

THE TWILIGHT ZONE, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS GEORGE BUSH'S AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am worried about what is happening to our great country today. I fear that many of us cannot see what is happening here. Maybe we are too close. Maybe there are even people who do not want us to see; but our friends and allies in Europe and elsewhere are reporting that they are seeing disturbing developments in our country, like the fading of our fundamental constitutional rights, the creation of a war machine that threatens world peace, the spending of a generation of Americans on this war on terrorism, and even an attack on truth in government by forming the Office of Strategic Influence to lie to us and to the rest of the world. The President even asked Hollywood to make these developments palatable to the American people.

With this as a backdrop, I would just like to ask that Members close their eyes and imagine being drawn deeper and deeper into black space. If Members keep their eyes closed and if they close them good and tight, they will be able to imagine themselves going faster and faster and deeper and deeper into a black unknown.

All of a sudden we see a bright light at a distance far away, but faster and faster and closer and closer it becomes brighter and brighter; and in one instant, with one grand motion, we can cross from the darkness into the light. But just before we make the crossing, a huge booming voice coming from nowhere, and at the same time coming from everywhere, booms all around us: You unlock this door with the key of understanding. Beyond it is another dimension, a dimension of hearing that which is not spoken, a dimension of seeing that which is invisible, a dimension of reading that which is not written.

We are moving into a land of both shadow and substance, of things and ideas. Welcome. We just crossed over into the Twilight Zone, otherwise known as George Bush's America. For it is here and only here that the White House could receive warning after warning of massive attacks that were going to take place on American soil, the attack happens, and both the President and the Vice President, in separate phone calls to TOM DASCHLE, ask that Congress not investigate what happened and why. That could only happen in the Twilight Zone.

Or that an administration battling worldwide perception, as well as a domestic one having come to power in circumstances like Zambia's or Kenya's, could form a shadow government inside the selected government, with no one in the real government knowing about the shadow government except the shadow leaders in it. That could only happen in the Twilight Zone.

Or that this President could propose the biggest hike in defense spending, where his dad stands to make a mint, as long as increased spending does not get lost wherever the \$2.3 trillion is that the Pentagon has already lost, and the Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, says we can afford it. That could only happen in the Twilight Zone.

Or that Arthur Andersen, who kept Enron's books, could still have contracts to keep the books over at FBI, DOJ, and the Pentagon. That could only happen in the Twilight Zone.

Wake up, America. We are not only in the Twilight Zone, we have crossed the threshold into George Bush's America.

CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILY AND FRIENDS OF CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER STANLEY HARRIMAN

(Mr. MCINTYRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my deepest condolences to the family and friends of Chief Warrant Officer Stanley Harriman of the Third Special Forces Group of the United States Army who gave his life in the service of our country.

I join with his family and friends in paying tribute to him for the ultimate sacrifice that he has made on behalf of our Nation, and my prayers are with his family.

Stanley Harriman was a decorated soldier who willfully and enthusiastically participated in Operation Enduring Freedom. Among his many awards and decorations were two Meritorious Service Medals, three Army Commendation Medals, three Army Achievement Medals, the Valorous Unit Award, Army Superior Unit Award, two Army Good Conduct Medals, the National Defense Service Medal, the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, three Southwest Asia Service Medals, the Humanitarian Service Medal, three Noncommissioned Officer Professional Development Medals, the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Service Ribbon, the Master Parachutist Badge, and the Special Forces Tab. Now, because of his heroic actions in recent days, he will also receive the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart.

This tragedy should remind us that our freedom and our security are neither free nor secure; they are repeatedly earned and protected by our men and women in uniform. They risk their lives so freedom may survive. Chief Warrant Officer Harriman's courage in the face of danger reflects his character, a character born of his personal commitment to his Lord as a committed Christian and to his family as a committed husband, father, brother, and son.

We owe Chief Warrant Officer Stanley Harriman a tremendous debt of

gratitude. His courage, character, and commitment to freedom are an example to all of us. It is important that we not only remember Stanley as an excellent and dedicated soldier and Christian family man, but also as the American hero that he is.

May God bless him and his family and those who have served with him. May God bless our great country. We indeed are a better Nation because of men like Stanley Harriman and those who serve with him in our Nation's Armed Forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SOCIAL SECURITY, THE SHADOW GOVERNMENT, AND THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of different issues that I would like to address this evening; but I find myself, having listened to the last hour of comments, in need of a little rebuttal to some of these comments, especially those comments that were directed to us by the minority leader, which of course went un rebutted.

First of all, the minority leader talks about some kind of secret Republican plan for Social Security. Where does he get that? What gives him the liberty to make those kinds of remarks? That speech that the minority leader gave, in my opinion, was one of the most partisan speeches I have heard on this floor.

I challenge the minority leader to show me one Republican or show me one Democrat on the House floor, one in office in either our House or at any elected level, that is against Social Security. Show me one elected official in this country that wants to devastate Social Security. Show me one Congressman, Mr. Minority Leader, that meets the standards that he put out there: because they are Republican, they must be against Social Security.

What really justifies some of those remarks, I would guess, is the fact that it is an election year, and now is the time to begin to position oneself as the savior of Social Security. The minority leader talks about, we should not talk about numbers, we should talk about values. He is right, the minority leader, we should talk about values. Part of those values are the preservation of that system.

All of us on this floor, Republicans and Democrats, want to preserve the

system; but in order to meet that value of preservation of the system, we need to talk about numbers. Let us talk about a few numbers.

When that system was created 67 years ago, we had, what, 12 workers for every retired person? Today that statistic is three workers for every retired person, and in a few short years it is going to be that there are two people working for every retired person. Take a look at the math on that, Mr. Minority Leader, and take a calculation of what that means.

Furthermore, take a look 67 years ago what the average age was, the average life expectancy for a male and a female, and compare it to today.

□ 1930

I would suggest that the difference between 67 years ago and the life expectancy today is at least a minimum of 14, perhaps 15 or 16 years. And what will it be when the generations of my children grow, another 10 years, when people are living longer?

And that is the good news. The fact is that our system is getting more and more weight put against it. We have got to come up with more and more dollars to continue the same kind of benefits. One, if we have less people putting in and more people taking out, we better talk about numbers, Mr. Minority Leader. And because of the fact that some of us who are fiscally conservative want to talk about numbers does not mean we are against Social Security.

Mr. Minority Leader, there are a number of Democrats on your side of the aisle who are fiscally conservative. There are a number of Democrats who worry about those numbers. There are a number of Democrats who put the emotion aside, the rhetoric aside and try and sit down with us and those who are interested in trying to figure out how do we work with these numbers so that, one, we can meet the demands of the future.

Any elected official that tells you that any other elected official wants to do away with Social Security, frankly, is not telling you the truth. I have yet in my years of service in the United States Congress, I have yet to find one Congressman, and we have gone through hundreds of Congressmen in the years that I have been in service, I have yet to find one Congressman who has told me to my face or I have heard it through an indirect conversation that has said what the minority leader said, and that is that the Republicans want to get rid of Social Security; that they have a secret plan out there for Social Security to slash the benefits of all of these people.

Mr. Minority Leader, I think your approach would be better phrased if you said, hey, look, we better sit down, both sides of this thing. We better talk numbers. Obviously, the value is preservation of the system. I think everybody agrees with that. So there should not be any argument about who wants to preserve the system.

Again, everybody that I know of in the United States Congress, and I defy the minority leader to show me somebody who does not, but everybody I know, every Congressperson wants to preserve the system. So put that argument aside. It is not an argument of preservation. It is a discussion of numbers.

How do we work with these numbers? How do we figure it out? Take a look at 67 years ago, the benefits that Social Security paid out, and take a look at the expansion of benefits that have occurred in the last 67 years without a reflective expansion of revenue coming in.

In other words, the Congresses through the years and the people of the country through the years have appropriated and approved more benefits than they have revenue coming in. Come on. You have got to deal with your family budget and you have a responsibility to deal with the budget of this country.

The best way to preserve Social Security for the future, which we all want to do, is to act with some economic sensibility. Do not mislead the people by pretending to promise them things that you know several years after you leave office, several years after you accomplish what you want to accomplish politically, somebody else gets stuck with the bill. That is what happened years ago when 40 years of rule here stacked up deficit after deficit.

Now we are back into a deficit this year, but it is not because of some kind of slight of hand. It is because we are engaged in a war and we are watching our revenue drop. We have to sit down and discuss that, just the same as Social Security. So those remarks at the beginning of this evening by the minority leader, again, some of the most partisan remarks I have seen on this floor, are clearly devised for election strategy.

It is an election year, and as we proceed closer to November, you will see, unfortunately, more and more people using the strategy of this microphone to enhance their own political self-serving interest. And I hope we can avoid that, especially when it comes to Social Security. Many of us, many Democrats that I know do not take part, do not participate in those kind of partisan discussions. They instead sit together in groups of people and say, how do we figure out, how do we work the numbers?

We have a problem. We have a lot more going out in Social Security over time than we have coming in. On a cash flow basis we are okay, but on an actuarial basis over time Social Security needs to have some adjustments.

I do not condemn the President of the United States. I commend the President of the United States for stepping forward and saying, get some expert help. Let me reach out to a commission, a commission made up of Republicans and Democrats, a commis-

sion made up of experts and of people who understand the needs of that generation and the needs of future generations, people that know, that are experts in accounting and economics.

That is the kind of panel that this President, President Bush, put together. Instead of condemning it and saying it is some kind of secret society out there which, of course, is obviously nothing but politically-charged language, the fact is they have come up with some suggestions, that the commission has worked long and hard to try to come up with something that is constructive towards preservation of the Social Security system.

So I would hope that the minority leader would tone down these kind of partisan remarks; and instead of showing up at the microphone and firing out with this negotiation as an election year strategy, in my opinion, I think he would be much better served if he would join us and sit down and maybe go over to the commission and sit down in person with that commission and talk about what their ideas are and what we can do to preserve the system.

SHADOW GOVERNMENT

Let me move on to a couple of other things that I think are very, very important.

First of all, in the last few days I have seen a media barrage, a media barrage across this country, about how aghast some people are that President Bush, the Vice President and the administration have put into place a back-up government in case a terrorist attack took out the sitting government in Washington, D.C.

Why would anybody be surprised about that? You better have a back-up plan in place. You know what happened at this U.S. Capitol on September 11? I was here. You know what kind of back-up plan we had? Zip. Zero. We were fortunate that a few brave souls, a few brave souls took a plane into the ground in Pennsylvania, because my guess is this plane would have been right here, coming through this dome in this Capitol and would have very easily wiped out the congressional leadership. That plane that hit the Pentagon very easily may have been intended to hit the White House and take out the leadership there.

Sure, we have a line of succession; but what happens to that line of succession, as occurred on September 11, when in one central location are your Cabinet secretaries and your different agencies, and they have no direction from the selected government on how to run? Of course you better make up back-up plans.

In fact, some of the people, some of my colleagues here have different bills they have introduced, for example, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) on succession. I think it is a very legitimate and, frankly, is a responsibility of this administration, after September 11 especially, to say, hey, what if this happens again? What if they would have wiped out the

United States Congress? What if they would have wiped out the White House? Who gives direction to our government? What kind of safeguards do we have?

So I commend the administration, not condemn it. I commend the administration for thinking forward into the future, for having some kind of foresight as to what we ought to do in case this scenario repeats itself again.

We all know that there are people out there who hate the United States and would love nothing more than to destroy this great building and the people that work in it and to disable our government. So now is the time to prepare.

So my opinion is people that have criticized this surprise me. Criticizing the President for, in effect, buying a back-up fire truck in case the fire station burns down. You ought to say, good job. Keep it up. That is the kind of forward thinking that we need to prepare against this ongoing battle against terrorism and this ongoing battle against people who wish evil against the United States of America.

HONORING CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER STANLEY L. HARRIMAN

I want to move on from this and visit just for a moment about the horrible casualties that we have taken as far as in the last 48 hours or so. The deaths that were suffered were terrible, but I want to read, in fact, about the gentleman who was mentioned here, Chief Warrant Officer Stanley Harriman who lost his life in the last few hours in Afghanistan. I wanted to read a few comments out of today's New York Times from the families.

This is a card last month that the Chief Warrant Officer sent his wife, an e-mail message rejoicing that he had been sent to Afghanistan. "Honey, I am so excited about going to Afghanistan. I will be doing what I have trained for 16 years to do."

His survivors, which include his wife, a 6-year-old daughter and a 3-year-old son, his father, who is retired military, and he has a brother; and of this family, the commitment of this family towards the duty of their father, towards the duty of their husband, towards the duty of their son, towards the duty of their brother, it is an amazing family, that the duty and the preservation and the great things that we have in this country called for him to be in Afghanistan.

Let me share that card. Let me repeat a card that the Chief Warrant Officer sent to his wife, another card. He mailed a card to his wife from Kuwait which she received about one week ago. Mrs. Harriman, the wife, read from it during an interview. "I know that it is not always easy with me gone so much, but we have so much to be thankful for. We are truly blessed by God, and these trials and tribulations will only make us stronger."

Then let me say to you what his brother said, after learning of his brother's death. This is the Chief War-

rant Officer's brother, Steve. He said that "he hoped the military would not flinch at pursuing military operations to their conclusion.

"Stan would not have changed it if he could. He would do it the same way," Steve said. "I hope they continue to do what they say they are going to do, to complete the mission."

And the key words here are "to complete the mission." We cannot allow the enemy to kill seven or nine or any number of our American soldiers over there and cut and run from our mission.

Some of you may have had the opportunity to see the movie *Black Hawk Down*. Those are the results, that is the kind of results where the sight of a body bag convinces many of our enemies across this world, the al Qaeda and some of the other people, that all you have to do is show the American citizens a body bag and they will cut and run. If you want to break America's resolve, kill a few of their soldiers.

As Steve said about his brother, his brother would want the military to complete its mission. And we have a very heavy mission on our shoulders, this country does, for the world, for the future of the world, not just for our generations and future generations of America, but for generations of all countries of this world. And that is to rid this world to the extent that we possibly can of the cancer that we discovered that had gone a lot further than we had ever imagined. That cancer had spread, and we discovered it on September 11.

Now, we have been able to locate some of that cancer, and we have got to cut that cancer out. You cannot ignore it. You cannot love it off your body. You cannot pray it off your body. All of these things help. Do not get me wrong. That all helps. But the reality is you have to go in with chemotherapy. You may have to go in with surgery. You may have to go in with radiation. You have got to get that cancer. You cannot turn your face the other way. You have got to complete your mission.

You cannot go in and get a few cells of the cancer. You cannot go in and nip the little end off of it. You cannot even go in a take a big chunk of it but still leave some vital cells of cancer still in your body. You have got to complete the mission.

This country has taken a loss in the last few days of some very young and very brave American soldiers. But I would guess that the families of those soldiers and every one of those soldiers if they could say it today would say to the United States of America, complete your mission. Take out the enemy. Destroy those who would destroy this country. Destroy those who would destroy democracy in this world. Destroy those who, without any regard to nationality, any regard to sex, any regard to age would kill thousands of people in an act of terrorist attack.

So I think that our resolve should be hardened. I do not think we should give any kind of message because I do not think it is true with the American citizens. I think our resolve should be hardened to complete this mission.

We have learned from the past. In Somalia, it was a disgrace, frankly, our brave soldiers that fought and gave their lives. Vietnam was another example. We did not complete the mission. And you know what? We have trained people out there, we have convinced our enemies that the United States, again, all they have to do is have a death of their soldiers or torture some of their soldiers or drag them through the street like they did in Somalia, and within a couple of weeks after seeing their soldiers dragged through Somalia the president of the country will order their troops out and we will have beat the American giant.

□ 1945

If we want to protect democracy in this world, if we want to stop terrorism before it stops us, and a better word, instead of stopped, is destroy us, we have to complete the mission. That is exactly what the Harriman family has relayed through the tragic death of Chief Warrant Officer Harriman, and that is "complete your mission."

I want to visit a little about the President and his dedication to the completion of this mission. I noticed some criticism in the last few days of some individuals who say, number one, the President ought to inform us of the operational details of what is going on over there. Listen, we are not military experts. We are Members of the United States Congress. We have some oversight authority and so on, and we work with the administration, but what do my colleagues want done? What, do they want the President to come over to Congress every day and say, all right, here is how many helicopters we have dispatched in this portion of Afghanistan, here is where this ship is, this is what we are doing? Let the President and the military administration do their job.

I heard a complaint over the weekend on some of the news stories that we do not seem to really have a plan of where this is going. Well, I think the Vice President, DICK CHENEY, did a very good job of responding to that. I think it was last evening, when he said, look, the people we are dealing with are terrorists. They are not going to meet us in some country and have a summit for peace or sign a peace treaty with us. There is not going to be some kind of long-term peace plan that they want to execute or cooperate in with the United States of America. There is no deterrent out there against these kind of people. They have one mission in mind: they want to destroy the United States, and they want to destroy anybody that is affiliated with the United States, and they want to destroy people that do not agree with them in any regard.

These are not the kind of people we can draw out some kind of peace plan or conclusion with short of taking them into custody or destroying them. And we cannot just stop with the al Qaeda. We have to call people what they are; we have to call it what it is.

I was amazed that after the President's speech, where he talked about North Korea, that all of a sudden some of my colleagues or some of the commentators across the country were starting to act like North Korea is a very amicable country; that the leadership, and not the people of North Korea, but the leadership of North Korea is not as evil as we portray them to be. What a misconception.

Take a look what North Korea is all about. In fact, if I was a wealthy man, I would spend my money and I would take every high school graduate in this country, if they wanted to go, and I would fly them to Korea and I would take them up to the DMZ and I would show them that line that separates two societies, the society of democracy and freedom against the society of communism and dictatorship and ruthlessness.

But all of a sudden, because our President and his administration, and a very able administration, DICK CHENEY and Condoleezza Rice and Donald Rumsfeld, because they say it so, we all of a sudden see them draw criticism. It was interesting that Colin Powell had to say the other day to even some of our allies in NATO, hey, every time you pound on the United States, why not pound on Iraq.

And when the President talks about Iraq as part of the axis of evil and the evilness of Iran, do not forget the leader of Iraq, Saddam Hussein, who has poisoned his own people. He has not used chemical warfare or other kinds of poison against an enemy, but used it against his own people who disagreed with his policies. Look at the mass executions in that country. Look at the oppression against women in that country. Look at the oppression against scholars.

And let me remind my colleagues that they are not content to keep it within their own borders. North Korea is not content to stay within its own borders. Iraq is not content to stay within its own borders. They want to reach outside their borders, and they want to destroy the signs of freedom, and they want to destroy the evidence of democracy. And we had better stand up to it.

Frankly, most of the people in America have given their support to the President and his leadership. We have got to draw the line in the sand. That is what the President has said, and he is willing to commit the American forces to complete the mission. That is what all of us need to do. But some of my colleagues stand up to the American people and say, well, where is this going and to start criticizing the administration at this point in time on our war against terrorism, when they

have not sat 10 minutes as the commanding officer of the United States, our chief military officer; they have not sat for 10 minutes in a lieutenant's chair in this mission. We need to give these people confidence. We need to give them our confidence that the job they are doing is what needs to be done.

The cancer that is the al Qaeda, the acts of these terrorists, must be stopped. And thank goodness we finally have an administration that, despite the fact that we have taken some casualties, understands that if we are going to clear out the rats, if we are going to get in there and get those cancer cells, we are going to take casualties. There is a lot of dirty work ahead for us to get rid of this threat. But if we do not get rid of it now, the casualties we take today will be nothing, nothing compared to the many casualties we will take in the future and the regrets we will have in the future because we did not support this administration and take out the al Qaeda while we had the opportunity to take out the al Qaeda; while we had the opportunity to do something to restrain the expansionist mode of Iraq and the ideals of Iraq to use nuclear weapons, or biological weapons, or any kind of weapon of mass destruction against the rest of the free world.

So I would urge my colleagues to be a little slower in their criticism; study the facts a little more and do not pretend to be some kind of tank captain out there who knows how to run the battlefield. We have experts out there that do that.

Now, I am not saying that Congress should forgive or forget or release our oversight responsibilities and our budgetary responsibilities, et cetera. I am not saying that. I am just saying that I am beginning to sense that Congress and some Members of Congress are beginning to run interference on their own team. As our quarterback is getting ready to throw the ball, it is not a member of the enemy team that has broken through the line, it is some of our own people, kind of confused and running back there and asking the quarterback if he ought to be throwing the ball, right in the middle of the play. That does not work.

This country, I think, has shown very admirable dedication to what this country is all about, and that is freedom and the protection of people throughout this world. Clearly, it has been reflected by our military, which has done an outstanding job. It has done such a good job that up to this point we have been able to limit casualties. But now when it comes to hand-to-hand combat, which is a necessary part, now when it comes to digging in real deep to get those cancer cells, we are going to have casualties.

I wish we would not have casualties. Everyone in this Chamber wishes we would not have casualties. These poor families who have suffered the worst loss a family can suffer wishes they

had not suffered that. But it is my opinion that almost everybody, almost everybody comes to the same conclusion, and that is that sometimes we have to fight. We cannot run. Sometimes we have to do what is right. Sometimes we have to draw that line in the sand; and when the other person steps over it, we have to stop them. Because if we do not, we will pay a very, very heavy price in the future.

Let me talk very briefly about NATO. As my colleagues know, NATO is our North Atlantic defense council or European council treaty organization, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It is very important. They have played an important part in our war in Afghanistan. Within hours after the September 11 attack against the United States of America, NATO, for the first time in its history, for the first time in its history, invoked what is called article 5.

Article 5 in the NATO agreement says, simplified, an attack against one is an attack against all. Within hours after that, NATO agreed to give the United States of America whatever was necessary, whatever the United States requested to assist them going after the people who committed that atrocious act of war against us. And the United States took advantage of that offer and took advantage of our membership in NATO.

We called upon our friends to help us track down the financial network that supported this from a financial point of view. We called upon our friends to help us with intelligence and to help us break up those cells, those terrorist cells, located throughout the world, including some located in the United States of America. We requested, and it was supplied, NATO AWAC aircraft. For the first time in the history of the United States, we had nine U.S. aircraft patrolling our skyways while we sent our AWAC aircraft over to the theater of operations.

I just recently returned from NATO meetings; and when I listened to the British, it was like listening to your own brother. The British are there. They are there 100 percent. And the British people, the ambassador over in London, told me what it was like hours after September 11. Tens of thousands of Britons came to the embassy to sign the condolence books. They could not get a phone call out because there were so many condolence phone calls from the British people to the American people. Tony Blair's resolve was instant and has only strengthened. It has not weakened. He came to the assistance of the United States.

And so I want to commend NATO, but at the same time that I commend our partners in NATO, I want to remind some of our fair weather friends in NATO that this is not going to be an easy battle. Do not let these casualties of the last few hours scare you off. This, clearly, is a battle for this next century. This is a battle that determines the safety and the freedom and

the future for all of our countries, whether you are in NATO or not. This time around it was the United States of America. It was New York. It was Washington, DC. Next time it might be Paris or next time maybe a terrorist attack in the country of Luxembourg or, God forbid, some other place in this world.

We need to stick together as a team. This is not the time to pound on the United States, as Colin Powell has said. It is time to recognize who the enemy is, to acknowledge to the American people and to all world people who that enemy is, and to do something about the enemy. It is time to get a rope around that wild horse and bring it in. This cancer that is spreading throughout the world must be stopped, and it is not going to be stopped through weak knees. It is only going to be stopped through teamwork, through dedication, and, frankly, through sacrifice.

The sacrifice reflected in the last few hours by the loss of American soldiers is exactly the kind of medicine that unfortunately is going to be necessary to take that cancer off that body. So let me, in conclusion of my remarks, just repeat what I said earlier, and these are the remarks of the brother of Chief Warrant Officer Stanley Harriman, who was killed in action in the last few hours, here is what his brother says; and this is how I conclude my remarks this evening: His brother Steve said that he hoped the military, and I add to that NATO and all our allies throughout the world, he hoped the military would not flinch in pursuing military operations to their conclusion. Stan would not have changed it if he could. He would have done it the same way. Steve said, I hope they continue to do what they say they are going to do, to complete the mission.

Our military, with our support, and the administration, which is doing an outstanding job of leading this effort, must be allowed to complete the mission, to protect the freedom of the world and democracy as we know it.

THE BUDGET AND THE DEBT CEILING INCREASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRENSHAW). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, this will be another in a series of 1-hours that the so-called Blue Dog Coalition is taking to focus on the budget, to focus on the request of the administration to raise our debt ceiling by \$750 billion. We want to continue to talk about this.

I want to make it very, very clear that we, the Blue Dogs, are willing to support a temporary increase in the debt limit to meet the expenses of the war and to allow government to meet its obligations; but we suggest holding

off on a long-term increase in the debt ceiling until we have a plan in place to return our country and our fiscal affairs to balance.

□ 2000

I remind everyone that it was less than a year ago that we stood and debated on this floor of the House the economic game plan that we were going to follow for the next year and the next 10 years. I remind everyone just briefly that the Blue Dogs felt that we ought to be conservative with the \$5.6 trillion projected surplus just in case it was not real, just in case something of an emergency nature might occur, just in case those who projected that surplus might be wrong.

We suggested that we ought to take half of that \$5.6 trillion projected surplus and pay down the debt. We were told by our friends on the other side of the aisle and the administration that they were concerned about paying down the debt too quickly.

Well, I do not know where they got that information, but now all of a sudden the President's budget that he has submitted to the Congress this year projects deficits and the utilization of the Social Security trust fund for the next 10 years. I repeat. The President's budget proposes using Social Security trust fund dollars for the next 10 years. That is the economic game plan that we are under tonight.

The Blue Dogs are suggesting that we ought to sit back, the Congress and the President, and our friends on the other side of the aisle need to sit back and roll up our sleeves and have an honest discussion about what we need to do to put our budget back in order. We need to have a serious discussion with everything on the table. The preceding speaker opened his remarks in just that vein, and there are a large number of Democrats who are willing to sit down and try to put our fiscal house back in order, but that offer has to be extended and so far it has not.

The bottom line tonight is that we are being asked to increase our debt ceiling by \$750 billion. That means we are going to have to borrow or it is suggested that we need to borrow that amount of money. In the conduct of the war, we are perfectly willing, if that should be the decision of the President, to borrow the money to fight the war.

There are some that suggest that maybe, just maybe, we ought to consider paying for it, because when we borrow it today we are saying that this generation does not wish to pay for that which we are enjoying, but we are perfectly willing to send that obligation to our children and grandchildren. That is part of the discussion that we wish that we were having on this floor tonight.

We have made it very clear we are willing to participate in a meaningful dialogue, a meaningful debate in which we can have ideas and suggestions put forward as to how we get from where

we are to where we need to be. Where we are today is we are back into deficit spending. We are back into spending the Social Security trust funds when after I think last year five times, five times we voted on this floor unanimously a lockbox on the Social Security trust fund. I guess we did not mean it.

The Blue Dogs when we were on the floor last year talking about the economic game plan that we suggested not only suggested that we ought to take that \$5.6 trillion surplus and devote half of it to paying down the debt, 25 percent of it to cutting taxes, and 25 percent of it to be spent on the priorities of this Nation.

What were those priorities? Fixing Social Security, fixing Medicare, dealing with prescription drugs, dealing with the educational problems of this country. We believe and still believe that we could do what we needed to do with that amount of revenue, and then we proposed cutting taxes with 25 percent of that projected surplus.

Well, we lost. We came up 14 votes short, I believe was the number. And under our system of government, when you lose, you go on to the next round.

Well, here we are into the next round being asked to increase the debt ceiling by 750 billion additional dollars. We say, whoa, let us not do that much at one time. Let us not admit that this body is not capable of working with the other body and working with the President and putting our fiscal house back in order and balancing our budget at a time certain. We are perfectly willing to deal with spending caps, with pay-go so long as everything is put on the table so we might have an open and honest dialogue and then get a vote on the issues in which we are concerned.

Now what does the debt ceiling mean to the average person watching us tonight? I know many times when you listen to us you get very confused. But, basically, it is a businessman going to their lender. It is a student going to their parents, having run up a \$6,000 credit card bill. Of course, the parents will pay because they do not want the kid's credit damaged in the long run, but they will work out the arrangement that includes reducing the allowance, getting a part-time job, and getting promises for less partying, et cetera.

The worse thing that we are doing with our accumulated Federal debt is the reverse of this scenario. Parents are going to the students with their bills and expecting the youths to pay for their elders' irresponsible consumption. A businessman that reaches his credit limit at his bank needs to go to his banker and say, I need to borrow additional money, I have this great investment potential, I have got this great idea, and you convince your banker that you have a plan that will pay him back not only what you have borrowed up to this point but also will pay back that which you are intending to borrow in upping your credit limit.