years and the impact that is going to have with budget deficits. It is using OMB numbers instead of the Congressional Budget Office, when the same Republican party shut down this place in 1995 accusing President Clinton of doing the exact same thing; and it underestimates the true cost of Medicare spending in the years to come.

As Yogi Berra once said, it is *deja vu* all over again. It takes us back to the deficit spending of the eighties and early nineties, using Social Security and Medicare trust fund money for other purposes, rather than taking us forward by maintaining fiscal discipline so we can deal with the greatest fiscal challenge facing us today: the aging population. This is happening at exactly the wrong time, Mr. Speaker, just before the 77 million American baby-boomers start retiring in just a few short years.

But this is more than just about the baby-boomers. This is about the future of my 3- and 5-year-old boys, because it will be their generation who will be asked to fix the irresponsibility of what occurred last year and what is about to happen today.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose the rule and to oppose this budget resolution.

□ 1430

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

Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, we will be calling a vote on it. I will offer an amendment to this unfair and undemocratic closed rule.

Democrats are seeking to make in order two amendments to the budget resolution. The first is a trigger amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), and the second is the Moore-Stenholm-Tanner-Matheson substitute that the majority

on the Committee on Rules refused to make in order.

The Moran trigger amendment prohibits the Congress from adopting any budget resolution next year if it does not project a surplus within 5 years. Democrats have offered a vehicle in this trigger amendment that can force the institution to face up to the facts.

The majority has spent some time today complaining that no substitutes were offered in the Committee on Rules. I beg to differ. The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), along with the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON), offered a substitute that establishes a budget plan for fiscal discipline. Yet, the Committee on Rules failed to make it in order. Our amendment to the rule would correct this serious failing.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, the President and every House Republican leader promised that every dollar of Social Security and Medicare trust funds would be saved for Social Security and Medicare. With this budget, that promise has been broken.

We want to give the majority one last chance to do the right thing, Mr. Speaker. By defeating the previous question, we can restore honesty to the budget process and protect Social Security.

The time for games has ended. Let us pass an honest budget, or at least a trigger amendment that protects Social Security. It is the right thing to do, and every Member knows it.

I urge a no vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD immediately before the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the distinguished gentleman from greater San Dimas, California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate, and I guess have participated in it briefly with my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

I have to say that I am reminded, as I have heard the exchange take place over the last hour or so, of the words of a very famous former Democratic President who was known for his colorful but poignant words when Harry Truman said, "Any jackass can kick a barn down, but it takes a carpenter to build one."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have a beautifully crafted budget which has come forward from the hard work of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE)

and the members of the Committee on the Budget working to address a challenge the likes of which the United States of America has never faced, this war on terrorism, while at the same time focusing on the important need to make sure that we have the resources to win the war on terrorism and to address a wide range of other priority needs which have come forward: transportation, which the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) addressed; national security issues; and education issues.

That is why it is so important that we focus on stimulating our economy and making sure that we grow this economy so that we have the resources necessary. Why is it that we have seen this slowdown? Because of September 11 and the slowing economy that followed. And what we have done is we have seen time and energy put into place to craft, like carpenters, this beautiful plan which I believe deserves bipartisan support because we are all together in our quest to win the war on terrorism, and the way to do it is to make sure that we have the resources necessary and a budget in place that will do that.

What is it that we have gotten from our friends on the other side of the aisle? Absolutely nothing. My friend, the gentlewoman from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) just talked about the fact that we had substitutes submitted. There were no substitutes submitted.

Mr. Speaker, every single time we have made in order substitutes that have come from the Blue Dogs, from the Progressive Caucus, from the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and yet, we saw the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget tell us that 96 pages, 96 pages, Mr. Speaker, were put into a package which simply criticized the package that came forward from the Committee on the Budget, and in fact, there was no alternative provided whatsoever.

Vote in favor of this rule and in favor of this very fair, responsible budget.

The amendment previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

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 in to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration resolution (H. Con. Res. 353) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2003 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2007. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed three hours, with two hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Saxton of New

Jersey and Representative Stark of California or their designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute 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. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. No further amendment to the concurrent resolution shall be in order except those specified in section 2 of this resolution. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order specified in section 2, may be offered by a Member designated in section 2 or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable as specified in section 2, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments specified in section 2 are waived. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution, as amended, to the House with such further amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division on the question of its adoption.

Sec. 2. The further amendments referred in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) By Representative Moran of Virginia, debatable for 30 minutes.

After section 303, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 304. CIRCUIT BREAKER FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective January 1, 2003, if the Congressional Budget Office's January Budget and Economic Outlook for any fiscal year projects an on-budget deficit (excluding social security) for the budget year or any subsequent fiscal year covered by those projections, then the concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year shall reduce on-budget deficits relative to CBO's projections and put the budget on a path to achieve balance within 5 years, and shall include such provisions as are necessary to facilitate deficit reduction.

(b) POINTS OF ORDER.—(1) In any fiscal year in which the Congressional Budget Office's January Budget and Economic Outlook for any fiscal year projects an on-budget deficit for the budget year or any subsequent fiscal year covered by those projections, it shall not be in order in the House or the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year or any conference report thereon that fails to reduce on-budget deficits relative to CBO's projections and put the budget on a path to achieve balance within 5 years.

(2) In any fiscal year in which the Congressional Budget Office's January Budget and Economic Outlook for any fiscal year projects an on-budget deficit for the budget year or any subsequent fiscal year covered by those projections, it shall not be in order in the House or the Senate to consider an amendment to a concurrent resolution on the budget that would increase on-budget deficits relative to the concurrent resolution on the budget in any fiscal year or cause the budget to fail to achieve balance within 5 years.

(c) SUSPENSION OF REQUIREMENT DURING WAR OR LOW ECONOMIC GROWTH.—This section is suspended if—

(1) the most recent of the Department of Commerce's advance, preliminary, or final reports of actual real economic growth indicate that the rate of real economic growth (as measured by real GDP) for each of the most recently reported quarter and the immediately preceding quarter is less than 1 percent; or

(2) a declaration of war is in effect.

(b) By Representative Moore of Kansas, debatable for one hour

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003.

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2003 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2004 through 2007 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$
Fiscal year 2004: \$
Fiscal year 2005: \$
Fiscal year 2006: \$
Fiscal year 2007: \$

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$
Fiscal year 2004: \$
Fiscal year 2005: \$
Fiscal year 2006: \$
Fiscal year 2007: \$

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$
Fiscal year 2004: \$
Fiscal year 2005: \$
Fiscal year 2006: \$
Fiscal year 2007: \$

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$
Fiscal year 2004: \$
Fiscal year 2005: \$
Fiscal year 2006: \$
Fiscal year 2007: \$

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$
Fiscal year 2004: \$
Fiscal year 2005: \$
Fiscal year 2006: \$
Fiscal year 2007: \$

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$
Fiscal year 2004: \$
Fiscal year 2005: \$
Fiscal year 2006: \$
Fiscal year 2007: \$

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$
Fiscal year 2004: \$
Fiscal year 2005: \$

Fiscal year 2006: \$
Fiscal year 2007: \$

SEC. 102. HOMELAND SECURITY.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2003 for Homeland Security are as follows:

- (1) New budget authority, \$
(2) Outlays, \$

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2003 through 2007 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology

(250):
Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$

Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
(5) Natural Resources and Environment

(300):
Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$
Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority,

(B) Outlays, \$



**TITLE II—RESTORING FISCAL DISCIPLINE  
AND PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY**

**SEC. 201. REVIEW OF BUDGET OUTLOOK.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—If, in the report released pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, entitled the Budget and Economic Outlook Update (for fiscal years 2003 through 2012), the Director of the Congressional Budget Office projects that the unified budget of the United States for fiscal year 2003 will be in balance and that the budget (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) will be in balance by fiscal year 2007, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House is authorized to certify that the budget is projected to meet the goals of a balanced budget and protecting social security.

(b) CALCULATING DISCRETIONARY SPENDING BASELINE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall use the discretionary spending levels set forth in this resolution to calculate the discretionary spending baseline. In calculating the report referred to in subsection (a), such Director shall exclude the emergency appropriations provided in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Recovery From and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States (Public Law 107–38) in calculating the baseline for discretionary spending.

**SEC. 202. REQUIREMENT FOR PRESIDENTIAL PLAN TO RESTORE BALANCED BUDGET AND PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS.**

(a) REQUEST IF UNIFIED DEFICIT PROJECTED.—If the report of the Congressional Budget Office referred to in section 202 projects a unified deficit in fiscal year 2003, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall request that the President—

(1) submit to the House a proposal to bring the unified budget of the United States into balance by fiscal year 2003 and the budget (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) into balance by fiscal year 2007, or

(2) submit to the House a request that the unified budget of the United States for fiscal year 2003 be in deficit by [INSERT SPECIFIC DOLLAR AMOUNT] if the President certifies that such deficit amount is related to the costs of war or recession.

(b) REQUEST IF DEFICIT PROJECTED FOR BUDGET EXCLUDING OASDI.—If the report of the Congressional Budget Office referred to in section 202 projects the budget (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) will be in deficit in fiscal year 2007, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall request that the President submit to the House a proposal to bring the unified budget of the United States into balance by fiscal year 2003 and the budget (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) into balance by fiscal year 2007.

(c) TEXT OF PROPOSAL.—The proposal shall include—

(1) specific legislative changes to reduce outlays, increase revenues, or both; and

(2) the text of a special resolution implementing the President's recommendations through reconciliation directives instructing the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and Senate to determine and recommend changes in laws within their

jurisdictions to reduce outlays or increase revenues by specified amounts; sufficient to meet the balanced budget goals described in section 201.

(d) INTRODUCTION OF PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL.—Within 5 legislative days after receipt of the proposal referred to in subsection (a), the majority leader of the House shall introduce legislation to carry out such proposal.

**SEC. 203. CONGRESSIONAL ACTION REQUIRED IF BALANCED BUDGET AND SOCIAL SECURITY PROTECTION GOALS ARE NOT BEING MET.**

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR LEGISLATION RESTORING BALANCED BUDGET AND PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS.—Whenever the President submits a plan to restore balanced budgets and restore the social security surplus under section 202, the Committee on the Budget of the House shall report, not later than September 15, a revised concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2003 with instructions to committees to achieve reductions in outlays or increases in revenues, or both, sufficient to meet the balanced budget goals in section 201, and appropriately revised section 302(a) allocations to the Committee on Appropriations.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR SEPARATE VOTE TO ALLOW FOR A UNIFIED DEFICIT IN FISCAL YEAR 2003.—If the resolution reported by the Committee on the Budget of the House proposes to eliminate less than all of the projected unified deficit in fiscal year 2003, then that committee shall report a separate resolution waiving the balanced budget goal for fiscal year 2003 and authorizing a deficit of a specific amount with a finding that the deficit is a result of economic recession or costs related to the war on terrorism.

(c) PROCEDURE IF HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE FAILS TO REPORT REQUIRED RESOLUTION.—

(1) AUTOMATIC DISCHARGE OF HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE.—If the Committee on the Budget fails to report the resolution required by subsection (a), then the legislation introduced pursuant to section 202 (legislation implementing the President's plan) shall be automatically discharged from consideration by the committee or committees to which it was referred and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(2) CONSIDERATION BY HOUSE.—Ten days after the applicable committee or committees have been discharged under paragraph (1), any Member may move that the House proceed to consider the resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and not debatable.

(d) APPLICATION OF CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT.—To the extent that they are relevant and not inconsistent with this title, the provisions of title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall apply in the House of Representatives and the Senate to resolutions and legislation under this title and reconciliation legislation reported pursuant to directives included in those resolutions.

**SEC. 204. INCREASE IN DEBT LIMIT CONTINGENT UPON PLAN TO RESTORE BALANCED BUDGET AND PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY.**

(a) TEMPORARY INCREASE IN STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT.—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House shall report a bill as soon as practicable, but not later than March 25, 2002, that consists solely of changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the statutory debt limit sufficient to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to meet the obligation of the Government through, but not later than, September 30, 2002.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—(1) Except as provided by paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the House to consider any bill, joint resolu-

tion, amendment, or conference report that includes any provision that increases the limit on the public debt beyond September 30, 2002.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the House if—

(A) the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House has made the certification described in section 201 that the budget (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) will be in balance by fiscal year 2007; or

(B) the President has submitted a plan meeting the requirements of section 202 and the House has voted on a resolution meeting the requirements of section 203.

**TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND ENFORCEMENT**

**SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN LEGISLATION REDUCING THE SURPLUS OR INCREASING THE DEFICIT AFTER FISCAL YEAR 2007.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that includes any provision that first provides new budget authority or a decrease in revenues for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2007 that would decrease the surplus or increase the deficit for any fiscal year.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House certifies, based on estimates prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, that Congress has enacted legislation restoring 75-year solvency of the Federal Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance Trust Fund and legislation extending the solvency of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for 20 years.

**SEC. 302. CRITICAL DEFENSE NEEDS.**

This resolution includes \$10 billion in new budget authority requested by the President for fiscal year 2003 within functional category 050, and a corresponding level of outlays that flow from this budget authority, without specified purpose. Therefore, this \$10 billion in new budget authority shall be available for critical defense requirements, including additional pay raises for military personnel, military construction, readiness, naval shipbuilding, and other procurement requirements not originally included in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2003.

**SEC. 303. RESERVE FUND FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by subsection (b), in the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Energy and Commerce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides a prescription drug benefit, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the appropriate committee allocations for such committees and other appropriate levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose.

(b) FUNDS AVAILABLE CONTINGENT UPON BALANCED BUDGET AND PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY.—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may only make revisions under subsection (a) if—

(1) the chairman has made the certification described in section 201 that the unified budget is projected to be in balance in fiscal year 2003 and that the budget (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) will be in balance by fiscal year 2007; or

(2) the President has submitted a plan meeting the requirements of section 202 and

the House has voted on a resolution meet the requirements of section 203.

**SEC. 304. RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL TAX CUTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by subsection (b), in the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Energy and Commerce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides for reductions in revenues of not more than \$4,431,000,000 for fiscal year 2003 and \$27,853,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2008, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may reduce the recommended level of Federal revenues and make other appropriate adjustments for that fiscal year.

(b) FUNDS AVAILABLE CONTINGENT UPON BALANCED BUDGET AND PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY.—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may only make revisions under subsection (a) if—

(1) the chairman has made the certification described in section 201 that the unified budget is projected to be in balance in fiscal year 2003 and that the budget (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) will be in balance by fiscal year 2007; or

(2) the President has submitted a plan meeting the requirements of section 202 and the House has voted on a resolution meet the requirements of section 203.

**SEC. 305. RESERVE FUND FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002 SUPPLEMENTAL FOR MILITARY ACTION AND HOMELAND SECURITY.**

If the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution providing appropriations requested by the President for military action and homeland security, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for that purpose and if the request by the President is accompanied by a list of rescissions to offset some or all of its costs, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate revisions to the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but the total adjustment under this section shall not exceed the amount so requested by the President.

**SEC. 306. RESERVE FUND FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION.**

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2003.—In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides in excess of \$7,529,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2003 for grants to States authorized under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the appropriate allocations for such committee and other appropriate levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed \$1,000,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2003 and outlays flowing therefrom.

(b) FISCAL YEARS 2004–2007.—In the House, if the Committee on Education and the Workforce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that reauthorizes grants to States under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the applicable allocations of the appropriate committees to

accommodate a total budget authority and outlay level for such program not in excess of the following: \$9,587,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom, \$10,755,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2005 and outlays flowing therefrom, \$12,047,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2006 and outlays flowing therefrom, and \$13,497,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2007 and outlays flowing therefrom (assuming changes from current policy levels of the following: \$1,752,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004, \$2,763,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2005, \$3,894,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2006, and \$5,180,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2007).

**SEC. 307. RESERVE FUND FOR HIGHWAYS AND HIGHWAY SAFETY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that establishes an obligation limitation in excess of \$23,864,000,000 for fiscal year 2003 for programs, projects, and activities within the highway category (under section 251(c)(7)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays for such committee by the amount of outlays resulting from such excess, but—

(1) only if chairman of the Committee on the Budget determines that the bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that establishes such obligation limitation provides that the obligation limitation is made available solely for programs, projects, or activities as distributed under section 1102 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century;

(2) only if the total amount of obligation limitation for programs, projects, or activities distributed by such formula for fiscal year 2003 exceeds \$23,864,000,000; and

(3) does not exceed \$1,180,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2003.

(b) RULE OF ENFORCEMENT.—In the House, section 302(f)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall be deemed to also apply to the applicable allocation of outlays in the case of any bill or joint resolution that establishes an obligation limitation for fiscal year 2003 for programs within the highway category, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon.

**SEC. 308. ADDITIONAL SURPLUSES RESERVED FOR DEBT REDUCTION.**

In the House, if after the release of the report pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 entitled the Budget and Economic Outlook: Update (for fiscal years 2003 through 2012), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget determines, in consultation with the Directors of the Congressional Budget Office and of the Office of Management and Budget, that the estimated unified surplus for fiscal year 2003 and for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2007 exceeds the estimated unified surplus for fiscal year 2003 and for that period as set forth in the report of the Committee on the Budget for this resolution, then the chairman of that committee may increase the surplus or reduce the deficit, as applicable, and reduce the level of the public debt and debt held by the public by the difference between such estimates for that period.

**SEC. 309. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

**SEC. 310. USE OF CBO ESTIMATES IN ENFORCING THIS RESOLUTION.**

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall enforce this resolution based upon estimates made by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office using the economic and technical assumptions underlying the Congressional Budget Office's report released on March 6, 2002, entitled "An Analysis of the President's Budgetary Proposals for 2003", except as provided by title II.

**SEC. 311. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL HOMELAND SECURITY STRATEGY.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) effective homeland security requires the coordinated efforts of Federal, State, local, and private investment to prevent, prepare for, and respond to terrorist attack;

(2) spending from each entity must proceed from a comprehensive strategy outlining threats, vulnerabilities, needs, and responsibilities for all aspects of homeland security strategy;

(3) there has been no comprehensive threat or vulnerability assessment to guide the homeland security budget;

(4) there has been no comprehensive national homeland security strategy to match priority needs with Federal spending; and

(5) in the absence of a national homeland security strategy, Congress will find it difficult to allocate funds according to the prioritization and required level of need.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my extreme displeasure with the budget that is before us today. It can hardly be called a budget—that implies some logic and order to the document.

In reality, the Republicans have filled this budget with "funny math" in order to say that it is balanced and fair. According to the Republicans, this budget protects our domestic agenda and allows for the nation to fight the war on terrorism.

However, this budget is anything but fair. After pushing through \$1.7 trillion in tax cuts last year and the \$43 billion in tax cuts in the so-called economic stimulus signed into law on March 9, 2002 which largely benefits the wealthiest Americans and corporations, our nation's financial situation has deteriorated at an alarming pace.

Just over a year ago, many experts were estimating a 10 year, \$5 trillion surplus. However, under President Bush's watch and because of the tax cuts, \$4 trillion of that surplus has disappeared. Over the next ten years we will have to dip into the social Security surplus—to the tune of \$1.8 trillion.

To protect those tax cuts, President Bush and the Republicans in Congress have advocated a budget that cuts and slashes hundreds of millions of dollars from domestic programs. Programs that, up until recently, they have said are their highest priorities.

For example, in the Budget Resolution Congress debated today, the Department of Education's budget is barely increased. In addition, the Republicans have underfunded elementary and secondary education by \$4.2 billion. Indeed, they do not even appropriate enough funding for President Bush's signature education legislation, Leave No Child Behind. The budget for that is underfunded \$90 million.

The President also campaigned on strengthening health care for all Americans. Since assuming office, he has repeatedly urged Congress to send him legislation that will help Americans with the burdens associated with health care. However, we do not have to look any further than his own budget to see what a low priority he and his party place on health care. While there seems to be a \$1.5 billion increase to health care services programs, in reality, the House Republican Leadership has required the elimination or reduction of several important programs in order to achieve this increase. For example, they have eliminated the Community Access Program, which coordinates health care to the under-insured and uninsured offered by public hospitals and community health centers and other community providers. They have also eliminated State Planning Grants, which help provide access to health insurance coverage. Additionally, the budget provides absolutely no assistance to those individuals and families who do not have health insurance, and requires States to return expiring SCHIP (State's Children Health Insurance Program) funds to the US Treasury. This means that 900,000 children would lose their health coverage.

I urge adoption of a budget that will protect the programs that millions of individuals depend on. A budget that will protect Social Security so that retirees can be assured that their benefits will be paid and that future generations will not be saddled with massive tax increases or reductions in benefits. Unfortunately, President Bush and his party have rejected this kind of budget. While I support the President in his efforts to combat terrorism both here and abroad, I am concerned that we are neglecting our domestic responsibilities and putting intense strain on the nation's finances—a strain that will remain for generations after the war on terrorism has been won.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support of the rule and for fully funding the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (IDEA). I am pleased that the Fiscal Year 2003 budget includes \$19.6 billion over 10 years for IDEA, however this amount is still a long way from providing states with the 40 percent funding level Congress committed to pay.

Federal IDEA funding assists states in providing invaluable services and educational opportunities for children with disabilities. However, Congress has not fulfilled their financial commitment to the states, and has left states to determine how to pay for IDEA.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should not mandate stringent federal programs without first determining how to fit these programs into the federal budget, and then providing states with the

necessary funds to comply with those federal standards. States should not be left to fund programs that are not initiated at the State and local level.

I support the IDEA program and realize the importance of providing disabled youth with the opportunity to gain an equal education. As the former Lieutenant Governor for the State of Idaho, and a former member of the state legislature, I also realize the budget constraints placed on states when federal programs are mandated without funding. As many states face severe deficit spending it is important for Congress to meet its commitments to IDEA, past and present.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, 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.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 206, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—221

Aderholt  
Akin  
Arney  
Bachus  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bereuter  
Biggert  
Bilirakis  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Boozman  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (SC)  
Bryant  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Coble  
Collins  
Combest  
Cooksey  
Cox  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Cunningham  
Davis, Jo Ann

Davis, Tom  
Deal  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Diaz-Balart  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
English  
Everett  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fossella  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gibbons  
Gilchrist  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Graham  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Grucci  
Gutknecht  
Hansen  
Hart  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger

Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Isakson  
Issa  
Istook  
Jenkins  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kerns  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Lucas (OK)  
Manzullo  
McCrery  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McKeon  
Mica  
Miller, Dan  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, Jeff  
Moran (KS)

Morella  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Oxley  
Paul  
Pence  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Portman  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reynolds  
Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roukema  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Saxton  
Schrock  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skeen  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Stearns  
Stump  
Sullivan  
Sununu

Sweeney  
Tancred  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Toomey  
Upton  
Vitter  
Walden  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watkins (OK)  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NAYS—206

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Barcia  
Barrett  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop  
Blumenauer  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Carson (IN)  
Carson (OK)  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Ford  
Frank  
Frost  
Gephardt  
Gonzalez  
Gordon

Green (TX)  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hill  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hoeffel  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoolley  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
John  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
Klecza  
Kucinich  
LaFalce  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Luther  
Lynch  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Millender  
McDonald  
Miller, George

Mink  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (VA)  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Phelps  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott  
Serrano  
Sherman  
Skelton  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thurman  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Velazquez  
Vislosky  
Waters  
Watson (CA)  
Watt (NC)

Waxman           Wexler           Wu  
Weiner           Woolsey         Wynn

NOT VOTING—7

Blagojevich     Schaffner       Traficant  
Gutierrez       Shows  
Riley           Tierney

□ 1457

Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. LUTHER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

MOTION TO RECONSIDER OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered on the resolution.

MOTION TO TABLE MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the motion to table the motion to reconsider offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote followed by a 5-minute vote on the resolution, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 206, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—222

Abercrombie	Cubin	Hansen
Aderholt	Culberson	Hart
Akin	Cunningham	Hastings (WA)
Armey	Davis, Jo Ann	Hayes
Bachus	Davis, Tom	Hayworth
Baker	Deal	Hefley
Ballenger	DeLay	Herger
Barr	DeMint	Hilleary
Bartlett	Diaz-Balart	Hobson
Barton	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Bass	Dreier	Horn
Bereuter	Duncan	Hostettler
Biggert	Dunn	Houghton
Billirakis	Ehlers	Hulshof
Blunt	Ehrlich	Hunter
Boehlert	Emerson	Hyde
Boehner	English	Isakson
Bonilla	Everett	Issa
Bono	Ferguson	Istook
Boozman	Flake	Jenkins
Brady (TX)	Fletcher	Johnson (CT)
Brown (SC)	Foley	Johnson (IL)
Bryant	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Burr	Fossella	Jones (NC)
Burton	Frelinghuysen	Keller
Buyer	Gallely	Kelly
Callahan	Ganske	Kennedy (MN)
Calvert	Gekas	Kerns
Camp	Gibbons	King (NY)
Cannon	Gilchrest	Kingston
Cantor	Gillmor	Kirk
Capito	Gilman	Kolbe
Castle	Goode	LaHood
Chabot	Goodlatte	Latham
Chambliss	Goss	LaTourette
Coble	Graham	Leach
Collins	Granger	Lewis (CA)
Combest	Graves	Lewis (KY)
Cooksey	Green (WI)	Linder
Cox	Greenwood	LoBiondo
Crane	Grucci	Lucas (OK)
Crenshaw	Gutknecht	Manzullo

McCrery	Radanovich	Stearns
McHugh	Ramstad	Stump
McInnis	Regula	Sullivan
McKeon	Rehberg	Sununu
Mica	Reynolds	Sweeney
Miller, Dan	Rogers (KY)	Tancredo
Miller, Gary	Rogers (MI)	Tauzin
Miller, Jeff	Rohrabacher	Taylor (NC)
Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Terry
Morella	Roukema	Thomas
Myrick	Royce	Thornberry
Nethercutt	Ryan (WI)	Thune
Ney	Ryun (KS)	Tiahrt
Northup	Saxton	Tiberi
Norwood	Schaffer	Toomey
Nussle	Schrock	Upton
Osborne	Sensenbrenner	Vitter
Ose	Sessions	Walden
Otter	Shadegg	Walsh
Oxley	Shaw	Wamp
Paul	Shays	Watkins (OK)
Pence	Sherwood	Watts (OK)
Peterson (PA)	Shimkus	Weldon (FL)
Petri	Shuster	Weldon (PA)
Pickering	Simmons	Weller
Pitts	Simpson	Whitfield
Platts	Skeen	Wicker
Pombo	Smith (MI)	Wilson (NM)
Portman	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)
Pryce (OH)	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Putnam	Smith (WA)	Young (AK)
Quinn	Souder	Young (FL)

NAYS—206

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Meeks (NY)
Allen	Gordon	Menendez
Andrews	Green (TX)	Millender-
Baca	Hall (OH)	McDonald
Baird	Hall (TX)	Miller, George
Baldacci	Harman	Mink
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Mollohan
Barcia	Hill	Moore
Barrett	Hilliard	Moran (VA)
Becerra	Hincheey	Murtha
Bentsen	Hinojosa	Nadler
Berkley	Hoeffel	Napolitano
Berman	Holden	Neal
Berry	Holt	Oberstar
Bishop	Honda	Obey
Blumenauer	Hooley	Olver
Bonior	Hoyer	Ortiz
Borski	Inslee	Owens
Boswell	Israel	Pallone
Boucher	Jackson (IL)	Pascarell
Boyd	Jackson-Lee	Pastor
Brady (PA)	(TX)	Payne
Brown (FL)	Jefferson	Pelosi
Brown (OH)	John	Peterson (MN)
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Phelps
Capuano	Jones (OH)	Pomeroy
Cardin	Kanjorski	Price (NC)
Kaptur	Kennedy (RI)	Rahall
Kennedy (RI)	Kildee	Rangel
Kildee	Kilpatrick	Reyes
Kilpatrick	Kind (WI)	Rivers
Kind (WI)	Kleckza	Rodriguez
Kleckza	Kucinich	Roemer
Kucinich	LaFalce	Ross
LaFalce	Lampson	Rothman
Lampson	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Langevin	Lantos	Rush
Lantos	Larsen (WA)	Sabo
Larsen (CT)	Larson (CT)	Sanchez
Lee	Lee	Sanders
Levin	Levin	Sandin
Lewis (GA)	Lewis (GA)	Sawyer
Lipinski	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Lofgren	Lofgren	Schiff
Lowe	Lowe	Scofield
Lucas (KY)	Lucas (KY)	Scott
Luther	Luther	Serrano
Lynch	Lynch	Sherman
Maloney (CT)	Maloney (CT)	Skelton
Maloney (NY)	Maloney (NY)	Slughter
Markey	Markey	Snyder
Mascara	Mascara	Solis
Matheson	Matheson	Solis
Matsui	Matsui	Spratt
McCarthy (MO)	McCarthy (MO)	Stark
McCarthy (NY)	McCarthy (NY)	Stenholm
McCollum	McCollum	Strickland
McDermott	McDermott	Stupak
McGovern	McGovern	Tanner
McIntyre	McIntyre	Tauscher
McKinney	McKinney	Taylor (MS)
McNulty	McNulty	Thompson (CA)
Meehan	Meehan	Thompson (MS)
Meek (FL)	Meek (FL)	Thurman
		Tierney
		Towns
		Turner

Udall (CO)       Watson (CA)     Woolsey  
Udall (NM)       Watt (NC)       Wu  
Velazquez       Waxman           Wynn  
Visclosky  
Waters           Wexler

NOT VOTING—6

Blagojevich     Knollenberg     Shows  
Gutierrez       Riley            Traficant

□ 1507

Mr. SULLIVAN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 206, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—222

Aderholt	Ferguson	LaTourette
Akin	Flake	Leach
Armey	Fletcher	Lewis (CA)
Bachus	Foley	Lewis (KY)
Baker	Forbes	Linder
Ballenger	Fossella	LoBiondo
Barr	Frelinghuysen	Lucas (OK)
Bartlett	Gallely	Manzullo
Barton	Ganske	McCrery
Bass	Gekas	McHugh
Bereuter	Gibbons	McInnis
Biggert	Gilchrest	McKeon
Billirakis	Gillmor	Mica
Blunt	Goode	Miller, Dan
Boehlert	Goode	Miller, Gary
Boehner	Goodlatte	Miller, Jeff
Bonilla	Goss	Moran (KS)
Bono	Graham	Morella
Boozman	Granger	Myrick
Brady (TX)	Graves	Nethercutt
Brown (SC)	Green (WI)	Ney
Bryant	Greenwood	Northup
Burr	Grucci	Norwood
Burton	Gutknecht	Nussle
Buyer	Hansen	Osborne
Callahan	Hart	Ose
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Otter
Camp	Hayes	Oxley
Cannon	Hayworth	Paul
Cantor	Hefley	Pence
Capito	Herger	Peterson (PA)
Castle	Hilleary	Petri
Chabot	Hobson	Pickering
Chambliss	Hoekstra	Pitts
Coble	Horn	Platts
Collins	Hostettler	Pombo
Combest	Houghton	Portman
Cooksey	Hulshof	Pryce (OH)
Cox	Hunter	Putnam
Crane	Hyde	Quinn
Crenshaw	Isakson	Radanovich
Cubin	Issa	Ramstad
Culberson	Istook	Regula
Cunningham	Jenkins	Rehberg
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson (CT)	Reynolds
Davis, Tom	Johnson (IL)	Riley
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
DeLay	Jones (NC)	Rogers (MI)
DeMint	Keller	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Ros-Lehtinen
Doolittle	Kennedy (MN)	Roukema
Dreier	Kerns	Royce
Duncan	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Dunn	Kingston	Ryun (KS)
Ehlers	Kirk	Saxton
Ehrlich	Knollenberg	Schaffer
Emerson	Kolbe	Schrock
English	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Everett	Latham	Sessions

Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skeen  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Tiberi  
Souder  
Stearns  
Stump

Sullivan  
Sununu  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Toomey  
Upton  
Vitter

Walden  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watkins (OK)  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NAYS—206

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Barcia  
Barrett  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop  
Blumenauer  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Carson (IN)  
Carson (OK)  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Ford  
Frank  
Frost  
Gephardt  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green (TX)  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)

Hastings (FL)  
Hill  
Hilliard  
Hinchev  
Hinojosa  
Hoeffel  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hookey  
Hoyer  
Inslie  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
John  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
Kleczka  
Kucinich  
LaFalce  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Luther  
Lynch  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller, George  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (VA)  
Murtha  
Nadler

Napolitano  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Phelps  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott  
Serrano  
Sherman  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Boehner  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Spratt  
Stark  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thurman  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Waters  
Watson (CA)  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Wexler  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn

NOT VOTING—6

Blagojevich  
Boyd

Gutierrez  
Harman

Shows  
Traficant

□ 1518

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.  
Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER OFFERED BY MR. DREIER

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that we reconsider the vote.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 206, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—213

Aderholt  
Akin  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bereuter  
Biggett  
Bilirakis  
Blunt  
Boehler  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Boozman  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (SC)  
Bryant  
Burr  
Burton  
Hayvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Coble  
Collins  
Hyde  
Combest  
Cooksey  
Cox  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Cunningham  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Diaz-Balart  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Everett  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Fletcher  
Foley

Forbes  
Possella  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Grucci  
Gutknecht  
Hansen  
Hart  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hoekstra  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Collins  
Isakson  
Issa  
Istook  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kerns  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Lucas (OK)  
Manzullo  
McCrery

McHugh  
McInnis  
McKeon  
Mica  
Miller, Dan  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, Jeff  
Moran (KS)  
Morella  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Oxley  
Paul  
Pence  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Portman  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reynolds  
Riley  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roukema  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Schaffer  
Schrock  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skeen  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)

Souder  
Stearns  
Stump  
Sullivan  
Sununu  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas

Thornberry  
Thune  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Toomey  
Upton  
Vitter  
Walden  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watkins (OK)

Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NAYS—206

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Barcia  
Barrett  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop  
Blumenauer  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Carson (IN)  
Carson (OK)  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Ford  
Frank  
Frost  
Gephardt  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green (TX)  
Hall (OH)

Hall (TX)  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hill  
Hilliard  
Hinchev  
Hinojosa  
Hoeffel  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hookey  
Hoyer  
Inslie  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
John  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
Kucinich  
LaFalce  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Luther  
Lynch  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller, George  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (VA)  
Murtha  
Nadler

Napolitano  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Phelps  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott  
Serrano  
Sherman  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Spratt  
Stark  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thurman  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Waters  
Watson (CA)  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Wexler  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn

NOT VOTING—15

Blagojevich  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Doolittle  
Gutierrez

Hilleary  
Hobson  
Jenkins  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kleczka

Lantos  
Saxton  
Shadegg  
Shows  
Traficant

□ 1538

So the motion to table was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:  
Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I was inadvertently detained and

missed rollcall vote No. 78, providing for consideration of H. Con. Res. 353, Budget Resolution 372 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 353.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 372 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 353.

□ 1538

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 353) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2003 and setting forth appropriate budget levels for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2007, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered as having been read the first time.

The text of H. Con. Res. 353, as amended pursuant to House Resolution 372, is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 353

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003.**

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2003 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2004 through 2007 are hereby set forth.

**TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

**SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$1,531,893,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004: \$1,626,605,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005: \$1,747,988,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: \$1,837,957,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$1,927,213,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$4,431,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004: \$5,455,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005: \$6,418,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: \$2,020,704,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$5,555,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$1,784,073,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004: \$1,840,292,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005: \$1,930,171,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: \$2,020,704,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$2,114,974,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$1,756,432,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004: \$1,815,097,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005: \$1,899,231,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: \$1,978,512,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$2,058,894,000,000.

(4) ON-BUDGET DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the on-budget deficits are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$224,539,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004: \$188,492,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005: \$151,243,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: \$140,555,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$131,681,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$6,414,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004: \$6,762,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005: \$7,073,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: \$7,371,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$7,661,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2003: \$3,495,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004: \$3,505,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005: \$3,448,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006: \$3,369,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007: \$3,270,000,000,000.

**SEC. 102. HOMELAND SECURITY.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2003 for Homeland Security are as follows:

- (1) New budget authority, \$37,702,000,000.
- (2) Outlays, \$21,860,000,000.

**SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2003 through 2007 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$393,828,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$375,259,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$401,640,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$390,578,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$422,740,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$409,696,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$444,243,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$425,090,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$466,458,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$439,181,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$23,752,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$22,343,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$24,683,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$22,675,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$25,481,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$23,165,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$26,137,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$23,769,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$27,043,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$24,467,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$22,743,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$22,095,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$23,398,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$22,798,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$23,917,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$23,577,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$24,476,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$24,073,000,000.

(4) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$8,800,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$4,985,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$9,274,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$4,192,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$8,798,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$3,128,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$8,015,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$1,910,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$9,405,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$2,361,000,000.

(5) Community and Regional Development (450):

- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$67,561,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$60,068,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$68,221,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$61,318,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$68,897,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$63,302,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$68,950,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$59,675,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$67,561,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$60,068,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$25,055,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$24,667,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$316,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$364,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$157,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$129,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$687,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$644,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$526,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$467,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$532,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$454,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$29,218,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$29,868,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$30,546,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$30,362,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$31,449,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$30,932,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$30,851,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$31,677,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$31,474,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$32,032,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$23,641,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$24,054,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$23,848,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$23,860,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$22,167,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$22,280,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$21,300,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$21,438,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$21,157,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$21,307,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$8,800,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$4,985,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$9,274,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$4,192,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$8,798,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$3,128,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$8,015,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$1,910,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$9,405,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$2,361,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$63,447,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$60,807,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$66,950,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$59,675,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$67,561,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$60,068,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$68,221,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$61,318,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$68,897,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$63,302,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$67,561,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$60,068,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$68,221,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$61,318,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$68,897,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$63,302,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$68,950,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$59,675,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$67,561,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$60,068,000,000.

(10) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$23,641,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$24,054,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$23,848,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$23,860,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$22,167,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$22,280,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$21,300,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$21,438,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$21,157,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$21,307,000,000.

(11) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$23,641,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$24,054,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$23,848,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$23,860,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$22,167,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$22,280,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$21,300,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$21,438,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$21,157,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$21,307,000,000.

(12) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

- Fiscal year 2003:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$23,641,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$24,054,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2004:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$23,848,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$23,860,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2005:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$22,167,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$22,280,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2006:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$21,300,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$21,438,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2007:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$21,157,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$21,307,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,352,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15,315,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$17,961,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15,515,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$17,461,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15,895,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$15,705,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$16,295,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$15,548,000,000.  
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$81,037,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$79,090,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$83,241,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$81,746,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$86,477,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$84,023,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$89,463,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$86,353,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$92,734,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$89,259,000,000.  
(11) Health (550):  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$223,536,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$219,931,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$237,930,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$236,645,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$255,817,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$253,959,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$274,576,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$272,695,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$295,541,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$293,035,000,000.  
(12) Medicare (570):  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$237,705,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$237,599,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$245,612,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$245,856,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$272,903,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$272,795,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$292,418,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$292,173,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$317,411,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$317,667,000,000.  
(13) Income Security (600):  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$322,031,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$322,385,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$325,372,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$323,791,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$334,538,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$332,599,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$344,039,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$341,754,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$352,017,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$348,019,000,000.  
(14) Social Security (650):  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$14,303,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$14,303,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15,170,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$15,170,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$16,063,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$16,062,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$16,863,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$16,863,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$18,013,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,012,000,000.  
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$56,858,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$56,733,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$59,127,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$58,888,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,220,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$63,473,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$63,401,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$63,246,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,550,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$62,642,000,000.  
(16) Administration of Justice (750):  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$36,948,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,320,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,663,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$42,219,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$37,606,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,201,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$38,880,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,775,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,776,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,550,000,000.  
(17) General Government (800):  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$17,604,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$17,408,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$18,067,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,196,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$18,426,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,334,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$18,442,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,227,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$18,788,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,546,000,000.  
(18) Net Interest (900):  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, \$262,524,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$262,524,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, \$277,366,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$277,365,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, \$286,992,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$286,991,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, \$294,769,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$294,768,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, \$302,679,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$302,678,000,000.  
(19) Allowances (920):  
Fiscal year 2003:  
(A) New budget authority, —\$689,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$1,791,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, —\$917,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$859,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, —\$816,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$787,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, —\$631,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$609,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, —\$696,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$678,000,000.  
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, —\$48,197,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$48,197,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2004:  
(A) New budget authority, —\$56,150,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$56,150,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2005:  
(A) New budget authority, —\$57,370,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$57,370,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2006:  
(A) New budget authority, —\$51,180,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$51,180,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2007:  
(A) New budget authority, —\$53,155,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$53,155,000,000.

## TITLE II—RESERVE AND CONTINGENCY FUNDS

### Subtitle A—Reserve Funds for Legislation Assumed in Aggregates

#### SEC. 201. RESERVE FUND FOR WAR ON TERRORISM.

In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Armed Services reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for operations of the Department of Defense to prosecute the war on terrorism, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate revisions to the allocations and other levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but the total adjustment for all measures considered under this section shall not exceed \$10,000,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2003 and outlays flowing therefrom.

#### SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE MODERNIZATION AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Energy and Commerce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides a prescription drug benefit and modernizes medicare, and provides adjustments to the medicare program on a fee-for-service, capitated, or other basis, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the appropriate committee allocations for such committees and other appropriate levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed \$5,000,000,000 in new budget authority and \$5,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2003 and \$350,000,000,000 in new budget authority and \$350,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2012.

(b) APPLICATION.—After the consideration of any measure for which an adjustment is made pursuant to subsection (a), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make any further appropriate adjustments.

#### SEC. 203. RESERVE FUND FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2003.—In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides in excess of \$7,529,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2003 for grants to States authorized under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the appropriate allocations for such committee and other appropriate levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed \$1,000,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2003 and outlays flowing therefrom.

(b) FISCAL YEARS 2004–2007.—In the House, if the Committee on Education and the Workforce reports a bill or joint resolution,

or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that reauthorizes grants to States under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the applicable allocations of the appropriate committees to accommodate a total budget authority and outlay level for such program not in excess of the following: \$9,587,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom, \$10,755,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2005 and outlays flowing therefrom, \$12,047,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2006 and outlays flowing therefrom, and \$13,497,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 2007 and outlays flowing therefrom (assuming changes from current policy levels of the following: \$1,752,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004, \$2,763,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2005, \$3,894,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2006, and \$5,180,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2007).

**SEC. 204. RESERVE FUND FOR HIGHWAYS AND HIGHWAY SAFETY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that establishes an obligation limitation in excess of \$23,864,000,000 for fiscal year 2003 for programs, projects, and activities within the highway category (under section 251(c)(7)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays for such committee by the amount of outlays resulting from such excess, but—

(1) only if chairman of the Committee on the Budget determines that the bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that establishes such obligation limitation provides that the obligation limitation is made available solely for programs, projects, or activities as distributed under section 1102 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century;

(2) only if the total amount of obligation limitation for programs, projects, or activities distributed by such formula for fiscal year 2003 exceeds \$23,864,000,000; and

(3) does not exceed \$1,180,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2003.

(b) RULE OF ENFORCEMENT.—In the House, section 302(f)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall be deemed to also apply to the applicable allocation of outlays in the case of any bill or joint resolution that establishes an obligation limitation for fiscal year 2003 for programs within the highway category, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon.

**Subtitle B—Additional Surpluses Reserved for Debt Reduction**

**SEC. 211. CONTINGENCY FUND FOR ADDITIONAL SURPLUSES.**

In the House, if after the release of the report pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 entitled the Budget and Economic Outlook: Update (for fiscal years 2003 through 2012), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget determines, in consultation with the Directors of the Congressional Budget Office and of the Office of Management and Budget, that the estimated unified surplus for fiscal year 2003 and for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2007 exceeds the estimated unified surplus for fiscal year 2003 and for that period as set forth in the report of the Committee on the Budget for this resolution, then the chairman of that committee may increase the surplus or reduce the deficit, as applicable, and reduce the level of the public debt and

debt held by the public by the difference between such estimates for that period.

**Subtitle C—Contingency Funds for Accounting Changes**

**SEC. 221. CONTINGENCY FUND FOR ACCRUAL ACCOUNTING.**

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate changes in section 302(a) allocations of the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Government Reform and aggregates, if appropriate, to effectuate and implement the necessary authorizing and appropriation measures to charge Federal agencies for the full cost of accrued Federal retirement and health benefits.

**SEC. 222. CONTINGENCY FUND FOR RECLASSIFICATION OF STUDENT AID ACCOUNTS.**

In the House, if a bill or joint resolution is enacted that amends the Higher Education Act to make student aid administration subject to annual appropriations, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may—

(1) increase the section 302(a) allocation for the Committee on Appropriations by the amount of new budget authority provided by that measure but not to exceed \$797,000,000 for fiscal year 2003 and the outlays flowing therefrom; and

(2) make the appropriate adjustment in the section 302(a) allocation for the Committee on Education and the Workforce resulting from the enactment of the bill or joint resolution making the student aid administration subject to annual appropriations.

**Subtitle D—Implementation of Reserve and Contingency Funds**

**SEC. 231. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

(d) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, there shall be a separate section 302(a) allocation to the appropriate committees for medicare. For purposes of enforcing such separate allocation under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the “first fiscal year” and the “total of fiscal years” shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2003 and the total of fiscal years 2003 through 2012 included in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution, respectively. Such separate allocation shall be the exclusive allocation for medicare under section 302(a).

**TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT**

**SEC. 301. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE HOUSE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), an advance ap-

propriation may not be reported in a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto.

(2) Managers on the part of the House may not agree to a Senate amendment that would violate paragraph (1) unless specific authority to agree to the amendment first is given by the House by a separate vote with respect thereto.

(b) EXCEPTION.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided—

(1) for fiscal year 2004 for programs, projects, activities or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$23,178,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2003 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2003.

**SEC. 302. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of such Act to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts provided for the Social Security Administration.

**SEC. 303. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE.**

The report submitted by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office on or before February 15 of each year pursuant to section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall include the following information for the preceding fiscal year—

(1) a comparison of the different impact between forecasted economic variables used to model projections for that fiscal year and what actually happens;

(2) an identification of the technical factors that contributed to the forecasting inaccuracies for that fiscal year;

(3) a variance analysis between forecasted and actual budget results for that fiscal year; and

(4) recommendations on how to improve forecasting accuracies.

**TITLE IV—SENSE OF CONGRESS AND SENSE OF HOUSE PROVISIONS**

**SEC. 401. COMBATING INFECTIOUS DISEASES.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the United States has historically taken an unparalleled leadership role in providing humanitarian assistance and relief to the world's poorest people;

(2) that role has included initiatives to expand trade, relieve debt of countries pursuing structural economic reforms, and provide medical technology to improve health and life expectancy around the globe; and

(3) good governance and continued economic reforms are essential to eliminating poverty, encouraging economic growth, and ensuring stability in developing countries.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should continue to assist, through expanded international trade, debt relief, and medical assistance to combat infectious diseases, those countries that reform their economies, promote democratic institutions, and respect basic human rights.

**SEC. 402. ASSET BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) For the vast majority of United States households, the pathway to the economic mainstream and financial security is not through spending and consumption, but through savings, investing, and the accumulation of assets.

(2) One-third of all Americans have no assets available for investment and another 20 percent have only negligible assets. The situation is even more serious for minority households; for example, 60 percent of African-American households have no or negative financial assets.

(3) Nearly 50 percent of all children in America live in households that have no assets available for investment, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 73 percent of African-American children.

(4) Up to 20 percent of all United States households do not deposit their savings in financial institutions and, thus, do not have access to the basic financial tools that make asset accumulation possible.

(5) Public policy can have either a positive or a negative impact on asset accumulation. Traditional public assistance programs based on income and consumption have rarely been successful in supporting the transition to economic self-sufficiency. Tax policy, through \$288,000,000,000 in annual tax incentives, has helped lay the foundation for the great middle class.

(6) Lacking an income tax liability, low-income working families cannot take advantage of asset development incentives available through the Federal tax code.

(7) Individual Development Accounts have proven to be successful in helping low-income working families save and accumulate assets. Individual Development Accounts have been used to purchase long-term, high-return assets, including homes, postsecondary education and training, and small businesses.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Federal tax code should support a significant expansion of Individual Development Accounts so that millions of low-income, working families can save, build assets, and move their lives forward; thus, making positive contributions to the economic and social well-being of the United States, as well as to its future.

**SEC. 403. FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PAY.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Members of the uniformed services and civilian employees of the United States make significant contributions to the general welfare of the Nation.

(2) Increases in the pay of members of the uniformed services and of civilian employees of the United States have not kept pace with increases in the overall pay levels of workers in the private sector, so that there now exists (A) a 32 percent gap between compensation levels of Federal civilian employees and compensation levels of private sector workers, and (B) an estimated 10 percent gap between compensation levels of members of the uniformed services and compensation levels of private sector workers.

(3) The President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2003 includes a 4.1 percent pay raise for military personnel.

(4) The Office of Management and Budget has requested that federal agencies plan their fiscal year 2003 budgets with a 2.6 percent pay raise for civilian Federal employees.

(5) In almost every year during the past two decades, there have been equal adjustments in the compensation of members of the uniformed services and the compensation of civilian employees of the United States.

(b) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House that rates of compensation for civilian employees of the United States should be adjusted at the same time, and in the same proportion, as are rates of compensation for members of the uniformed services.

**SEC. 404. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON MEDICARE+CHOICE REGIONAL DISPARITIES.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) one of the goals of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 was to expand options for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare+Choice program;

(2) the funding formula in that Act was intended to make these choices available to all Americans; and

(3) despite attempts by Congress to equalize regional disparities in Medicare+Choice payments in the Balanced Budget Refinement Act of 1999 and the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Benefits and Improvement and Protection Act of 2000, rural and other low-payment areas have continued to lag significantly behind their higher-payment counterparts in average adjusted per capita (AAPCC) reimbursements.

(b) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House that if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill to reform Medicare, it should apply all new funds directed to the Medicare+Choice program to increase funding to counties receiving floor or blended rates relative to counties receiving the minimum update.

**SEC. 405. BORDER SECURITY AND ANTI-TERRORISM.**

It is the sense of the House that this resolution assumes \$380 million in new budget authority and a corresponding level of outlays in functional category 750 (Administration of Justice) for the Immigration and Naturalization Service to implement a visa tracking system as part of a comprehensive plan to protect the United States and its territories from threats of terrorist attack.

**SEC. 406. PACIFIC NORTHWEST SALMON RECOVERY.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) Pacific Salmon are historically, culturally, and economically important to the people of the Northwest;

(2) the United States Government has negotiated treaties with the Columbia River Indian tribes;

(3) the National Marine Fisheries Service in December 2000 issued a biological opinion on the Federal Columbia River Power System calling for greater efforts by the Federal Government, to satisfy the ESA standards of section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act; and

(4) the citizens of the Pacific Northwest are committed to salmon recovery and their hard work in communities throughout the region to advance local solutions deserves Federal assistance.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that this resolution assumes that the Pacific Northwest salmon recovery program, administered by Federal agencies on the Federal Columbia River Power System and Pacific coast, should be made a high-priority item for funding.

**SEC. 407. FEDERAL FIRE PREVENTION ASSISTANCE.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) Increased demands on firefighting and emergency medical personnel have made it difficult for local governments to adequately fund necessary fire safety precautions.

(2) The Government has an obligation to protect the health and safety of the firefighting and emergency medical personnel of the United States and to ensure that they have the financial resources to protect the public.

(3) The high rates in the United States of death, injury, and property damage caused by fires demonstrates a critical need for Federal investment in support of firefighting and emergency medical personnel.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, has successfully provided financial resources for basic firefighting needs since its inception; and

(2) in the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the ultimate sacrifice paid by over 300 firefighters, that as Congress makes funding decisions regarding the proposed grants for first responders, local firefighters receive at least as much funding as they did under the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate shall not exceed 3 hours with 2 hours confined to the Congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 1 hour of debate on the Congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the attention of my colleagues for what I think is a very important, very sober debate today that needs to occur about America's future.

Mr. Chairman, the world changed on September 11. Boy, we have heard those words quite a bit lately from a number of Members in a bipartisan way. We are at war. America suffered a profound national emergency. Our pre-attack recession grew deeper, and any one of those challenges would have made putting a budget together very difficult. But all three at one time, trust me, put a pretty difficult task before this Congress in trying to put a budget plan together. All three could have resulted in deficits for many years.

But when the world changed on September 11, the President came forward with a plan. He provided leadership, and America saw the Congress come together in a bipartisan way. We provided, in a bipartisan way, resources to meet the national emergency, resources to prosecute the war, and about week and a half ago, bipartisan tax relief and job creation resources, as well as worker protection assistance.

These were appropriate responses, but these appropriate responses eliminated the surplus.

Americans out there, constituents of all of ours, are still wondering: Is America safe; will I have a good paying job; and what is my family's future going to look like?

First on the question of is America safe, our budget secures our Nation, allows us the resources to win the war, secure the homeland, invest in future technology, and keep our promise to our veterans.

With the budget plan that we put together and that we present to the Congress today, we secure our Nation's future, and we do it in a positive way.

The second question that Americans are asking is will I have a good paying job? Our budget secures a growing economy. It funds job creation and worker protection, adopts a national energy strategy, invests in America's roads and infrastructure, provides for an agriculture safety net, promotes trade and access to our products, and, yes, provides additional tax relief and tax reform. We believe in short what this budget plan does, it creates jobs.

With this budget plan, I believe we secure a growing economy. But Americans are still asking questions. They are asking, do my family and I have a secure future? We cannot forget while we are securing the economy, securing the homeland, that America's priorities must continue. We must secure the future for ourselves and our families, leave no child behind in education, fully fund and reauthorize special education, conserve and protect our environment, access quality and affordable health care. And finally, modernize Medicare and provide prescription drugs for seniors, and protect every penny of Social Security benefits, our pensions, and our savings for the future.

With the plan that we put together, we believe we have better secured our future for ourselves and our families. Without our bipartisan response to the economy and to the war and to protect the homeland, this would have not only been a balanced budget, but even with this budget and even with the short-term borrowing that needs to occur to accomplish those important priorities, under our plan we begin to pay down the national debt again in 2004.

So I believe our mission is undeniable. We must secure America's future. Our strategy is clear. We need security for our Nation, security for a growing economy, and security for ourselves and our families. I believe that our budget makes it happen, together with the fine work of the American people.

We have a plan. There is no doubt that people can quibble with the fact that no plan is perfect in every regard. But the President proposed a plan, we made it better. We are providing positive leadership at this crucial time in American history, and it is time to get that job done.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORN-

BERRY) to talk about securing our Nation.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, every year during the debate on the budget, someone says it is about more than just numbers, it is about priorities. Certainly since September 11, the priorities of the country have changed.

□ 1545

National security is not just something that happens in a military base or in some far-off country. It touches every household, every workplace, every school and hospital in the country. National security is the first priority of the country, and it is the first priority of this budget.

The first paragraph of the President's budget submission says that the war against terrorism is a war unlike any other in American history. We did not choose this war, but we will not shrink from it; and we will mobilize all the necessary resources of our society to fight and to win.

That is what this budget does. It mobilizes the resources necessary to fight and win the war against terrorism. The budget provides \$46 billion, or a 13 percent increase, in defense. Some people think that is too much. Other people do not think it is enough. The committee decided to go with what the President recommended, giving him all of the resources he has asked for to fight this war. We also support the President in focusing on the troops with a 4.1 percent pay hike for the troops as well as an additional 2 percent for some specially targeted mid-career personnel. This budget will help give the troops the tools they need to do their job, with \$69 billion in procurement and \$54 billion for research and development.

It includes the largest operating and maintenance budget ever at \$140 billion; but it also keeps faith with those people who have already served our country, fully funding for the first time in a number of years military health care, expanding concurrent receipt for those who are most severely disabled, and also significantly increasing VA health care by about 12 percent.

In addition to those categories, Mr. Chairman, the budget follows the President's lead in nearly doubling the spending for homeland security. There are some important initiatives here, such as significantly increasing the money for border security. So for the INS, Customs, Coast Guard, which may all be put together soon, there are significant increases in their funding. It improves funding to prepare for bioterrorism with money for hospitals, research for vaccines, strengthening our ability to detect attacks. Most significantly, it has a new program to assist the local policemen, local firefighters and emergency responders with \$3.5 billion administered by FEMA so that those local first responders can have money to train, equip and get the things that they need to do.

Mr. Chairman, it is fair to disagree about the spending on any particular

program, but the overriding fact of this budget and the overriding fact of our time is that this country is at war against terrorism. It is a different kind of war. Sometimes we will be in a fierce military battle such as we have seen in recent days in Afghanistan. At other times there will be lull in the military operations. Sometimes the memory of the attacks against innocent Americans are going to be fresh in our minds. At other times those memories will seem to fade, and we face the danger of drifting back into business as usual.

But the truth is it is not going to be business as usual again for a very long time. We are at war. This budget supports the President in fighting and winning that war, it supports the soldiers on the ground in Afghanistan, it supports the people guarding our borders and the other people trying to protect our public health, it supports local policemen and firefighters; and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, it deserves our support as well.

This is the time to put our money where our mouth is. It is not the time for vague statements and assurances. We put our money where our mouth is with our votes. I suggest we vote for this resolution.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, when we set out to put together this budget, our goal was to put together a strong wartime budget, a budget that met the priorities laid out by the President during his State of the Union Address, to fund and win the war on terrorism, to fund our homeland security needs, and to get our economy moving again after the attacks on September 11 and the impact it has had on our economy and not just in Washington and New York but across the country.

We worked hard to put together a budget plan that meets these priorities and in particular on the economy, putting together a budget that lays the groundwork for strong economic growth not just as we move forward in the year but out 2 years, 5 years and 10 years. We put together a budget that fully funded the worker protection act signed by the President earlier this year, extending unemployment benefits and giving businesses, large and small, incentives to invest in new technology, new productivity, accelerating the depreciation that they could take. We have got to remember that jobs are not created here in Washington by legislators. Jobs are created by entrepreneurs and risk-takers and investors. In my home State of New Hampshire, over 60 percent of the jobs come from small businesses. By giving them that incentive to invest, we give them the opportunity to create jobs for others.

We made a commitment to implement a national energy strategy to reduce our dependence on oil imports

from the Middle East and from overseas. We made a commitment to invest in roads and infrastructure, something that the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure spoke about with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) during a colloquy earlier. We made a commitment to pass a strong farm bill and included that in the budget. We made a commitment to expand opportunities to export American-manufactured products overseas, expand trade and strengthen our economy.

We will hear and have heard a lot of criticism about this budget proposal, but let us remember a few things. If someone wants to change this bill, if someone is criticizing this bill, the spending levels and the priorities, you have got three choices: you can raise taxes to fund those priorities, and I do not think in this economy we should be raising taxes; you can cut defense and homeland security funding to put into a particular domestic initiative, and I think that would be a grave mistake in this environment as we have made a commitment to win the war on terrorism; or you can increase the deficits. Those are your only three choices.

We will hear a lot of scare tactics about Social Security, but let us step back a little bit. The budgets that were opposed by the other side of the aisle over each of the last 4 years, let us look at what they have done. We have paid down over \$450 billion in debt. Never have we put public debt as a percentage of our economy at such a low level. And the scare tactics on Social Security, let us look at where the Social Security trust funds are, with and without the tax relief legislation passed last year. The balances in the Social Security trust funds have not been changed one penny.

Do we need to take up legislation to strengthen Social Security? I believe we do. Do we need to fund a prescription drug benefit for Medicare? Absolutely. And we have committed to doing just that. In this budget, there is \$350 billion for a Medicare prescription drug benefit that is voluntary, that is affordable, that makes a difference for seniors around the country. We have increased special education funding, something very important to schools in New Hampshire, to a record level. And we have funded \$2.6 billion in veterans health benefits and also funded concurrent receipt legislation.

This is a budget that sets good priorities, that I think sets the right priorities; but that does not mean we have not had to make some tough choices. But in not presenting a budget plan, the other side has defaulted on their willingness to make those choices or to set priorities. We heard some discussion about a potential substitute calling for a mid-session review and better CBO scoring. That is not an alternative. That is not a different set of priorities. We need a budget and we need vision. That is what this committee has offered.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Committee on the Budget for yielding me this time and compliment him for his leadership in putting together a budget that is good for American families. All over America, families will ask, Is this a good budget for America's families? And it is. It is a balanced approach. It balances our national defense needs, our homeland security, economic needs, and the priorities for our families. It is a balanced approach. We have made the critical decisions and we have made the critical choices as to where we will invest the \$2.1 trillion.

Again, this budget will be criticized; but our colleagues on the other side have no Democrat substitute. In the Committee on the Budget, we got an idea as to what a substitute might look like if it were proposed. There was \$175 billion to \$200 billion of new spending. Zero of it would be used to reduce the national debt. Zero would be used for Social Security. Zero would be used for national defense. Zero would be used for homeland security. \$175 billion of it, all of it, would be used to increase Washington spending. We do not necessarily believe that that is the best approach for America's families, because if they were not going to increase our national debt, what they would have had to have done is they would have had to have increased taxes. The last time they increased taxes on American families, let us take a look at what they did. They retroactively increased the death tax, they increased taxes on Social Security, they raised Medicare taxes, they raised the gas taxes, they raised personal income tax rates, and they raised the corporate tax rate. That is not a balanced approach for America. We have made the tough decisions that will secure the future for America's families.

Let us take a look at some of the choices that we have made. Let us take a look at what we have done in the area of education. In the last 6 years, we have doubled the investment in our children, the dollars that we have invested in education. This now will enable us to build on those results and continue moving forward in this critical area. The one that perhaps makes the most difference to our local school districts is what we have done for our children with special education needs. Not only do we focus on a priority, but every time we invest in special education we fulfill a commitment that we have made, that we made way back in the 1960s as to funding this and what the Washington commitment would be.

Republican Congresses have tripled funding for IDEA funding in the last 6 years. We increase that by another \$1 billion in this budget, and we put in place a plan so that within the next 10 years we will fully fund our commit-

ment. It is our commitment to these special students, and it is our commitment to local school districts which will free up a lot of education dollars at the local district that they can then drive. We maintain our commitment to higher education by continuing to fund Pell grants at \$4,000. We increase funding for low-income school districts. We put an emphasis on reading first. We have committed to our families and to America that we will keep our focus on education.

We also will ensure that we improve health care. We have set aside \$5.9 billion for bioterrorism. We have set aside \$350 billion to develop a Medicare prescription drug plan. We have carried through, and this is the final installment, of doubling funding over 5 years for the National Institutes of Health. We improve veterans health care. We improve community health centers and health center programs for rural areas. We are committed to continuing our focus on health care and retirement.

This is a balanced, good approach that will secure the future for America's families.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, a year ago I closed the debate on the budget by noting that it has taken us almost 20 years, \$4 trillion in debt, to escape the fiscal mistakes that we made in the 1980s and to turn this budget around and finally move it out of deficits and into surpluses. But we did it. There is the record of the late 8 years of the Clinton administration: every year a better bottom line.

I went on to say that today, if I had one priority, a year ago, one overriding objective, it was simply this, to make sure that we did not backslide into the hole that we have just dug ourselves out of. That was my objective, I said. That is why I had a problem last year with the Republican resolution, because it left so little room for error. I went on to say I hoped that these blue sky projections that totaled some \$5.6 trillion in surpluses over the next 10 years will materialize. It will be a great bounty for all of us. But if they do not and if we pass this resolution, we can find ourselves right back in the red again in the blink of an economist's eye. Mr. Chairman, here we are, back in that hole again. You listen to the other side talk, and you would not even think that we had a problem.

I just pulled two pages out of various economic studies of the budget situation we have got on our hands. Here is CBO's most recent estimate of the deficit in the President's budget. This year it will be \$248 billion.

□ 1600

\$248 billion. Next year, \$297 billion in the red, in deficit. Over the next 10 years, 2003 to 2012, it will be \$1.8 trillion in deficit, and that means \$1.8 trillion into the Social Security Trust

Fund, because that is how you make up that deficit.

They act as if we do not have a problem. They talk about recovering surplus. Look at their own numbers. Next year, a deficit of \$224 billion on budget excluding Social Security. Over 4 or 5 years, \$830 billion.

Here we are, Mr. Chairman. We have witnessed the biggest fiscal reversal in the history of our country. \$5 trillion has vanished, disappeared, it is gone. We had \$5.6 trillion last year. Looking at the President's own numbers this year, we have \$0.6 trillion if we implement his budget. Last year we had for 10 straight years nothing but black ink on the bottom line, 10 straight years we had on budget surpluses last year.

We talked last year about virtually paying off all of the Treasury's debt held by the public, over \$3 trillion worth. This year, this year we have got on budget deficits for 10 straight years. And what are we talking about now? Raising the ceiling on the national debt immediately. The Secretary of Treasury says he needs \$750 billion of additional debt ceiling because the national debt is going up, it is not coming down.

Well, here we are, Mr. Chairman, and my problem with this Republican budget is that it presents no plan, no strategy, no way to get us out of this hole. It only leads to bigger deficits and greater debt.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) offered a process before the Committee on Rules and defended it on the floor. So did the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN). They at least had a way to back the budget out of Social Security, which is an objective we all profess at least to hold. It was not made in order. Nothing was made in order, except this resolution under the rule that was presented to us.

So we have a Republican budget in name, but in name only, because it does not have a plan. Oh, it has a default plan, all right. In the absence of any kind of constructive concerted plan, it has a default plan. That default plan is to keep on borrowing and spending Social Security, to revert to the practice that we all foreswore and said we would never ever do again once we reached that summit and were able to get away from that onerous practice.

Why do we have such little time then in the face of such serious matters to debate the most consequential vote that we will cast in this session? It is not because Republicans are eager to get home. It is because their budget will not stand scrutiny, not for long, and they know it. It will not stand scrutiny because it is just the tip of the iceberg. This is not the real budget. This is part of their budget.

Let me give you an example. Last year, in order to shoe-horn the tax bill into the amount allocated for the total tax bill, they phased it in over time, and then in 2010 they did something dramatic, they actually repealed everything that had just been imple-

mented. So we have a repealer in 2010 that undoes tax cuts that were done last year.

We asked, with this 5-year budget, does it provide or anticipate anything with respect to the repeal of the repealer in 2010? We were told emphatically "no." The next day the Speaker said absolutely, we will repeal the sunset provision in the Tax Code. Ari Fleischer at the White House backed him up. Those are pretty high sources.

But you search this budget in vain for any trace whatsoever of the repeal of the repealer in the year 2010. It is not in here. CBO tells us if you put it in there, you have to make a \$569 billion adjustment, deduction, to revenues. It is not in there.

Nor is there any provision for fixing the AMT, nor is there any provision for extending popular tax provisions that will expire, nor, for that matter, is there any of the President's request for \$675 billion in additional tax relief. It has all been pushed forward into the second 5 years.

This is not some policy wonk debate whether you should do a budget 5 years or 10 years. This is a concerted strategy to shove everything forward and make the first 5 years as good as you possibly can by ducking the issue that will come just over the horizon.

A budget is a plan, we all know that. We have household budgets, and if we had a plan here, if the Republicans had a plan in their budget, they would display it. They would roll it out. Because surely if they had a plan, one goal, one objective in that plan, would be to get the budget out of Social Security, to quit borrowing and spending the Social Security budget.

One of the reasons we have a 5-year budget, one of the reasons that we have Social Security, one of the reasons that we have OMB as a scorekeeper for this budget instead of CBO, is right here. It is this chart right here. These bar graphs right here tell an awful lot.

If you look to the far left axis, you see a little blue stub. That is where the Clinton administration got us. We were, for the first time in 30 years, out of Social Security, out of Medicare. We had a surplus over and above both of those accounts.

2001, you see a little stub below the line. That too is a partial Clinton year. The reason that stub is below the line is that the Republicans shifted a corporate tax payment, \$35 billion worth, from September 15 to October 1 to shore up 2002 numbers. Back that artificial shift out and it too is right at the line.

So this is the beginning baseline that the President inherited, the best fiscal situation any President has inherited in modern times. And these are the deficits that are entailed by his budget and these are the results to Social Security and to Medicare. Medicare, the yellow or orange line at the top. Fully consumes the Medicare surplus, \$650 billion over the next 10 years, every penny of it. Social Security, 70 to 75

percent of the Social Security surplus is fully consumed over the next 10 years.

The key thing is if you look in the year 2007, which is a terminal year in this budget, if you looked at their budget you might think, well, they have a plan. It looks like the amount of invasion of the Social Security surplus is about to diminish, they are about to turn the corner. But in truth, it keeps on keeping on. There is no plan. There is no result.

This is not the kind of budget that will put us back on the path we were on. We have had some fundamental changes since this time last year, I will be the first to acknowledge it, and I will be the first to say the debate today is not about national defense or homeland defense. We support both, on the same terms and in the same amount.

But we also support Social Security. We also thought we had a good thing going with our fiscal policy last year. We would like to get back on this path. This budget does not lead us back. This leads to more debt, more deficits, more invasion of the Social Security Trust Fund, and it has no plan for resolution of any of those things.

Before this year is out, I hope, earnestly hope, having been here 20 years and struggled and worked to put the budget on an even keel, I hope we will have some solution to this problem. But this is not a solution. This does not lead us in the right direction and this budget should be emphatically defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, this budget is deceptive in at least three respects, and I and a number of colleagues are going to elaborate on that in the next few minutes.

First, it uses a 5-year forecasting window instead of the customary 10-year window; secondly, it bases the forecast on projections generated by the administration's political appointees at OMB, rather than the nonpartisan CBO; and, thirdly, it omits the cost of major initiatives that both parties agree must be enacted.

Since the 1997 Balanced Budget Act, it has been customary to employ 10-year projections in budgeting. Last year, when Republicans were pushing a major tax cut, they were eager to use 10-year projections that put the aggregate cost of their proposal in a more favorable light. Now, when it does not work that way, when it does not suit their purposes, Republicans are providing only a 5-year budget outlook.

This budget further seeks to mask the effect of the Republicans' failed fiscal policies by using OMB projections instead of relying on Congress' official nonpartisan scorekeeper, the CBO. During committee markup, our budget chairman characterized this hat trick

as a simple use of the remote control. "If you don't like the weather report," he said, "you might as well change the channel. That is what we are doing."

Yes, indeed, they have changed the channel. Remember, though, that shutting down the Federal Government in 1995 was undertaken by our Republican friends precisely to force a Democratic administration to use CBO estimates. Now House Republicans have decided that CBO's figures are, well, inconvenient. And they are. Just using CBO's baseline estimate of spending under current law exposes a \$318 billion hole over 10 years.

It sounds like the bad old days of "rosy scenarios," and it goes straight to the resolution's bottom line and explains the majority's sudden affection for OMB figures.

Finally, this budget omits and understates the cost of things that the Republican leadership has already stated its intent to do. The administration is about to request supplemental appropriations for defense and homeland security. Congress will honor these requests.

The day after the committee markup of this budget, the Speaker himself announced plans to bring to the floor in April larger tax cuts than this resolution permits. The budget resolution accommodates none of this, nor does it provide for a workable Medicare prescription drug benefit, nor for natural disaster relief, nor for critical investments in education, nor for a fix for the Alternative Minimum Tax.

Mr. Chairman, the real Republican budget creates a huge permanent deficit. It spends at least 86 percent of the Social Security surplus and all of the Medicare surplus over the next 6 years, and it heaps up public debt for years to come. Smoke and mirrors cannot hide the fact that the Republican budget spends the Social Security surplus as far as the eye can see, and it has no plan to bring the budget out of deficit and back into surplus.

Clearly, supporters of this budget do not want to reveal the ultimate consequences of their choices, and in the next few minutes my colleagues and I will further elaborate on the ways this budget cloaks its full cost.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, we are here on a historic day. This is the first time in 19 years we have had a totally closed rule on the budget; no amendments, no alternatives, one shot, Republican, that is it.

Now, why is that? Well, you have come to the second annual meeting of the county fair where they play the three walnut shell con game. We are playing it again. We played it last year.

The fact is that the first shell here is the budget estimates. Are we going to

use OMB or CBO? These people closed the government down in 1995 over whether or not we are going to use OMB or CBO. They said CBO is the only numbers. Now this year, it is OMB. Well, they moved that around.

Then they said last year, we have a lot of money, oh, gosh, we have a lot of money. Look at them 10-year projections. Then things went to pieces. So this year they said let us just look at 5 years. That is enough. That is sufficient enough. That is a second shell.

If you think about it, they have understated the cost of mandatory spending. They talk about the stimulus package we passed last week with \$100 billion in it, and they ignore it, totally ignore it. And there is a budget coming within 2 weeks of our getting back here, we will have a supplemental budget out here for the military, and they act in this budget as though that does not even exist. It is like, well, it has to be that third shell. It is somewhere in there, I do not know.

They do not cut the tax cuts they plan to offer. The President put a budget out and said we are going to repeal those tax cuts. And he says no, I want to repeal the repealer. They voted no in the committee on that issue. They are not going to do that, they say.

Right now there are 3 million people paying the Alternative Minimum Tax. Within 5 years you are going to have 30 million people having to figure their income tax twice, and they are just closing their eyes to it. "Do not show me." They just hide everything.

Now, this is the slam-bam-thank-you-ma'am budget. It is going to go through here. It means absolutely nothing. It is a total sham. But what it really is is a generational mugging. It is a mugging of our kids. This shell game is trying to hide from our kids what we are doing to them.

We are starting down the same thing we did in the Reagan years. It was 1983 with a closed budget, a closed rule, and we started down like a rocket. And it took us 20 years to dig out of it. And here we are today, going down that same road.

Now, I hope the kids are watching, because they are playing a shell game on you. They are simply hiding what this costs. They do not want you to know. And they are taking it from Social Security. There is no plan in these shells for how you are going to get out of using Medicare and Social Security.

□ 1615

Everybody here knows that 40 million people are coming down the road toward Social Security and Medicare, and there is nothing.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for demonstrating that these arguments about 5 versus 10-year budget numbers and switching to OMB estimates are not just budget wonkery. They have real consequences for our

fiscal solvency and for the welfare of future generations.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, there is so much chicanery in this Republican budget resolution that it would make even an Enron auditor blush.

Our Republican friends are not happy with the estimates produced by the Congressional Budget Office. They say, we will just write a budget using the administration's far rosier estimates. Did not House Republicans demand 7 years ago that the Clinton administration use CBO estimates? My, what a difference.

Nor is the GOP happy with what the 10-year budget projection would reveal: A stunning loss of \$5 trillion in projected surpluses, largely due to last year's tax cut. No problem, we will just write a budget with a 5-year projection. It just disappears like magic.

Everyone in this Chamber knows that the shorter projection is an attempt to conceal the cost of making last year's tax cuts permanent, an estimated \$569 billion.

This resolution includes one purposeful evasion after another. But there is one thing our Republican friends cannot hide: The fact that their budget will raid the Social Security and Medicare trust funds every year for the next 10 years, for a total of \$2 trillion.

Last year, the majority leader offered these reassuring words: "We must understand that it is inviolate to intrude against either Social Security or Medicare, and if that means foregoing, or, as it were, paying for tax cuts, then we will do just that." They did not. They are not. That promise has turned out to be as empty as the GOP's lockbox.

This budget resolution, Mr. Chairman, is as irresponsible and as dishonest as were the Enron financial statements. And, tragically, the consequences of its adoption could be as negative. Let us reject this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, there's so much chicanery in the Republican budget resolution that it would make even an Enron auditor blush.

Our Republican friends are not happy with the estimates produced by the Congressional Budget Office.

They say, "We'll just write a budget using the administration's far rosier estimates."

Didn't House Republicans demand seven years ago that the Clinton administration use CBO estimates?

Nor is the GOP happy with what a 10-year budget projection would reveal—a stunning loss of \$5 trillion in projected surpluses largely due to last year's tax cut.

No problem, they say. We'll just write a budget resolution with a five-year projection.

Everyone in this chamber knows that this shorter projection is an attempt to conceal the costs of making last year's tax cut permanent—an estimated \$569 billion over 10 years.

This resolution includes one purposeful evasion after another.

But there's one thing our Republican friends cannot hide: the fact that their budget will raid the Social Security and Medicare trust funds every year for the next 10 years for a total of \$2 trillion.

Last year, the majority leader offered these reassuring words:

"We must understand that it is inviolate to intrude against either Social Security or Medicare and if that means forgoing or, as it were, paying for tax cuts, then we'll do that."

That promise turned out to be as empty as the GOP's lockbox stunt.

Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution is as irresponsible and as dishonest as were the Enron financial statements. And the consequences of its adoption could be as negative.

Let us reject it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, the reality behind this budget is that we are going to be spending Social Security cash on functions other than Social Security for the next decade.

The second reality is that most of that reflects budget choices that have nothing to do with the war in Afghanistan, the war our brave troops are fighting against the scourge of global terror. I believe the majority does a terrible disservice to our troops to try and hide behind their valor in selling budgets that raid Social Security.

The ultimate effect of the raid on Social Security will in all likelihood be higher taxes for the very men and women fighting this war as they are forced to support baby boomers in retirement years, because the baby boomers passed budgets that ran these terrible deficits.

Reject the majority budget and stop the raid on Social Security.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, when this debate started, the chairman referred to this as a wartime budget. We are united in the war on terrorism.

What exactly are we fighting for? We are fighting for a democracy. We are fighting for the right to have an open and honest debate on the floor of the House of Representatives about our Nation's priorities. We are failing that standard miserably today, because there was absolutely no response whatsoever to the fact that we are using a faulty set of numbers to have this debate.

For years, there has been universal support for using the Congressional Budget Office, which has been widely referred to as a nonpartisan, apolitical office, so we can discuss how spending proposals and how tax cut proposals affect our ability to have a balanced budget and pay down the massive Fed-

eral debt, which influences interest rates and has a lot to do with the solvency of Social Security and Medicare.

Instead of using those numbers, we are left with the flippant comment, "If you do not like the weather, change the channel." Also, we are using the politically-charged Office of Management and Budget numbers. No one disputes that fact. So we are not going to have an honest road map, an honest blueprint with which this body can judge how our spending and tax cut proposals affect our ability to get back to a balanced budget, to keep interest rates low, and to begin to prepare Social Security and Medicare for the solvency of the baby boomers.

We are failing one of the most fundamental tests of our democracy today. For that reason, we should reject the budget resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important day because we are debating a budget that is a very important budget.

It is amazing to me that the other side is arguing, stop the raid on Social Security. When they were in the majority for 40 years, they took the surpluses of Social Security and spent them on big government programs. We are the ones that stopped the raid on Social Security and paid down over \$450 billion on the debt on our children.

Mr. Chairman, we have a choice to make today. We can stand with the President in funding the war on terrorism, defending our homeland, and balancing the budget, or we can align ourselves with those who offer no budget for national defense, no budget for homeland security, and no budget for Social Security.

The other party has come here not to praise any budget but to bury it. They are demonstrating the height of fiscal irresponsibility because they offer no budget at all for our country.

These charts offer a very clear picture of the Democrats' budget. This is the Democrats' budget on national security. This is the Democrats' budget on homeland security. This is the Democrats' budget on Social Security.

Republicans, though, Mr. Chairman, strike a very responsible balance. Our budget gives the President the resources he needs to wage a war against international terrorism and bolster our homeland defenses. It also puts us on the path to a balanced budget, and puts us on track to pay down more than \$180 billion in debt over the next 5 years.

Republicans are committed to returning to a balanced budget. We are the ones who balanced it in the first place. This is what our budget does: It returns us to a balanced budget so that we can protect the Social Security trust fund and pay down the debt on our children.

For decades, the Democrats have raided the Social Security trust fund, and for years Republicans, by fighting for a balanced budget, have protected seniors.

The attacks on September 11 and the recession forced a short-term wartime deficit spending, but as our economy rebounds and as we demonstrate fiscal restraint, we will move back into a surplus. That is why it is important to hold the line on spending right now.

So from the other side of the aisle we hear a chorus of criticism, but they offer no answers. Democrats all voted to raid Social Security just last year, and they have not offered a budget this year.

We know what they are against, but where is their solution? If they had the courage of their convictions, they would be forced to answer the question that they have been ducking all year long: Do they want to raise taxes, or raid defense and other priorities to pay for more spending?

The Democrats need to tell us whether they are raisers or raiders. Support this budget, and let us go forward for fiscal responsibility.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) be allowed to control 10 minutes of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I rise in very strong support of this budget resolution. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) for crafting a resolution that has the largest increase in veterans' affairs spending, especially discretionary spending, for our veterans.

There is a \$2.8 billion increase for health care in this budget. Let me just point out to my colleagues, it is needs-based. This is not something that was just "let us add it for the sake of adding," but it is needs-based.

Next year, there will be about 700,000 new, unique veteran patients. Veterans are flocking to our outpatient clinics and our community-based outpatient clinics and the like because they are getting good health care, 700,000. The budget would provide, like I said, about a \$2.8 billion increase.

Let me also point out to my colleagues that other important programs will be funded as a result of this. Last year, we passed historic legislation to help the homeless veterans. That is accommodated by this budget.

We have passed an increase in the G.I. bill, a 46 percent increase in that

college education benefit. That is accommodated by this budget.

I believe the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) deserves our thanks. He sat down with my staff and I and we spent hours going line by line over why this budget needed to be added to, and he met those needs.

I hope that every veterans' service organization, and I have spoken to virtually every one of them, they are happy with what we are doing. It is real, and I would hope my friends on the Democratic side would look at this provision and realize that we are doing justice to our veterans.

It is a good bill and a good resolution. I urge strong support for this.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

If we look across the array of defense requirements, what our men and women in uniform need in terms of ammunition, spare parts, equipment, pay, this budget starts to turn the corner from what I call the Clinton era.

If we look specifically at modernization, at the idea that we need more new trucks, tanks, ships, planes, good equipment for our people, we are spending about \$11.9 billion more than we were in the last year of the Clinton administration.

With respect to the ammo shortages, we are going to still have an ammo shortage, but we are cutting that shortage down. We are coming into it with about \$2.2 billion extra.

With respect to operations and maintenance, we are coming in with an extra \$3 billion or so.

Across-the-board, and we are coming in also with a 4.2 percent pay raise, to follow the minimum 6 percent pay raise of last year.

So we are starting to rebuild national security with this budget. We have a long way to go. I would like to have an extra \$50 billion or so in this defense budget, but on the other hand, at least we are starting to turn the corner from some very tragic days of the past 10 years or so, and I very strongly support this budget.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, who has been a leader on the issue of concurrent receipt.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this budget. For over 17 years, I have been working to eliminate the current offset between military retired pay and VA disability, which unfairly penalizes more than 500,000 military retirees nationwide.

The last Congress took the first steps towards addressing this inequity, and took an additional step towards eliminating the offset by authorizing my repeal legislation, H.R. 303.

I am very pleased, Mr. Chairman, that the budget resolution earmarks over \$500 million to fund concurrent receipt as a first step in fiscal year 2003, with increasing amounts over the next 5 years, providing a cumulative total of \$5.8 billion.

While this falls short of the funding needed to completely eliminate the current offset, it will provide for a substantial concurrent receipt benefit. And I am very, very thankful, on behalf of all of our veterans out there, to the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) and other members of the committee, especially the gentlemen from New Hampshire, Mr. BASS and Mr. SUNUNU, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK), and the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman STUMP) of the Committee on Armed Services.

The major veterans organizations support this. Let us vote for this budget so we can help our veterans and our military out there.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK), a member of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) for this outstanding budget.

As we can see from the chart, this budget keeps the promises made to our military families. For so many years, promises have been made and remain unfulfilled, but the buck stops here.

We are funding a military pay raise. Our men and women in uniform are grossly underpaid for the services they provide to this country. We have a 4.1 percent pay increase in this budget.

We are delivering on our promise to improve living standards by increasing pay. In addition, we are improving the living standards for our military families by funding over \$4 billion for improving current military family housing, as well as for building brand new housing.

□ 1630

It is unacceptable that we require military families to live in substandard housing facilities. We must support military families by supporting the budget. Finally, we are fulfilling the century-old promise of funding concurrent receipt for our disabled retired veterans. As a retired Naval officer, I believe the delivery of this promise is long overdue. This budget funds concurrent receipt for our veterans, those who need it most. It will send home a real check with real financial benefits. This year we are providing over \$500 million for this program and 5.8 billion over the next 5 years.

Our retired veterans desperately need our help. They dedicated their lives to the defense of our country, and it is time we show them how much we appreciate that.

This is a solid budget. It funds programs to improve the quality of life for our military families, and it keeps the promises to our veterans that were made long ago. I encourage my colleagues to support this budget. It is unacceptable for individuals to attack this budget when they do not offer a plan of their own.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, the events of September 11 have certainly highlighted the challenges of border security. This budget makes a commitment to the Customs Service, increasing their budget by \$619 million; substantially increases the Coast Guard as they meet the challenge of protecting our seaports; and takes a dramatic step towards reforming the INS, as has been so painfully clear that they are in need of reform in the past several days.

This budget keeps its commitment to veterans. It maintains our homeland security, and it reduces the burden of taxation on the American families. This budget is a responsible plan. Where is the other budget? It has been called chicanery. It has been called irresponsible. Where is your plan? Where is the alternative? If these things are so bad, if investing in defense, if investing in homeland security, if reducing the burden of taxation is so bad, where is the alternative? Where can the American people go to read your budget? They can get it online. They can call the Government Printing Office to get ours. Where might they go to read your budget? Where might they see what the alternative is to our plan? Where might they find those?

The Budget Resolution for FY2003 is a balanced, wartime budget that provides and prioritizes three fundamental securities of the United States: national security, economic security, and personal security.

Recently, there has been some discussion on the implications of using CBO's numbers over OMB's numbers. I believe that the use of OMB's number is the right choice and that our wartime budget will secure the future of every American family by making America safer and our economy stronger.

The bulk of the difference between CBO and OMB arises from differences in the starting point. The OMB baseline underlying over the President's budget projected a surplus of \$51 billion for the FY2003, increasing to \$109 billion in 2004, and totaling \$764 billion over the 5-year period 2003–2007. The CBO baseline projects a surplus of \$6 billion in 2003, and \$61 billion in 2004 and \$489 billion of the next 5 years.

There are two principal reasons for the baseline differences between CBO and OMB: (1) different treatment of emergency spending in response to the September 11 terrorist attacks on New York and Washington, and (2) different expectations of the future path of the

economy and their implications of tax collections and spending.

By adjusting CBO's surplus estimates to treat emergency spending increases as a one-time occurrence affords us the opportunity to make CBO's baseline estimates project \$16 billion for 2003, \$77 billion for 2004, and \$584 billion over the 2003–2007 period. Thus, the difference in baseline projections amounts to \$35 billion for 2003, \$32 billion for 2004, and \$180 billion over 5 years.

The principal difference between CBO and OMB is how the proposed increase in discretionary spending is portrayed. CBO measures from a baseline that assumes that last year's emergency response spending will recur. CBO also asserts that nondefense discretionary budget authority will be \$51 billion below baseline levels over the next five years. The President's policies for nondefense spending would actually exceed the baseline by \$34 billion over the next five years, under a baseline that treats the emergency response spending as a one-time event.

The difference in FY2003 between CBO and OMB is attributable to different revenue estimates. Over the next 5 years, slightly more than 60 percent (\$110 billion) of the \$180 billion difference is largely due to revenues. OMB expects that wages and salaries and corporate profits will constitute a larger share of GDP than does CBO. In addition, OMB projects that the average tax rate on corporate profits will be higher than CBO.

CBO estimates the costs of the President's policy proposals are quite similar to those of OMB. The cost of revenue policies are the same as OMB's for 2003 and 2004, and \$1 billion lower than OMB over the next 5 years. Similarly, mandatory policies are estimated to have the same cost for 2003, but are \$9 billion higher over the 2003–2007 period. Outlays for discretionary spending are slightly different because CBO assumes higher outlays from defense appropriations.

Our budget provides all the necessary resources to accomplish our three main national security goals: winning the war, strengthening homeland security, and modernizing the armed services. The wartime budget resolution makes the tough choices that are necessary to meet the nation's top priority of winning the war and strengthening our national defense, while continuing to invest in the modernization of the armed forces for 21st century combat. The top priority of the House budget is to provide all the resources necessary to ensure that Americans are free from terror. This budget resolution achieves this objective.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), a member of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just highlight two areas that demonstrate what a sound budget this is in dealing with national defense and homeland security. First of all, there is \$3 billion here for what I call "force security." That is to make sure that we protect our men and women in uniform and their families, whether they are here or whether they are abroad anywhere in the world. A lot of that money is going to go for physical assets that you can see and touch, just, for instance, to reinforce an entrance

gate to a military installation, to provide fencing to make sure it is off limits, to make sure unauthorized vessels cannot enter our military ports.

And then there is \$3.5 billion that goes to FEMA, that will go down to State and local governments, to let the State and local government spend the money as they see fit to equip or train or to hire more policemen, more firemen, more rescue workers, whatever they think is best. Maybe it is to use the money for increased, enhanced communications that we found we needed after a terrorist attack. But I think these are two points that make this a very sound budget. I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), the distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget, who has also been a leader on the issue of concurrent receipt.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman, and I rise in strong support of the House budget resolution and particularly for the provisions that it addresses in the issue of concurrent pay for veterans.

For over 100 years, soldiers disabled in the line of duty have had their retirement pay offset by disability payments. This is the only group of individuals that suffers from this tragic inequity, and now I am pleased to report that we have included in this budget provisions that will provide over half a billion dollars to start addressing this offset issue, a total funding over 5 years of over \$5.8 billion.

In the 7 years that I have served on this committee, 8 now, we have never been able to do this and we do now for the first time in that period of time that I have been on the committee.

I would also note that these provisions have the strong support of the American Legion, the VFW and these other national VSO's.

Mr. Chairman, this is a groundbreaking provision in this budget. I urge that the Congress support the pending budget resolution.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), a distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, this budget funds critical national security programs that will allow the United States to respond, not just to prosecute this war, but to respond to future threats. As this chart shows, the North Korean missile threat to the United States has grown enormously, originally from a scud missile, now to the taepo dong missile, which is able to deliver a weapon of mass destruction against the United States.

More worryingly, North Korean missiles are now being sold to the government of Iran, and these missiles are not only aimed at U.S. Armed Forces in the Persian Gulf but also our allies in Israel which can now be well hit

with the no dong and taepo dong systems. Likewise, the Syrian missile threat has grown, especially to our allies in Israel. If you are concerned about the security of U.S. allies, if you are concerned about responding to the missile threat, then you should support this budget. I wish the other side had produced a budget which would outline their program to respond to these threats to America and its allies. Our budget does that, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, the other side has said repeatedly in committee and on the floor that they support the President and his efforts to prosecute the war and to defend the homeland. But the fact is, without the specific budget alternative to compare, we do not know what trade-offs they would make. We do not know how they would achieve it. So what we are left with some verbal assurances without any numbers to back them up.

Mr. Chairman, I think we all understand the political frustration which bubbles up to the fore, particularly when you are facing a very popular President prosecuting a war which touches every American and has the support of the American people. But I would suggest that that frustration is no excuse to fall back on the old tactics of trying to scare people on Social Security. It is no excuse to fail to put forth a budget and only try to take pot shots at the President and this committee's budget.

I would suggest that this is a good budget. It supports the President 100 percent in his efforts to prosecute the war and defend the homeland. And it does it with more than just verbal assurances. It puts hard dollars, hard numbers behind those promises. I think we can all safely support it, and I suggest that Members vote for the budget.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me say there is no difference between us when it comes to national defense or homeland defense. Republicans are supporting \$383.3 billion for national defense. So do we as Democrats. When it comes time to vote on appropriations bills that really put that money into play, we will be there. We will support it because we support the President in the war on terrorism.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 8½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) for the purposes of control.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we are considering a budget resolution. A budget is a document where our Nation tells us what priorities are real to our Nation. It tells us who the winners and who the losers are. It is an area where we should consider our defense and our nondefense. It is an area where we should consider all people, and we should not put people who are vulnerable at risk.

Mr. Chairman, when we think about all the older citizens who are now getting their social security, we know they will now get their Social Security. So this issue is not about those who are getting their Social Security. No, this issue is about senior citizens who are fearful that they would not get their Social Security in the future. This issue is, indeed, putting those senior citizens at risk.

So when people are saying I am wondering, please, do not raid my Social Security, they are also talking perspective because this budget is a 5-year budget. Furthermore, when you consider our budget last year at April 2001, we had a surplus of \$5.6 trillion. It was August, August, not September 11 that we had found that we had spent down to 3.1. The surplus had gone. Indeed, when we began this year in February, we had less than \$1 billion, \$661 million. Indeed, we are raiding the Social Security trust fund, and they say we are not? We are.

We have now spent all of the unified surplus that is available. The only surplus, I heard my colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), say that what we should do and we would challenge each other, the only thing we can do is go to the surplus or raise taxes. Well, we are indeed spending a surplus. What surplus are we spending? We are spending the Social Security surplus.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, very simply, all day long we are going to hear a lot of talk about billions and trillions of dollars. I like to make things simple for myself and for my constituents at home. If you take an average worker or maybe a married couple together making \$50,000 a year, over the 6 years this budget deals with, both this year and the 5 years projected, they will spend, they will pay \$37,200 in Social Security taxes, \$37,200. However, under this budget plan, \$11,328 of that money will not go into the Social Security trust funds.

They think they are paying taxes for Social Security. It does not go there. What will they get in return for that \$11,000? They will get an IOU put in. They will get a bill for interest to pay on the money that is been used to spend; and they might, I am not sure yet, they might get a promissory note sent to them by this Congress. Some people are proposing to send them a little note saying, Trust us; your Social Security taxes are okay.

My constituents do not trust us. They should not trust us. We should leave their Social Security taxes alone in the trust fund that they wanted to have their money put into that they have been told. Working people deserve the truth. They are not getting it today. They will not get it with this budget. We should vote no.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I was reading the committee report in the resolution, and there is a comment here about the real meaning of balance. It says, "The principle of a balanced budget is more than simply a numbers game in which spending and revenue match up. It reflects the sense that Members of Congress are controlling the budget, not being controlled by it."

Now all these Members on the other side got up and said, we increase spending for this and we increase spending for that. And believe me, I am for most of the stuff that you got up and said. But the fact is you are acting like it is being done for free and it is balanced. But this is where it costs. We are having to borrow against the Social Security trust fund money. That is not free money. That money costs today about 6.5 percent over a 20-year period. That money costs. Who is going to pay that back? Well, not the taxpayers today, but the taxpayers 20 years from now and the taxpayers 30 year from now. I hope to be around doing that. I know the chairman hopes to be around. Our kids will be paying for that as well.

That is the real macroeconomic picture of this budget.

Now this Member will say, I think the mistake we made was last year when we said we bet the ranch on 10-year numbers and the numbers did not pan out, and they did not pan out because of the recession, and they did not pan out because of the war. Many of us said at the time that is why you could not trust 10-year numbers because we did not know what the economy was going to do, and God forbid we might have a war or a flood or something else, and we had all three.

That is why we are in this situation now. This money will have to be paid back before, before we do anything about fixing Social Security for the long run. And that is what is wrong with this budget because the other Members are saying we are going to put more money in this, more money in defense, more money for customs, more money for veterans. We are all for that, but we are acting like it is free money. And there is nothing free about this. It is going to cost the taxpayers. If it will not cost them today, it will cost them tomorrow; and we will be back in the hole that we were in for

20 years beginning in the 1980's. And the taxpayers, unfortunately, myself being one and every Member here being one, will have to dig out. And I think that is what is wrong with this budget.

□ 1645

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, with today's vote on the Federal budget we have a clear choice. We can go back to deficit spending, raiding Social Security and increasing this Nation's debt or we can choose to travel down the path of fiscal responsibility, balancing the budget, saving Social Security and paying down our debt.

Our Republican friends suggests this is a wartime budget and it should be, but is it right to ask young men and women in uniform to fight this war and then come home and ask their generation to pay for it? I think not.

On at least four occasions since 1999 this House has voted overwhelmingly to put the Social Security Trust Fund in a lockbox, pledging never to use it again to cover the other expenses of government. If any corporate officer in America raided their employee's retirement fund they would be guilty of a felony and locked up for a very long time, but here in Washington, after promising never to do it again, the Republican leadership has presented us a budget that, without apology and without remedy, raids the Social Security Trust Fund.

This is the wrong choice for America and I urge my colleagues to vote no on this irresponsible budget.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What we have seen, indeed we have no other choice, they say, other than to raid Social Security, and indeed we had a choice. We had a choice. We could have paid down the debt. Paying down the public debt would have allowed to us to protect Social Security and the Medicare Trust Fund.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) for the purposes of control.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have worked in the Committee on the Budget to put together a budget that funds the priorities laid out by the President in his State of the Union address, funding the war against terrorism, funding homeland security and getting the economy moving again, and what we have heard over the last 10 minutes here are a lot of scare tactics.

First and foremost, the suggestion that Social Security taxes paid are not credited to the Social Security Trust Fund. That simply is not true and it is

outrageous to scare the American people, let alone to scare someone who is on Social Security today, by suggesting otherwise.

We have heard a lot of discussion about the Social Security surplus. Well, let us look at the budgets that the minority voted against in past years, setting aside the Social Security surplus, paying off \$450 billion in debt, and that is one of the reasons we start from a strong foundation.

The suggestion that the Social Security Trust Fund balances are changed one iota because of any tax relief legislation that was passed last year is completely false and misleading. We have put together a budget that funds our economy, encourages investments for small businesses and technology and equipment, strengthens agriculture, funds our highway priorities and keeps the economy moving forward, and I think those are the right priorities.

To criticize the budget without offering any alternative, without offering any other proposal is simply wrong, and those on the other side that voted against the tax relief package last year that would want to repeal it this year in increased taxes, I think are headed in the wrong direction. Those on the other side that would want to cut defense spending are headed in the wrong direction. We funded the right priorities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), someone who has worked hard and probably understands Social Security better than anyone else in this Chamber.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) for yielding this time to me.

Sitting here listening to this debate, I find it absolutely outrageous. Either the speakers that have been up talking about raiding the trust fund do not have a clue as to how it works or the debate has been absolutely dishonest. Anyone who says that there are dollars in the Social Security Trust Fund that we are raiding, it is not true. It is absolutely not true.

The whole question with regard to the Social Security Trust Fund from 1970 right up through 1997, every bit of that surplus was being spent yet the dollars were in the trust fund exactly the way they were before. They go into the trust fund. They are replaced by Treasury bills that are put in the trust fund. There are no dollars in the trust fund. There is no way we can go in and raid the trust fund unless we are grabbing Treasury bills out of there.

To listen to the argument that anyone tries to use as a scare tactic I think is below the dignity of this House of Representatives, and I think that this scare tactic is absolutely the low point that I have ever seen in this House of Representatives.

We have a once great party that is now bankrupt of ideas. They have no budget to bring to us. They have no

plan to save Social Security. All they can do is throw stones. Sit in the bleachers, sit on the other side and throw stones to us on this side. This is absolutely, I think, outrageous. It is below the dignity of this House.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, in early October of last year this House passed a new approach for farm legislation in a very strongly bipartisan manner and in a margin of over two to one. It was the intent of our committee at that time to have hopefully a conference report that we could bring back to this body and have signed into law a new farm bill sometime last year so that we would begin to be able to deal with the problems that have been confronting the agricultural economy for the last 4-plus years. Unfortunately, there was no item with which we could conference.

However, in February, on Valentine's Day, we finally had that item that we could conference. We are in conference now, and it is this Member's hope that early in April upon our return we will be able to provide to the body a conference report.

We, however, have lapped over into a new budget cycle. What made it possible for us to be able to write that farm bill last year was the strong commitment of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, and the good work of the Committee on the Budget in providing \$73.5 billion in last year's budget and providing \$73.5 billion in this year's budget to allow us to continue.

While much of the focus may be on the Committee on Agriculture as those farm bills are being written, the American farm family owes a great deal of gratitude to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and to the Committee on the Budget for holding their commitment to provide a strong agriculture because where we are today, Mr. Chairman, would not have been possible without that support.

I appreciate it very much. I commend the committee for the work they have done.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) for yielding me the time.

We have before us today a wartime budget. The fact is that is a difficult task to put together. We have done the responsible thing of assembling just that. It fully funds our national priorities with significant increases in defense spending because we need that for the war that is underway. Huge increases in homeland security, we need that so people will be more secure in their homes. Increases in education, in-

creases in veterans health care, fully funding a prescription drug benefit and, quite importantly, in my judgment, by limiting the growth in the rest of government, but for the extension of unemployment benefits that we all voted for a couple of weeks ago, this budget for fiscal year 2003 is balanced.

We have done the hard work of putting together a wartime budget, and my Democratic friends who are throwing stones, feigning horror, have done so without a single substantive alternative. Are not my colleagues just a little bit embarrassed that they do not have the courage to propose a budget of their own? The only idea frankly that we have heard from the left, although without the courage to put it to a vote, is to repeal last year's tax cut, raise taxes and spend more money.

What would that do for Social Security? Not much. Let me suggest that the idea of raising taxes, while the economy is as weak as it is now, is a terrible idea. We in Congress have a responsibility to be helping people get back to work, to help get this economy moving again, to help people get greater job security, increase the likelihood that people will get raises and improve their standard of living, and the best way to do this frankly is to tear down the barriers to economic growth, tear down the barriers that prevent job creation, and lower taxes do that.

Look at this chart. In the year 2000, as my colleagues can see from this chart, taxes had reached a postwar record high. Not since 1944 had the Federal Government imposed such a huge tax burden on our economy and there is no doubt that many economists agree that that huge tax burden helped to contribute to the economic slowdown, and the fact is we passed tax relief just in time, and this budget accommodates the continued phase-in, gradual though it is, of the tax relief that we passed last year, and that has got to be part of the reason that this slowdown has been relatively mild and it is going to help us get out of this economic decline that we have been in, lessen the severity of it.

The last thing we can do is go back and turn the clock back and go back to those record high taxes. For the sake of job security and economic security for our families, I urge my colleagues to vote for this budget.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER).

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues should be ashamed of themselves, trying to scare the American people on Social Security, making them believe they are not going to get a check. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader, came to the floor and he said, "We should be talking about another budget." The problem is my colleagues do not have a budget. He does not have a budget.

Last week in the markup in Committee on the Budget all my colleagues

presented were 40 amendments. Had we accepted the 40 amendments, we would have spent \$225 billion more than we are spending. Yet my colleagues accuse us of wasting Social Security moneys.

He said, "It shows deficits as far as the eyes can see. We have squandered \$4.5 trillion surplus, gone in the flash of an eye."

My colleagues like CBO numbers. So let us see what they say. We should have had a \$283 billion surplus this year, but because of a recession and a bad economy we are down \$197 billion. Because of 9/11 spending, we are down \$54 billion, and yes, we gave the American people, hardworking families, \$40 billion of their own money to keep, to prosper their own families. That is minus \$9 billion.

He said, "Our prescription program is paltry." Actions speak louder than words. Where is my colleagues' prescription drug program? They have none. At the same time he comes out and he says, by saying it is paltry, he wants us to spend more money, but my colleagues accuse us of spending the Social Security Trust Fund. Then he gave this sweet story about his mother, and she said what if I do not get my Social Security check next month or next year, what will I do, implying that somehow people are not going to get their Social Security check. That is criminal. This self-righteous hypocrisy on this floor is outlandish.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to this debate and watching back in my office, and I have to say it has not been a very proud day for our friends on the left. Here they are, they have got all kinds of complaints about our budget, but they have no budget of their own.

The other thing that came through as I watched this debate in my office on television, and I think it probably came through to the American people as well, what this is is a classic debate between those people who believe in America and those who do not, those who believe our brightest days are yet to come and those who think our brightest days are behind us. It is a debate between optimists who believe in America, who believe that we can fight a war, that we can strengthen our economy, that we can meet the legitimate needs of the American people with this budget, and those who believe we cannot.

I have not given up hope on the American people. I have not given up hope that we can have a brighter day. I believe that the economy is going to get stronger. I believe the tax cuts that we have passed were exactly the right medicine at exactly the right time, and I believe that there is better than a 50-50 chance that we not only will have a balanced budget next year, we are going to actually have a surplus.

That is what the American people want. They want responsible govern-

ment. They want a responsible budget, and they want people who step up and take that responsibility and pass this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) for the purposes of control.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, President Bush started with a balanced budget and budget surpluses as far as the eye could see, but today the GOP budget plan has squandered that surplus, and we will have to borrow \$1 trillion from Social Security over the next 5 years and \$2 trillion from Social Security and Medicare over the next 10 years just to pay their bills.

The lockbox that we all talked about a year ago has been smashed and the contents have been looted.

□ 1700

This budget does, indeed, represent a generational mugging. The majority is demanding spending programs and tax cuts for themselves, paid for by borrowing Social Security and Medicare dollars from seniors and leaving the bill for our children. This budget is putting money in the form of spending programs and tax cuts into the left-hand pocket of the taxpayer, but taking out money from their right-hand pocket where the trust funds are located.

The Social Security trust fund surplus is estimated to be \$2 trillion over the next 10 years. This budget spends \$1.5 trillion of those dollars by borrowing that money, plus all of the surplus, \$556 billion of the Medicare trust fund, in order to pay these bills. If we take Social Security and Medicare out of the mix, as we all agreed to last year, this year we will have a \$244 billion on-budget deficit with similar deficits of that size each year for the next 10 years.

Last year, the CBO, Mr. Chairman, estimated that we could pay off our entire debt by 2011. In just 1 year, after the tax cuts, 9-11, and a short recession, we are now projected to have a debt of \$2.8 trillion by 2011. The impact of debt, Mr. Chairman, is higher interest payments by the government. One year ago we were facing \$709 billion in interest payments over the next 10 years. Now we are facing \$1.8 trillion of interest payments, a \$1 trillion increase.

This budget plan alone for the 2003 budget year requires us to pay \$220 billion in interest payments, 11 percent of our Federal budget. The impact of higher debt and more borrowing is also higher interest rates paid by consumers. When we borrow in Washington, we drive up the long-term rates and the consumer costs for purchases,

such as homes and cars and college tuitions.

We need reduced government borrowing, Mr. Chairman, lower government debt, lower interest rates, and increased savings to continue the growth of productivity and the recovery of our economy. This budget plan will do none of these things and should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, when you find yourself in a hole, the wise man says, stop digging; stop making the problem worse. Stop the renewed borrowing, stop the return of deficits. Vote "no" on this budget resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. HOEFFEL. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we were just asked to raise the statutory debt ceiling to almost \$7 trillion. Why? Because of this budget. This budget increases the interest costs on our debt by over \$1 trillion over the next decade. We are going to increase the debt held by the public to over \$3 trillion.

The question is, Who pays off this debt? It is not going to be us. Most of us will be retired. We are going to retire with the baby boom generation. We are going to join those 77 million people that will double the number of people on the retirement rolls. We are going to leave it to our kids to pay off this debt and at the same time pay for our Social Security and Medicare costs, and that is not right.

That is why this budget is not right and why it should be defeated. Our kids deserve better.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, we face some clear challenges. We are in a recession, and we have a war on terrorism to fight. I have to say that some of the aspects of this budget are things I certainly agree with. I appreciate the commitment to our veterans; I can appreciate the commitment to defense spending and homeland defense.

The issue about the long-term plan, about how we get away from deficit spending, that is something we have to work on. And whether or not we pass this budget today, that problem is not going to go away. I would like to call on my colleagues to work together in a more bipartisan way in the future.

We do need to address this issue. It is important to us. Our constituents expect us to work together. We have not done that yet, but I hope we do so sooner than later.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a very distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

This budget is a cash-flow management plan for fiscal year 2003 and for 4 years beyond. It is a cash-flow plan that is, in many ways, similar to the cash-flow plans that individuals must manage for themselves, those which families plan while sitting around the kitchen table and small businesses establish when determining how many employees they will hire or how many equipment purchases they will make in the coming year.

In fact, there are over 1 million families today, due to the tragic events of last September, who are planning their finances to weather the emergency situation they are facing in their lives: loss of a job, slowing business revenues, and so forth. Many of these families will borrow or have borrowed from their savings or retirement, life insurance or home equity to ride out the storm.

Mr. Chairman, it is from the cash flow of the taxpayer all across the country that the Federal Government receives its income. When individual family and business budgets are healthy and strong enough to make the necessary and often the discretionary purchases, when they are thriving enough that they are adding jobs to the workforce and expanding business opportunities, the Federal Government's budget is the strongest. Today, we have a deficit cash flow. It is from the lack of consumer confidence caused by the lack of job confidence.

Mr. Chairman, we must examine what has eroded consumer and job confidence. The 7 o'clock news reports tally the market and the unemployment numbers. In February of 2000, the NASDAQ began to plunge from almost a high of 4,700 points; "dot coms" were folding at a rapid pace. In February, the Dow Jones began to fluctuate and plunged in November of 2000. Unemployment numbers began to rise in November of 2000. With such numbers, is it no wonder that job confidence and consumer confidence were eroded?

This decline in confidence, coupled with the significant and unexpected expenditures of the last months, are the major reasons we find ourselves working to establish a responsible budget plan. How has this administration and Congress addressed this decline in confidence? The Congress passed the 2001 Economic Growth and Tax Relief Act for American workers, extended taxpayer cash flow, where our cash flow comes from, by \$74 billion in 2001, by over \$60 billion in 2002, and by over \$90 billion in 2003, plus the stimulus package of \$43 billion that we just passed.

In 3 years, Mr. Chairman, the Congress will leave over \$300 billion in cash flow to the taxpayers. So, let us look at what has happened when we have had major tax relief over the last few

decades. In the 1960s, revenues increased; 1961, \$92 billion in revenue for the Federal Government; in 1970, it doubled, \$196 billion; in the 1980s, 1981, we had revenues of \$599 billion. In 10 years, it increased to over \$1 trillion.

Mr. Chairman, the same will happen with the tax relief package that we passed yesterday. This budget is evidence that the Congress trusts the people at home, the people we live with, the people we work beside, the people who are our neighbors running the small and large businesses that are the engine of our economy. And as a reminder, my colleagues, they supply the money we spend here each year.

I trust them and I want them to have more money to spend, to invest, and to use as they see fit. That is why I support this responsible budget, and I urge others to.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority whip.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and I want to recognize first off the excellence with which he has dealt on this budget, and commend him, the members of his committee, and the staff for their excellent work.

Mr. Chairman, today we should have had the opportunity to be engaged in a debate over our Federal budget. This budget debate should reflect the professional judgment and our most imaginative thinking to create a budget for America's future. We do not all agree on every issue, but we should have been able to have a debate about those issues. Instead, we are faced with a closed rule which forecloses some of that debate; and we are, instead, faced with a budget from the Republican side which is a sham.

It is a sham because it hides from view the billions and billions of dollars the Republicans are draining from the Social Security trust fund. It is a sham because it disguises the inadequate prescription drug benefit for seniors as it drains the Medicare trust fund. It is a sham because it ignores the cost of the supplemental appropriations that we know President Bush will be sending to the Congress.

When we review the Republican budget, we have to wonder what happened to all of the budget deficits on the Republican side. Have they become an endangered species? Indeed, I think they have become extinct. For such a long time they fought so fiercely to reduce the Federal deficit and eliminate the national debt, and now they are extinct.

And where did all the Republicans go who voted five times, five times, for a lock box to prohibit using Social Security trust funds for anything but Social Security? Those same Republicans have broken promises to the American people by an all-out raid in this budget on the Social Security trust fund.

In addition to being a sham, this Republican budget is a shame, because it

misses an opportunity to create a fiscally sound balanced budget which invests in America's future and grows our economy by creating jobs and lowering interest rates.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that our Federal budget should be a statement of our national values. I ask my colleagues if it is a statement of their values to raid the Social Security trust fund and decimate the Medicare trust fund; is it a statement of their national values to undermine the ability of Americans to retire in dignity; is it a statement of their values to put our children into oppressive debt to bolster a failed Republican economic plan?

The Republican leadership's budget is a desperate attempt to cover up the total failure of their economic plan. In an attempt to cook the books, the Republicans used the more optimistic OMB estimates, even though they shut down the government in 1995-96, if my colleagues remember that, to insist on CBO estimates.

One year ago, the Republicans promised to protect Social Security, provide a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and pay down the Federal debt. But their budget fails to balance the budget, fails to protect Social Security, fails to provide adequate funding for prescription drugs, and fails to fund the education promises signed into law by President Bush. The request from Treasury Secretary O'Neill to raise the debt limit by \$750 billion to finance the government past the 2004 election is an ultimate symbol of the failure of the Republican economic plan.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no," a billion, billion, billion times no, on the Republican sham budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN) involving Social Security.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding to me.

Social Security is one of our Nation's most successful anti-poverty and retirement programs. Currently, 45 million seniors, their spouses, and their dependents receive Social Security benefits. The strength and viability of this program is a priority for all Members of Congress, Republican, Democrat, and Independent alike. Our Democrat colleagues, however, claim that this budget will somehow endanger Social Security and erode the ability of the Social Security trust fund to pay benefits.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this budget will not have any impact on the status of the Social Security trust funds whatsoever; is that correct?

Mr. NUSSLE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, that is totally correct; and I want to thank my colleague for

not only his concern but his leadership in the brief time he has been here in the House.

I would also like to reiterate my own personal commitment to the strength and stability of the Social Security program. Social Security is a promise that neither I nor my Republican colleagues around here take lightly.

The gentleman is correct in his understanding that the budget in no way alters the financial position of the Social Security trust fund. The status of the Social Security trust funds is unchanged by this budget.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, is it true that under this budget the Social Security trust funds continue to grow throughout the 5-year budget horizon?

Mr. NUSSLE. Yes. In fact, we add about \$1 trillion to it over the next 5 years after this budget is in effect.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this budget provides full funding for Social Security benefits and cost of living adjustments for all recipients; is that correct?

□ 1715

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, that is correct. The gentlewoman from North Carolina made a comment earlier about how somebody was concerned whether they would get their benefit check. There is not a senior in America that is not going to get their benefit check under Social Security. Nothing in this budget changes that. I wish Members on the other side would stop that scare tactic.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman guarantee me that my grandmother, Katherine Boudreau, will continue to receive her Social Security benefits next month and the months to come for the rest of her life? Also, will the gentleman guarantee me that my constituent, Daisy Burris, with the AARP of Tulsa and the people she represents, will receive her Social Security benefits in the next month and the years to come?

Mr. NUSSLE. Not only are the Social Security benefits of the gentleman's grandmother safe, but all of our Social Security benefits are safe under this budget. By voting for this budget resolution, Members will honor their commitment to their constituents and to the seniors of America. Certainly there are concerns about Social Security on the horizon that we need to be concerned about, but this budget does not change the trust fund whatsoever. Every senior will get those benefits.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for purposes of control.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN).

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

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, one of the issues that I hear most about is the high cost of prescription drugs and the incredible struggle that senior citizens have to pay for them. It is clear that this is a major source of worry and distress for seniors and their loved ones. It is time for Congress to listen to our greatest generation and make affordable prescription drug coverage a priority. Unfortunately, a prescription drug benefit that is affordable for all Medicare beneficiaries is not a priority in this Republican budget.

This budget replaces the President's inadequate proposal with its own inadequate proposal. What they are calling a Medicare reserve fund, using numbers from the OMB, this budget claims to increase Medicare spending about \$89 billion over 5 years, and \$350 billion over 10 years. However, if we used the CBO numbers rather than OMB, this is drastically reduced. Like the rest of the budget, using OMB numbers makes their increase in Medicare spending appear higher than it actually is.

And if this were not enough, the budget also holds the Medicare prescription drug benefit hostage to Medicare reform and a provider payment adjustment. The Medicare reserve fund can only be tapped when a proposal that includes modernization, prescription drugs, and provider payment adjustments is before this House for consideration.

All three issues must be addressed before we can assist our seniors with their prescription drug crisis. A detailed plan for Medicare reform has not yet even been proposed. Meanwhile, seniors have to continue to struggle and wait for prescription drug help. In addition, an independent commission which advises Congress about Medicare provider payments estimates that the adjustments that are coming will consume half of this Medicare reserve fund that has been set aside for all three purposes.

How long must American seniors wait to see a Medicare prescription drug benefit? I believe that this is not the way to treat the retirees of the greatest generation who worked hard, lived through a depression, won a war, raised their families and created the strongest economy in the world. They deserve access to the affordable drugs that they need to stay healthy. I urge my colleagues to vote against this flawed budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my Democratic colleagues in opposition to the budget on the floor today. I would like to talk about how unfairly this budget treats the senior citizens in our country.

Last year the President and House Republicans went on record saying that the Social Security and Medicare surpluses should be protected and pushed several "lockbox" bills. However, this year their budget spends more than 86 percent of the Social Security surplus in the next five years and spends the entire Medicare surplus for the foreseeable future.

While the Republicans want to send "certificates" to seniors guaranteeing that Social Security checks will keep arriving, they are raiding the Social Security and Medicare surpluses. Then they try to hid the extent of their invasion of these funds by using Office of Management and Budget (OMB) numbers and obscuring from view the effects of their tax policies after 5 years. Seniors are not going to be swayed by this sham budget, especially when it puts their future and their health at risk.

When I'm home in Wisconsin, one of the issues I hear about most (whether in the grocery store on main street or in listening sessions) is that middle class seniors cannot afford to pay for their prescription drugs. It is clear that this is a major source of worry and distress for seniors and their families.

It is time for Congress to listen to our greatest generation and make affordable prescription drug coverage a priority. Unfortunately, a prescription drug benefit that is affordable for all Medicare beneficiaries is not a priority in this Republican budget.

This budget replaces the President's inadequate proposal with its own inadequate proposal: What they're calling a Medicare reserve fund. Using numbers from the OMB, this budget claims to increase Medicare spending by \$89 billion over 5 years, and \$350 billion over 10 years. However, if we use the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) rather than OMB numbers, this increase is drastically reduced. Like the rest of the budget, using OMB numbers makes their increase in Medicare spending appear higher than it actually is.

But if this were not enough, this budget also holds a Medicare prescription drug benefit hostage to Medicare "reform" and provider payment adjustments. The Medicare reserve fund can only be tapped when a proposal including "modernization," prescription drugs, and provider payment adjustments is before the House for consideration. All three issues must be addressed before we can assist our seniors with the prescription drug crisis. A detailed plan for Medicare reform has not yet even been proposed. Meanwhile, seniors will have to continue to struggle and wait for a prescription drug benefit.

In addition, an independent commission that advises Congress about Medicare provider payments, estimates that provider payment adjustments will consume half of the Medicare reserve fund that has been set aside for all three purposes.

How long must American seniors wait to see a Medicare prescription drug benefit? I believe that this is not the way to treat the retirees of the greatest generation who worked hard, lived through the depression, won a war, raised their families and created the strongest economy in the world. They deserve access to the affordable drugs they need to stay healthy. I urge my colleagues to vote against this flawed budget.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to myself.

Mr. Chairman, here we are with another variation of the three shell game. This budget purports to offer a prescription drug benefit. Now if we take the numbers of last year's program and look at how much the Congressional Budget Office says they will cost, it is \$400 billion. Do we have \$400 billion? No, we have \$350 billion. But in Sunday's New York Times, many doctors

say they are refusing Medicare patients because they are not being paid enough. Out of that \$300 billion, we are going to pay for drug benefits, and we are going to pay for provider reimbursement. We are going to give more money to doctors and hospitals.

If we use the Congressional Budget Office figures, we have only \$124 billion. So the reason the other side uses the OMB figures is because it is \$350 billion. Which number would Members take? Of course the other side would take the \$350 billion.

If we look at this chart, we can see if we pay back the providers what we said we are going to give them, it costs \$174 billion out of that \$350 billion. If we are using the \$124 billion, we cannot even cover the providers. The doctors alone cost \$128 billion. So there is not enough money under this one to provide even for the doctors.

Now, let us say we take the \$350 billion and we say we are going to do only the doctors, so we are going to do \$128 billion. That gives us what, 225, 222. Now, is that enough for a drug benefit? Remember, I said it was \$400 billion to do a decent benefit? That is a benefit where seniors pay 50 percent and the government pays 50 percent. Do Members think that is an adequate benefit?

There are 9 million widows in this country who live on Social Security. They make less than \$10,000 a year off Social Security. They are supposed to come up with half the drug benefits. If they just have a few things, that is fine. But where are they going to get \$1,000 or \$2,000 to pay while the government pays the other \$2,000?

This simply is an inadequate benefit that they are talking about. Yet the other side tells the people, the President said in the campaign, we will have a prescription drug benefit. The President stood in this well twice and said we are going to have a prescription drug benefit. But there is no money. It is a shell game. They are hiding it and confusing people with statements, but the figures do not lie. Vote "no" on this thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PENCE) assumed the chair.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2356. An act to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2003

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS).

(Mr. WATKINS of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATKINS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the work that the gentleman from Iowa has done as our chairman on the Committee on the Budget. I left Congress in 1990, and one of the things that always bothered me was the fact that it seemed like when I sat on the other side, we could never come close to balancing the budget. I would like to say that it is great that we have not only balanced the budget since I have returned, but with the economy growing, we have reduced over \$450 billion in debt that was on the backs of our children. I would like to think that has done a great deal to help us in the future.

Yesterday Chairman Alan Greenspan and the Feds decided not to increase interest rates. They realized that there is still some softness out in the economy. I am thankful that we passed the tax relief package nearly a year ago, and also just last week, the job creation and work protection bill in a bipartisan vote. That vote was 417-3. Yes, even with the economic indicators that were soft and started downward in September, the last quarter of 2000 before the Bush administration took office, but really took a downward spiral after September 11, creating a loss of about a million jobs. Let me say, with this job creation work protection bill, not only are we allowing the uninsured to have 13 extra weeks of unemployment insurance, we want to make sure that those who are unemployed have a check and are meeting their obligations.

Also we have done some things with 30 percent expensing which is accelerating activity. Tractor implement dealers in my area, they are out buying. Farmers and ranchers are buying equipment. That is going to help us a great deal more, not only in just the facts, but in the spirit of things in moving this economy forward.

This budget is a compassionate budget because in it we have dealt with unemployment insurance. Yes, we have helped business, and we have helped a lot of individuals. There are work tax credits for welfare to work. It also deals with Native Americans, trying to work with them with accelerated depreciation, and letting them have jobs instead of relying on just gaming and some of the other interests. Native Americans have the worst economic conditions of any group in the United States.

We have a budget here that gives us an opportunity to move this country forward. I encourage a bipartisan vote on it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 9 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) for purposes of control.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, we will not find a Member on this side of the aisle who is not 100 percent supportive of winning this war against terrorism and bolstering our homeland security. However, we cannot forget our domestic priorities. Over the next 5 years, we will cut over \$96 billion below what it costs to maintain these programs at their current level.

For the next few minutes what I would like to do is put a human face on some of these funding cuts, and maybe people watching this debate back home will have a better understanding of what this budget does. For example, everybody knows that health care costs are skyrocketing on an annual basis. As a result, 40 million Americans cannot afford health insurance. That includes 9 million children. This budget pretends that these people do not exist.

Compounding that situation is the fact that there are some programs that provide some minimal health care. For example, the rural health care program, it is cut by 41 percent. Telehealth programs are cut by 84 percent. Another problem is the freezing of funding for the Healthy Start program. It is for expectant mothers for prenatal care. I cannot think of any Member here who thinks that depriving mothers of prenatal care is something that we should be doing.

Then there is the matter of our homeland security. The people on the front line are police officers. Yet this budget completely eliminates, not cuts, eliminates the Department of Justice local law enforcement block grant, which is designed to put more cops on our streets. As a result, hundreds of communities across the United States, large and small, will see less cops on the street, meaning we can expect an increase in crime because this budget, as I just stated, eliminates this program.

□ 1730

Then there are our public schools. Every State is having problems with revenues and high enrollments. Just a little over 2 months ago, we had the No Child Left Behind Act signed into law. Most people voted for it. If Members will recall, President Bush made this a pillar of his State of the Union address and rightly so, ensuring that every child has a right to a first-rate education. So what happened to this program? You can see that is what is authorized, that is what we enacted last year, and this is what we are proposing, a \$100 million cut just from last year.

As a former teacher, I have also talked to educators in Oregon. One of the things they begged me not to do was pass another Federal program and another Federal mandate without the funds. We are not giving them the funds. Then there is special education.