

how much time the defense appropriation bill took earlier in the day. I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania was interested.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, we hope we have completed within our time allotment to preserve our win of previous years, and that is only due to the cooperation of all the Members. So I am not going to talk anymore because I may overstay my time.

□ 1815

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GILLMOR). Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE) having assumed the chair, Mr. GILLMOR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5011) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 462, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 426, nays 1, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

YEAS—426

Abercrombie	Bishop	Capps
Ackerman	Blagojevich	Capuano
Aderholt	Blumenauer	Cardin
Akin	Blunt	Carson (IN)
Allen	Boehert	Carson (OK)
Andrews	Boehner	Castle
Armey	Bonilla	Chabot
Baca	Bonior	Chambliss
Bachus	Bono	Clay
Baird	Boozman	Clayton
Baker	Borski	Clement
Baldacci	Boswell	Clyburn
Baldwin	Boucher	Coble
Ballenger	Boyd	Collins
Barcia	Brady (PA)	Combest
Barr	Brady (TX)	Condit
Barrett	Brown (FL)	Conyers
Bartlett	Brown (OH)	Cooksey
Barton	Bryant	Costello
Bass	Burr	Cox
Becerra	Burton	Coyne
Bentsen	Buyer	Cramer
Bereuter	Callahan	Crane
Berkley	Calvert	Crenshaw
Berman	Camp	Crowley
Berry	Cannon	Cubin
Biggert	Cantor	Culberson
Bilirakis	Capito	Cummings

Cunningham	Israel	Norwood
Davis (CA)	Issa	Nussle
Davis (FL)	Istook	Oberstar
Davis (IL)	Jackson (IL)	Obey
Davis, Jo Ann	Jackson-Lee	Olver
Davis, Tom	(TX)	Ortiz
Deal	Jefferson	Osborne
DeFazio	Jenkins	Ose
DeGette	John	Otter
DeLahunt	Johnson (CT)	Owens
DeLauro	Johnson (IL)	Oxley
DeLay	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
DeMint	Johnson, Sam	Pascarell
Deutsch	Jones (NC)	Pastor
Diaz-Balart	Jones (OH)	Payne
Dicks	Kanjorski	Pelosi
Dingell	Kaptur	Pence
Doggett	Keller	Peterson (MN)
Dooley	Kelly	Peterson (PA)
Doolittle	Kennedy (MN)	Petri
Doyle	Kennedy (RI)	Phelps
Dreier	Kerns	Pickering
Duncan	Kildee	Pitts
Dunn	Kilpatrick	Platts
Edwards	Kind (WI)	Pombo
Ehlers	King (NY)	Pomeroy
Ehrlich	Kingston	Portman
Emerson	Kirk	Price (NC)
English	Kleczka	Pryce (OH)
Eshoo	Knollenberg	Putnam
Etheridge	Kolbe	Quinn
Evans	Kucinich	Radanovich
Everett	LaFalce	Rahall
Farr	LaHood	Ramstad
Fattah	Lampson	Rangel
Ferguson	Langevin	Regula
Finler	Lantos	Rehberg
Flake	Larsen (WA)	Reyes
Fletcher	Larson (CT)	Reynolds
Foley	Latham	Riley
Forbes	LaTourette	Rivers
Ford	Leach	Rodriguez
Fossella	Lee	Roemer
Frank	Levin	Rogers (KY)
Frelinghuysen	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (MI)
Frost	Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher
Gallegly	Lewis (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Ganske	Linder	Ross
Gekas	Lipinski	Rothman
Gephardt	LoBiondo	Roybal-Allard
Gibbons	Lofgren	Royce
Gilchrest	Lowe	Rush
Gillmor	Lucas (KY)	Ryan (WI)
Gilman	Lucas (OK)	Ryun (KS)
Gonzalez	Luther	Sabo
Goode	Lynch	Sanchez
Goodlatte	Maloney (CT)	Sanders
Goss	Maloney (NY)	Sandlin
Graham	Manzullo	Sawyer
Granger	Markey	Saxton
Graves	Masara	Schaffer
Green (TX)	Matheson	Schakowsky
Green (WI)	Matsui	Schiff
Greenwood	McCarthy (MO)	Schrock
Grucci	McCarthy (NY)	Scott
Gutierrez	McCollum	Sensenbrenner
Gutknecht	McCrery	Serrano
Hall (OH)	McDermott	Sessions
Hall (TX)	McGovern	Shadegg
Hansen	McHugh	Shaw
Harman	McInnis	Shays
Hart	McIntyre	Sherman
Hastings (FL)	McKeon	Sherwood
Hastings (WA)	McKinney	Shimkus
Hayes	McNulty	Shows
Hayworth	Meehan	Shuster
Hefley	Meeke (FL)	Simmons
Herger	Meeks (NY)	Simpson
Hill	Menendez	Skean
Hilleary	Mica	Skelton
Hilliard	Millender-	Slaughter
Hinchee	McDonald	Smith (MI)
Hinojosa	Miller, Dan	Smith (NJ)
Hobson	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)
Hoeffel	Miller, Jeff	Smith (WA)
Hoekstra	Mink	Snyder
Holden	Mollohan	Solis
Holden	Moore	Souder
Holt	Moran (KS)	Spratt
Honda	Moran (VA)	Stark
Hooley	Morella	Stearns
Horn	Murtha	Stenholm
Hostettler	Myrick	Strickland
Houghton	Nadler	Stump
Hoyer	Napolitano	Stupak
Hulshof	Neal	Sullivan
Hunter	Nethercutt	Sununu
Hyde	Ney	Sweeney
Inslee	Northup	Tancredo
Isakson		

Tanner	Turner	Weiner
Tauscher	Udall (CO)	Weldon (FL)
Tauzin	Udall (NM)	Weldon (PA)
Taylor (MS)	Upton	Weller
Taylor (NC)	Velazquez	Wexler
Terry	Visclosky	Whitfield
Thomas	Vitter	Wicker
Thompson (CA)	Walden	Wilson (NM)
Thompson (MS)	Walsh	Wilson (SC)
Thornberry	Wamp	Wolf
Thune	Waters	Woolsey
Thurman	Watkins (OK)	Wu
Tiahrt	Watson (CA)	Wynn
Tiberi	Watt (NC)	Young (AK)
Toomey	Watts (OK)	Young (FL)
Towns	Waxman	

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—7

Brown (SC)	Miller, George	Traficant
Engel	Roukema	
Gordon	Tierney	

□ 1839

Ms. SANCHEZ changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 277 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill and concurrent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2690. An act to reaffirm the reference to one Nation under God in the Pledge of Allegiance.

S. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives.

INCREASING PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 462, I call up Senate bill (S. 2578) to amend title 31 of the United States Code to increase the public debt limit, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of S. 2578 is as follows:

S. 2578

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

SECTION 1. INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT.

Subsection (b) of section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$5,950,000,000,000” and inserting “\$6,400,000,000,000”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 462, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

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

Mr. Speaker, more than a month ago, this House passed H.R. 4775 by a vote of 280-138, a clear bipartisan majority. That bill created the ability to address the debt limit. For over a month, the Senate has not responded to addressing the debt limit.

However, recently the Senate sent to the House S. 2578, a bill to raise the debt limit. Debt-limit bills usually originate in the House. In fact, the last time this situation faced the House was in 1946. In 1946, the Senate sent the House a debt ceiling bill. On the floor of the House then-majority leader John McCormick referred that bill to the Committee on the Judiciary. The House did not consider the attempt by the Senate to initiate debt-limit legislation.

So today, in the act of considering a Senate-initiated debt-limit bill, we are in a situation which, based upon the data provided to me by the Parliamentarians, could be considered to be an unprecedented situation. But given the circumstances surrounding the way in which we are required to take this bill up, it should not be considered a precedent because for over a month we could have been engaging in the historical usual pattern of addressing debt limit.

It is quite true that that measure that was presented to the House in 1946 was a Senate bill to lower the debt limit, not to raise it. That is why the House, in attempting to preserve its prerogative, felt comfortable in referring the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary from which it never surfaced. But a bill to lower the debt limit, as Members appreciate, does not contain within it the need to act, as does a bill that increases the debt limit.

The failure of the Senate to act on the invitation to address the debt limit by the House means that the Senate has successfully run down the clock by which we could utilize the House initiation of addressing the debt limit. So as far as the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is concerned, the measure before us should not be considered a change in the historic relationship between the House and the Senate over the origination of debt-limit legislation; but, rather the action taken today is a one-time acknowledgment of the exigencies of the circumstances facing the House. We are dealing with this purely to facilitate the movement of this bill to the President's desk, and it should not be interpreted as a precedent-changing situation.

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

□ 1845

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

A lot of strange things are happening on the Republican watch as the Committee on Ways and Means loses all of its jurisdiction. I was just about to blame the Republican leadership; and,

lo and behold, it is the Senate that is responsible. Every time I get ready to be critical of the Republican leadership for bypassing the House rules, by creating rules to pass legislation, I hear my distinguished and talented and intellectual chairman say, "This is not unprecedented. This is just the first time it is happening because what is unprecedented is what the other body is doing. Shame on the other body."

Let me tell you this. We are the keepers of the tradition of the House, and these rules are being violated each and every day. Who would think at a time of war when our Nation is still in recession, where we are trying to bring our wounds together, where we recognize that, sure, we lost 5 or \$6 trillion in the surplus, it was not the Republicans' fault, it was because the economy let us down. But now that we are asked to increase the debt ceiling, we are no longer Republicans and Democrats, we are Americans, and we are going to say, yes, let's do it.

Why? Because Republicans are trustworthy? Of course we cannot say that. Because we come together when the full faith and credit of the United States is at stake. When that flag goes up, then we have no choice except to increase the debt ceiling. It is just the same as finding out at home that when you find out that your credit has run out, you can start pointing fingers, but if you need an extension or the mortgage is going to be foreclosed, then you have to get the extension.

All we want to know is, what did you do with the money? How are you going to spend the additional money that you are going to borrow? And if the Senate is so irresponsible, why did the House not act sooner? Why did the Committee on Ways and Means not come together in a bipartisan way and bring something to the floor?

Mr. Speaker, the Senate may have a lot of things that they are doing in an unprecedented way, and they should be subject perhaps to a lot of criticism. But the inadequacy of the House leadership and the fact that my historically prestigious committee is losing jurisdiction each and every day under Republican leadership, let us not blame that on the Senate.

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

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

I am trying to understand how the Committee on Ways and Means is losing jurisdiction when the chairman of the committee and the ranking member are debating a bill brought to us by a rule which allows no amendments, exactly the way in which legislation coming from the Committee on Ways and Means is always dealt with.

I think if you have really followed this debate over time, you will understand the dynamics of the debate. If we do not do it, we get criticized. If we do it, we get criticized. If in fact the measure before us, which originated in the Senate and is the work product of

the Senate leadership and the gentleman from New York finds the Senate's language and structure unacceptable, then his problem is with the leadership of the Senate, not of the leadership of this House.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), a senior member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I always am impressed by the chairman of the committee's use of words. He said that we are out here because of the exigencies of circumstances. What he means is, we made a mess and we got to fix it. It is a mess that did not have to happen.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to an op-ed of Sunday, February 11, 2001, by Robert Rubin that is called A Prosperity Easy to Destroy. It says in short:

The proposed tax cut of roughly \$2 trillion—\$1.6 trillion of tax cuts plus \$400 billion of interest on debt that would otherwise have been retired—would substantially diminish the fiscal position of the Federal Government, and would create a serious threat of deficits on the nonentitlement side of the Federal budget.

This was all predicted in February of last year. We came out here, and we have been told, "You can spend all you want, you can give it all away, you can do all these things."

He actually even predicted that there would not be any money for a prescription drug benefit. Ha. Mr. Rubin knew very well. He is the guy that brought us out of the mess that you created between 1980 and 1992. Two Republicans, Mr. Reagan, Mr. Bush, they dug the hole, we dug us out of it, and now you are back into it and you call it the exigencies of circumstances. Why do you not admit you have made a mess? You cannot get the votes for your prescription drug benefit because it is inadequate and everybody knows it. You are privatizing Medicare and you are trying to hide this debt raising right underneath the prescription drug benefit.

If you are lucky and you can squeeze the votes out of your people, the press tomorrow will talk about Republicans pass inadequate drug benefit. They will never mention this business about the mess you created fiscally in this country. You ought to be ashamed of yourself bringing it out here like this.

The article referred to is as follows: [From the New York Times, Feb. 11, 2001]

A PROSPERITY EASY TO DESTROY
(By Robert E. Rubin)

I had not intended to get involved in the public debate on fiscal policy at this point, but I feel so strongly that a tax cut of the magnitude proposed is a serious error in economic policy that I felt a need to speak.

The proposed tax cut of roughly \$2 trillion—\$1.6 trillion of tax cuts plus \$400 billion of interest on debt that would otherwise have been retired—would substantially diminish the fiscal position of the federal government, and would create a serious threat

of deficits on the non-entitlement side of the federal budget. That, in turn, could increase interest rates and recreate the loss of consumer and business confidence associated with the deficits of the late 80's and early 90's.

Over the last 20 years, our nation has seen the benefits of fiscal discipline, and also the adverse consequences of a lack of fiscal discipline. Big tax cuts are a fast way back to deficits and economic stress. From these experiences, there are lessons that should guide policymakers. First, we gain greatly when our nation is clearly committed to budgetary discipline and lose greatly when it is not. Second, it is wise to be prudent—we should avoid committing ourselves to dramatic courses of action that are hard to reverse in the face of the inherent uncertainties of any projections. Third, we have a duty not to pass on burdens to the next generation when we can act today. The size of the proposed tax cut fails all these tests.

Instead, the fiscal discipline that was so central to the remarkable economic conditions of the past eight years is the best path for both our short-term and long-term economic well-being. A brief look back can provide very useful guidance for going forward.

In 1992, the unemployment rate was over 7 percent, the fiscal deficit was \$290 billion and projected by the Congressional Budget Office to grow to over \$500 billion in 2001 from there, the federal debt had quadrupled over the preceding 12 years and was projected to double again by 2001, and the prevailing view was that economic conditions would remain mediocre well into the future.

The economic transformation that followed included massive job creation, rising incomes, low inflation, unemployment now at 4.2 percent, and today's large current and projected surpluses. Many factors contributed to this transformation, including globalization, new technologies, vast corporate restructuring and our flexible labor and capital markets. But I think there is no doubt that key and indispensable to this was the restoration of fiscal discipline, beginning with the deficit reduction program of 1993.

Just how dramatic a change in economic policy this was is evidenced by the vituperativeness of opposition, with strident prediction of vast increases in unemployment and recession.

Instead, fiscal discipline contributed greatly to lower interest rates and, very, very importantly, restoration of confidence by consumers and business after deficits had come to symbolize a much broader set of concerns about our ability to manage our affairs. The result was increased demand; increased investment, especially in the new technologies; increased productivity; and sustained growth in gross domestic product, jobs and incomes.

We are now in the process of unwinding the excesses that, in my view, inevitably develop after an extended period of good times. To minimize the difficulty and duration of that unwinding and to best realize our very favorable longer-term prospects, we should continue with our hard-won fiscal discipline and not adopt a greatly outsized tax cut that seriously threatens the federal government's fiscal soundness.

There is broad agreement amongst virtually all mainstream economists that a tax cut this year is unlikely to provide meaningful economic stimulus to deal with whatever adverse circumstances may occur this year. Moreover, if a tax cut is desired for short-term stimulative purposes, the vast preponderance of the one proposed—which affects later years—is largely irrelevant. Instead, a front-end-loaded, moderate tax cut, or even a special rebate aimed at working people with the highest propensity to spend, would maxi-

mize current economic impact. The point would be to achieve increased short-term demand without causing a level of fiscal deterioration that would, on balance, damage confidence.

The serious threat of the proposed tax cut to fiscal soundness becomes apparent when you look at the numbers a little more closely. The surplus of \$5.6 trillion as projected by the C.B.O. is roughly \$2.1 trillion after deducting Social Security and Medicare surpluses—as many members of Congress in both parties have advocated—and making realistic adjustments to better represent future spending on current discretionary programs and tax revenues. Since the proposed tax cut would cost \$2 trillion, or \$2.2 trillion if an alternative minimum tax adjustment is included, it would entirely use up the remaining surplus, with no additional debt reduction. And that leaves nothing for special programs that already have broad support, like a prescription drug benefit or a greater increase in defense spending for a missile defense system, or other purposes or additional tax cuts, all of which are almost sure to happen this year or over the next few years. These spending increases and the additional tax cuts could well cost between \$500 billion and \$1 trillion, leading to a deficit under this analysis of the C.B.O. projections.

Moreover, five-year budget forecasts, to say nothing of 10-year forecasts, are highly unreliable—just look at the forecasts that were made five or 10 years ago. Thus, even if you favored a very large tax cut as the preferred use for available surplus—which I emphatically do not—even a moderate degree of prudence would suggest waiting a few years to see whether or not the projected surpluses are actually occurring, meanwhile paying down debt. That would also be in plenty of time to deal with any concerns about the uses that might be made of the surplus after the debt is retired. The suggestion that tax cuts could be rescinded if projected surpluses don't materialize seems unlikely politically.

The political impetus in Washington is toward tax cuts and spending. Real progress has been made over the past decade toward a political mindset of discipline, but that is always highly vulnerable, and a very large tax cut is a significant step back to the political mindset that produced the deficits and quadrupling of the debt from 1980 to 1992.

The imperative for maintaining our fiscal discipline and not taking a risk of losing the current opportunity to retire the publicly held debt of the federal government is increased by the importance of putting the federal government in the best possible position to meet the Social Security and Medicare requirements of future generations, when the federal budget is projected to be in deficit again.

All of this is independent of the question of how best to use the surplus available on a fiscally sound basis. My own preference would be to divide this between debt reduction, a more moderate tax cut predominantly favoring middle-income and lower-income people, and special initiatives in important areas like education and health care. Others have different views. But we should all agree that it would be profoundly unwise to seriously risk the hard-won fiscal discipline that has brought so many benefits to our nation.

We have had a remarkable eight years after a far more difficult period, including a recession in 1990. We should learn from experience and stay with a landmark change in strategy that worked, not take the path that experience suggests poses a real threat to our economic well-being.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. STENHOLM), one of the outstanding Members of the House.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to make it very clear that this side of the aisle has been in favor of raising the debt ceiling clean since at least March. We have made repeated offers. What we are not in favor of doing is increasing the debt ceiling with a blank check to continue to borrow money without changing our economic game plan.

I join with Chairman THOMAS in his opening remarks because it is in the same spirit that he referenced back to 1946 that we attempted to have an offer of an amendment today to lower the amount of debt ceiling from \$450 billion to a \$150 billion increase. That is exactly the same spirit in which was done in 1946. We asked for that to be made in order, but the rule once again denied the minority an opportunity to have a clean up and down vote on an alternative.

I do not understand why we continue to have the inability to have debate on issues as important as the debt ceiling is. I hope no one makes the argument that we are here as obstructionists. We are here today positively saying we will offer in the motion to commit—recommit, commit, whatever the new terminology is—this bill back to the Committee on Ways and Means with an instant recall at \$150 billion so that we might have another look at the budget prior to the end of this fiscal year when CBO re-estimates.

It is fiscally irresponsible for this group, this House, to stand on this floor and increase by \$450 billion without revisiting the economic game plan that we are under. Take a look at State after State after State in which governors are having to make tough decisions. Here we are no longer tax and spend, we are borrow and spend. That is exactly what this resolution will do. Those who vote for it today will be voting to borrow and spend another \$450 billion with the exact same economic game plan that has gotten us into the problem that we are in today.

I do not understand this. I do not understand why, once again, the chairman comes on, and no one comes over and debates.

Where is the debate?

Mr. RANGEL. Where is the debate? Well, I guess it is all on the outside. I can understand the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a senior member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, Democrats will vote to raise the debt ceiling when there is a plan to reverse fiscal irresponsibility. There is no plan. The fiscal irresponsibility began right here in this U.S. House of Representatives under your majority, and now you try to shift the blame to the Senate, trying

to obscure the fact that the irresponsibility commenced right here.

We told you that the sheer size of the tax cut made all of your plan a risky gamble. We warned you the projections of future budget surpluses were not written in stone. As it turned out, they were written in sand, in substantial part because of your policies.

We have gone from surpluses as far as the eye could see to deficits as far as the eye can see. You are diverting Social Security and Medicare to pay for your tax cuts and other irresponsible programs. The majority has compounded its irresponsibility, as I have said, by tonight saying raise the debt ceiling without any plan to stem the red ink in this budget. It is another \$450 billion that will come where? From Social Security and Medicare payroll taxes. You have no plan. All you are trying to do is to shift the blame.

This Congress is obliged to raise the debt ceiling, we are obliged to pay our debts, but we should not just write a blank check, which is what you want. We need a plan to stop this raid on Social Security and Medicare.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution, to vote "no" until you become fiscally responsible with the funds of our fellow and sister citizens.

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

They wanted to know where is the debate? I am trying to figure out what it is that I am supposed to debate. The gentleman from Michigan comes on the floor and says Democrats will vote to increase the debt limit. The measure in front of us is to increase the debt limit. But the gentleman then said he asked his colleagues to vote "no" on the resolution.

Which position are you supposed to debate? Yes or no? I find it interesting that if they knew last year prior to September 11 that we were going to have all of those problems associated with the tragedy around the 11th and the consequent commitment by this President to carry the war to the terrorists and they were prescient enough to know that the country was going to face that situation, gee, I wish they would have let us know that was going to happen. We could have taken some procedures and some steps that would have certainly been far more humane than what occurred.

I find that people who are more than willing to use hindsight as the reason for taking a position rather interesting when shortly they will also urge their colleagues to vote "no" on the Medicare package. Only this time their argument is going to be that we do not spend enough. We are only going to spend \$350 billion.

The beauty of the Democrats' ability to debate is they are masters at compartmentalizing. Right now it is, "You spendthrifts, we have to raise the debt limit." Several hours from now it will be, "You cheapskates, you are not willing to spend enough to help the seniors."

And they say, why are you not willing to debate? I am trying to figure out which Democrat I am supposed to debate. The one that is complaining the Republicans are spendthrifts and we have to raise the debt limit? Or the one who is saying, you are cheapskates, you are not willing to spend enough, \$800 billion, to help seniors.

I guess the problem I have is that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) in characterizing a Member several days ago puts me in exactly that dilemma.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time and yield the control of the time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, the gentleman from Texas will control the time for the majority.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished leader. We were calling for debate. We did not know you were going to bring out the leader. We want to hear what he has to say about this since the chairman of Committee on Ways and Means is confused.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

I am a farmer. I think, just for the sake of being honest and not hoodwinking the American people, maybe we should get this, if you will, discussion out of the hay mound and down on the barn floor where we can chew it up seriously.

□ 1900

The fact is, maybe I would make an analogy that my family that I love went out and spend more money than they should and now the question is, do we pay that credit card bill? So, reluctantly, probably as one of the most fiscal Members of this Congress, I say, look, we have to pay our bills.

The problem has been on that spending. Let me give my colleagues an example. If we held the line on spending since President Clinton came into office in 1994 we would not have this problem today. That is not just Democrat control; it is the Republican control. There is an overzealousness to spend, and that is what we have been doing.

Let me give my colleagues this example. In 1998, we passed and executed a plan designed to balance the budget by 2002. That is what we promised in 1998. That budget projected fiscal 2002, this year's revenues, at just under \$1.89 trillion. Actual revenues, even after the tax cut, were way in excess of that, according to CBO, and now are expected to come in over \$2 trillion, or more than 5 percent above the projection. However, it was spending. Our projection in 1998 for outlays were under \$1.89 trillion and are now expected to be \$110 billion higher than we

projected. It should be clear that it is spending.

Now, this tough question: I do not want to vote to increase the debt ceiling without some kind of a plan like every family has, like every business has, to say, look, we are going to borrow a little more, but we are going to have to pay it back sometime. How are we going to eventually pay it back so that we do not leave this mortgage to our kids?

Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where the \$35 billion in increased defense expenditures and \$6 billion expanded homeland are part of the problem. We have to deal with that national security problem. Let us pass this debt ceiling, but, likewise, let us move ahead and have a plan of how we are going to repay this debt so that we do not leave it to our kids.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. All we need is a plan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is precisely on target with his comments. During the 1990s, we understood the need to balance the budget. What was the result? It created the greatest period of economic growth in the history of the Nation. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means says, hindsight, it is easy. It is foresight that we undertook in the 1990s. We prepared for the rainy day; that was the whole notion: a national disaster, international conflict, a downturn in the economy.

That is why we do not understand a reckless \$2 trillion tax cut. We should have been focused on the items that we might not have been able to control in the near or far future.

Unemployment has gone from 4 percent to 6 percent, the budget deficit is at \$250 billion, and a Wall Street analyst said yesterday, the economy and the markets right now are in the midst of a full-blown corporate governance shock. Stock market numbers are down, the value of the dollar has dropped considerably, retail sales have dropped along with consumer confidence, and we continue right down this road.

Now here is the point that I find most focused tonight and the one that I think troubles me perhaps far more than anything else. There were Members on the other side of this body who were going to impeach Secretary Rubin, going to impeach him. Actually, the Committee on Financial Services in this House held hearings on impeaching Bob Rubin because of the debt ceiling question. They would not vote to raise that debt ceiling under any circumstances.

Tonight, the argument is, well, if we had better hindsight, it would be much

easier for us to undertake these sorts of initiatives.

The point that we have reached is because of the tax cut, and we have to focus on that issue, and we have to understand it and keep it in perspective. At the same time that we discuss this, American companies are allowed to sneak out of this Nation in a time of war in the dark of night to Bermuda to escape what they contend to be corporate taxes.

Mr. Speaker, \$48 billion more, \$38 billion more for homeland security. The chairman was mistaken. The problem is not hindsight; the problem is vision and foresight.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that I am hearing talk over here about where is the Republican plan to get out of the predicament that we are in. The obvious question is, where is the Democrat plan? Where has it been? Where is the budget?

I sit on the Committee on the Budget. The Democrats did not have a budget in committee, they did not have a budget on this House Floor, and they have the nerve to come down here and say, where is our plan?

We put a budget together. We put a budget on this floor. We passed it on this floor. We have a plan. They may disagree with it, but they did not have the courage to put a budget on the floor and have an honest debate about it and have an honest vote about it.

Let me tell my colleagues what the plan would look like if we had one. It would be all about more spending, and they know that. I know they do not like tax cuts, but what they wanted to do with that money is they wanted to spend it. I have not been here all that long, this is only my fourth year, but each and every single time that we have had an appropriation bill on this floor, if we did not all agree, and on many we do, but when we did not agree, what was the objection on their side? It was always that it does not spend enough.

Well, let me tell my colleagues, we cannot spend our way into a deficit unless we are spending too much. And the Democrat plan, that I must infer, since they will not put one on the table, can only be that they want to spend even more money.

The Democrats also know for a fact that the big problem that we face is the result of an economic slowdown and a war that we are engaged in. The fact is, if it had not been for the tax cut that we passed last year, I do not know what kind of condition this economy would be in, but it would clearly be in much worse shape than it is in now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt this measure.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I did not want to embarrass them by saying we told you so, but since he asked for it, I

yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, to tell them what our plan was.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, just 18 short months ago, OMB and Treasury both told us that there would be no need to raise the debt ceiling for at least 7 years, not until 2008. OMB told us that they foresaw surpluses coming that would total \$5.6 trillion over the next 10 years.

A year later, when OMB sent up its budget, the budget that we are now working upon, it contained a simple pie chart. Look at page S-415. According to OMB's own pie chart, 40 percent of the surplus was a massive miscalculation. It did not take sufficient account of the economy; it technically was deficient. Seventeen percent of the surplus was wiped out by spending increases, much of it for defense, and 43 percent, 43 percent of the projected \$5.6 billion surplus, according to OMB's calculation, had been wiped out by the tax cuts, or would be wiped out by the tax cuts enacted last June.

Mr. Speaker, this is the chart, this is the line on this chart right here, this blue line at the bottom, that we would have followed had we followed the budget resolution that we proposed, had we not taken the proposal that the Republicans made and that the President made. This, instead, is the chart that, the line that we are on, the red chart, that is additional debt. That is the bottom line.

This is a bar chart that shows us where we might have been with the publicly-held debt. We could have retired all of the publicly-held debt if we had husbanded our resources and earnestly tried to do it. We had that opportunity. We would have actually paid off most of the publicly-held debt; and, instead, we are going to accumulate \$2.8 trillion in additional debt because of the budget that we adopted 2 years ago and still now are implementing.

That is why we find ourselves tonight in June, 2002, not June, 2008, but June, 2002, raising the debt ceiling by \$450 billion. Many of us Democrats will not support this bill before us because last year in 2001 we proposed a budget.

Speaking of compartmentalizing, we had a budget. We proposed a framework for the budget, and we proposed to set aside in our resolution one-third of the surplus to be used for debt retirement until we had finally reached some agreement for making Social Security/Medicare solvent far into the future. We wanted to commit that extra third of the surplus for that purpose, and our Republican colleagues roundly rejected the idea. They passed a massive tax cut that left no room for error, and that is why we are here tonight slipping through in the space of 1 hour a \$450 billion increase in the debt.

We believe that the Government has to meet its obligation, but we do not

want to make the Treasury play games with our trust funds. Many of us on this side will vote for a debt increase of \$150 billion. This allows us to meet our obligations to our creditors and at the same time meet our obligations to our children, passing a budget that gets us back in balance.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, there is nobody in the House of Representatives with more integrity when it comes to numbers on the budget than the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), and I commend him for what he just said. Except there are a couple of things that he may have forgotten to mention and a couple of rest of the stories.

First of all, it is true that the Democrats last year introduced a budget plan. Of course, they did not have a majority. They could not even get a majority of their own caucus to support the plan, but, yes, some of them did have a plan. If that plan would have been adopted, not only would we be into Social Security this year but we would also be standing here on the floor today knocking up against the debt ceiling.

So you can say you had a plan and you can say that maybe your surplus projections may have been a little bit better, but do not tell us that you were not into Social Security and do not tell us that you were not knocking up against the debt ceiling.

That is last year. Now let us talk about this year. There is no minority plan. There were a couple of members of the Blue Dog Caucus that came forward with our budget with a trigger. So they took our plan, and there is a plan called the House Budget, which we passed in the House and which we have now deemed and which the President has accepted and which we are operating under and which we passed two appropriation bills today and which we will also pass a prescription drug bill later, that is operating in the House of Representatives and is operating for this Federal Government.

We have a plan. There is a challenge with regard to the plan, and I wish you would direct your attention to the other body which has nothing, no budget, no plan, no ideas on what to do. Yes, they rushed through a debt ceiling increase and put it over here and we will deal with it today, but when we talk about plans, you do have to at least smile a little bit, and I do see a few of you smiling, that you do not have a plan, and that is when we are talking about plans, the plan that is not there.

But there are a few Members with integrity who are coming to the floor today and putting forward ideas, their ideas for increased spending. There is going to be a prescription drug benefit

that is going to come forward from the Democrats a little bit later. It will be, and I think my colleague from the Committee on Ways and Means said earlier it was going to be somewhere in the \$600 billion range. Folks, we are getting it scored; and my guess is it could be over a trillion dollars of new mandatory spending.

Oh, but do not worry about that. Let us compartmentalize that. Because we are going to deal with the Republicans and the debt ceiling today, even though we do not have a plan.

And then other thing that many Members with integrity come forward with, they say, you know what, that tax cut that we passed last year was too much, it was way too much, and so let us not do anything about that either except maybe roll it back. That is called a tax increase.

So the plan is foggy, but we are starting to see what the minority side is starting to come up with. It is called higher taxes and more spending, higher taxes and more spending. Now tell me how that plan does not knock up against the debt ceiling?

So I understand you can come to the floor today, and part of not governing means that you do not have to make a choice and you do not have to make a plan and that is fine. You get to have that luxury. But let us just recall history. For 40 years, this trillions of dollars that have been added to the debt were added to the debt by a Democratic-controlled Congress.

□ 1915

It was only over the last 5 years that that debt has started to be reduced. By almost half a trillion dollars that debt was reduced. I think that is a pretty good track record.

One other thing I would just mention, for those who predicted back in February that all this would happen. They have forgotten September 11. September 11 is why we are here. That is why we have to do this today.

Let us vote to increase the debt limit and be responsible about the plan to get us back into fiscal responsibility.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have made in order an amendment to this bill in the form of H.R. 4758, which is a plan to raise the debt and at the same time commit this Congress to balancing the budget again by the year 2007.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker's announced guidelines, the Chair will not recognize request to offer an amendment that would not be not germane to the bill.

Mr. SPRATT. I can ask unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not recognize for such unanimous consent requests.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. STENHOLM. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that by unanimous consent this body may do almost anything if we all agree, all 435.

The debate has been that we have no plan. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) offers a plan by unanimous consent. This seems to be or would be in order, unless there is objection from the other side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are certain unanimous consent requests that require clearance from both sides of the aisle. Among those are a request for consideration of non-germane amendments to bills, which this would be.

Mr. STENHOLM. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. STENHOLM. Again, from the rules that the Chair is reading, this is what I thought I was interpreting, that by unanimous consent we may adjust a rule, if there is no objection from the other side. I hear no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. These are the Speaker's announced and published guidelines for recognition of unanimous consent requests. The Chair will not recognize those unanimous consent requests that have not been cleared by both sides.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I now inquire of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget if he would, by unanimous consent, agree, so that we might clear up the problems that the Speaker is having with this, what I consider to be, very fair request.

I have heard objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I was smiling, as the gentleman recorded, because I had not seen the chairman of the Committee on the Budget since we lost the \$4 trillion. Welcome back.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, we are debating tonight this bill because our fiscal house is in total disarray. After 8 years of shrinking deficits, and finally reaching one true surplus in fiscal year 2000, we have seen over the last months a deteriorating fiscal condition that has allowed us to be bumping up against the \$5.95 trillion statutory debt ceiling, when we were told by Secretary O'Neill just a year ago we would not reach it until 2008.

The truth of the matter is that we need to return to fiscal responsibility. We need to stop raiding the Social Security trust fund. If any corporate executive in America raided the employees' retirement trust funds, they would be thrown into jail. Yet we are doing it tonight.

The truth is, the Democrats have laid out a plan. That plan has been intro-

duced in the form of legislation. That plan says we will agree to a \$150 billion increase in the debt ceiling immediately and no further increase until we have a plan to return us to a balanced budget by 2007, until we establish spending caps to control our spending, and until we strengthen and extend the pay-go rules.

That is the Democratic plan. That is what this House should be approving tonight.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RANGEL. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. RANGEL. If the majority has no further speakers, is it possible they could give us their time, because we have a lot of speakers?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas may yield his time if he wishes.

Mr. ARMEY. With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I was advised by my daddy not to waste time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear what he said. If they do not have any speakers, we have a lot of speakers.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New York, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. For every \$100 the Federal Government is spending, we are now bringing in about \$90 worth of revenue. The way we are making up the other \$10 is to borrow it. Some of it comes from the Social Security trust fund, and the rest of it comes from the private capital markets. We have reached our limit, or we are about to reach our limit as to what we can borrow.

Logic tells us that what we ought to do is sit down and figure out how we got here. I think it is true that the terrorist attack had something to do with that, indisputably. I think it is true that the recession had a lot to do with it, indisputably. But the other side has to admit that the \$2 trillion tax cut that they recklessly put through this House last year also has got something to do with it.

The two parties ought to come together, discuss the alternatives, extend the debt ceiling tonight by an amount necessary to cover us during that period of time, and put our house back in order. That is a reasonable, sensible approach, which is why the other side will not let it get to the floor.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

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

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding time to me.

There is no question that circumstances have changed from where we were a year ago. We acknowledge that we have this war on terrorism. We have homeland security concerns, so the situation has changed.

We ought to change the way we are figuring out what we are doing about the budget. If we have to go borrow more money from a bank to buy a car or a house, we have to tell the bank a story about how we are going to pay them back. That is just common sense. But we do not have that story here. We are not telling people that story. We are telling the American people we want to borrow more money that is going to be on their backs and the next generation and the next generation, with no story about how we are going to pay it back.

So let us all agree that the situation has changed. Let us all agree that we have a tough job ahead of us. Let us roll up our sleeves and work together and come up with some kind of plan on a going-forward basis to put us back in a position of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it was only a few months ago that Republicans were telling us we would not need to touch this debt ceiling until 2008, and fringed concern that we would probably pay down so much debt that we would hurt the economy.

Well, we know that in the meantime much has happened, but one of these developments is the impact of one tax break after another for their wealthy Republican friends and another is that corporate tax abuse has been totally ignored to the extent that some corporations in this country actually have the arrogance, at a time of national security need, to renounce their citizenship, move their mailbox to Bermuda or some other foreign island, and evade their United States taxes at the same time our deficits continue to mount.

It is not just a spending issue, though there have been plenty of spending bills in this House that I have voted against. A loss of tax revenues also contributes to the deficit and a total disinterest and disregard for this aspect of the problem by the Republican leadership.

I do not believe there is a carpet big enough to sweep underneath all the mess that Republicans have made of our budget. After a few years of paying down the deficit, when Americans enjoyed the benefits of lower interest rates to purchase homes and cars, we now face a return to years of one deficit after another. How incredible that at the offer of a unanimous consent resolution to at least say, can we not agree in a bipartisan fashion that by the year 2007 we will be off this deficit financing and we will have a balanced budget, their answer is no; to object, to

refuse to consider a commitment to having a balanced budget by at least the year 2007.

We do have a default issue tonight, not about the debt. Rather it is a default in leadership; it is a default in responsibility. We have heard so much talk lately about intelligence failures, but one of the most obvious is the inability to grasp that when the elite do not pay their fair share, like these corporations that are heading offshore, the rest of us have to pick up the tab.

Then Republicans come, as they are tonight, and ask to use our Social Security cards as their credit card for more spending and more tax breaks.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for yielding time to me, and also for his great friendship and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the other side come to this floor this evening and talk about this debt as if we did not have good sense over here.

Now, if we are doing so good, Mr. Speaker, how come we are broke? I just do not quite understand that. It is like we did not have enough sense to tell the difference between turnip greens and butter beans.

If we are doing so good, if this plan that the gentleman from Iowa kept referring to a while ago is working so well, how come we are broke? How come we need to borrow another \$450 billion, not from ourselves, but from our children and grandchildren, for crying out loud?

Who in their right mind would want to do something like that? Why would we want to come to this floor and borrow another \$450 billion from our children and grandchildren and have no idea how we are going to pay it back?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, for a refreshing change in pace, I am more than pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. Speaker, when I was elected in 1987, I had one big desire: to get our country's financial house in order and to balance the Federal budget. That was my desire. I did not feel I really had an opportunity to really have an impact on that until John Kasich came and started offering amendments to cut spending in 1989, and more and more of us started to join with him.

Then in 1994 a major change happened: Republicans had an opportunity to lead this House and to try to get our country's financial house in order. We did that by 1997, and in 1998 we ended deficit spending. In 1999 we ended using Social Security reserves. That happened. That is a fact. It was a bipartisan effort.

There are times I voted to increase the national debt, and there are times I voted not to. But when I hear a col-

league who has pushed the farm bill so hard talk to us about not increasing the deficit, I think, did that not contribute to increasing the national debt? Is that not a part of spending? When I see some of my colleagues who voted for the defense budget, did that not help increase the national debt?

Now, I also voted for the tax cut. So did a number of Democrats. When the Senate had a chance to repeal the tax cut, only three of them wanted to repeal it. Now, I was uncomfortable when we had a debate to increase the national debt, and it was kind of put into something else. I heard my colleagues say, let us have it clean. So I asked my leadership, and others did, as well, let us have it clean.

There were some who said the \$750 billion increase, as the President proposed, is simply so high because it might push us beyond even the election of the President. So when there was an effort by Senator DASCHLE and Republicans jointly to come in with \$450 billion and to have it clean, I pleaded with my House leadership to just take it right off this desk and send it to the President. That is what we have an opportunity of doing.

I really think, and I know why my colleagues on this side of the aisle are tempted to do it, there are things they do not like, and this is a way for them to illustrate their contempt, their anger, all the things that are pent up.

□ 1930

I just cannot imagine you would do it on this issue, not on this issue. I cannot imagine that we would tomorrow risk the fact that this may not pass. And, you know what? It may not pass. Maybe you will succeed in getting some Republicans, a few, to vote against it, and maybe my Democratic colleagues will convince the rest of their conference to make a political game of this. In the end, we are simply pushing another debate on this until February, 2003, the next Congress. Maybe the Democrats will be in charge. Maybe the Republicans. But we will have to wrestle with this issue.

But for me there is no question. I voted for the tax cut. I did not vote for the farm bill. I thought the farm bill was an outrage. I think it kind of sent a message that is unfortunate. I voted for the defense bill. I voted for the 9-11 costs. So in the end when you see the votes go up and if my Democratic colleagues are successful in convincing most of their colleagues to vote against this and this goes down, I think tomorrow people will know where the problem is.

This is Senator DASCHLE's bill. It is a Democratic bill in the Senate that we have an opportunity to take off this desk and pass it, and any alteration to this sends it right back to the Senate.

I sincerely hope my colleagues remember, if they voted for the farm bill, that they have some obligations. If they voted for the defense bill, they have some obligations. And the tax

cuts which my colleagues are concerned about really have not taken effect. They have come in years in the future. But the one thing that did take effect was the \$300 or the \$500 or the \$600 payment. The Democratic proposal. Thank God. Because as we went into this recession more spending and tax cuts have made this recession less. So I salute my colleagues for making this recession less by spending more and making the debt ceiling increase necessary.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for yielding me time.

I personally do not care whether it is a Democrat or Republican bill. What we have got in this country is a \$6 trillion debt. We are paying a billion dollars a day interest, and all we have asked for is a plan of some kind to get us out of this hole before we pass another \$450 billion authority to borrow money. If anybody thinks that is unreasonable, I would like to debate that point. There is not a business or a family listening tonight anywhere in this country that would run their own business like we are running the Nation's business, borrowing another \$450 billion with absolutely no plan.

The plan we are operating under does not balance for the next decade without using Social Security trust funds. Now, if anybody can convince the American people that that is a reasonable approach to this Nation's financial problems, I would like to talk to them because it is absolutely, I tell you what you can do. You can bamboozle people a little while, but the American public is not stupid by any stretch of the imagination, and they know that year after year of red ink is sooner or later going to catch up with us and with our children.

I will tell you something else. The most insidious tax raise, tax hike in the world is borrowing money because you pay interest year after year after year, today a billion dollars a day in interest because our predecessors and us did not have the fortitude to either cut the programs we do not like and do not need or to raise the revenue for the ones that we do. That is where we are. This is shifting responsibility, and it is a generational mugging.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have got right here in front of me, it took me 5 months to compile this, I have got the votes of every one of the Democratic leadership, every single time, from the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI),

the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), right on down the list, every single time that you voted to take 100 percent of the money out of the Social Security trust fund.

For 40 years your budgets used money out of the Social Security trust fund. When I came here, we had \$5 trillion of debt. The gentleman just said, and he is right, not quite a billion dollars a day but almost a billion dollars a day we pay on the interest when we came here.

Now, if you pay down \$500 billion it does not take a mathematician to figure if you are paying a billion dollars a day and there is 365 days in a year, you will end up with a lot more billions of dollars. And it keeps going up, and it keeps going up because you cannot pay it down.

I heard the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) every single day when I was on the floor in the minority come in and talk, oh, the lady in the red dress. I am sorry. We need a middle-class tax cut. But in 1993, when you had the House, the White House and the Senate, you could not help yourselves. You increased the tax on the middle class. You increased the tax on Social Security. You took every dime out of the Social Security trust fund. You cut veterans COLAs. You cut military COLAs. You called it a deficit reduction plan.

But yet when Republicans came we eliminated that Social Security tax. We gave a middle-class tax cut. And our policies, not one single Democrat bill or budget, not one Democrat budget from the President ever passed. As a matter of fact, Republicans brought up your budgets to show how bad they were.

And for you to get up here and day after day talk about tax breaks for the rich, I talked to some of my colleagues. I said, what are you talking about? You know that is not true. And they said, it is gamesmanship. You lowered the bar too low in this House.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), a member of Committee on Ways and Means.

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

There is a lot of partisan finger pointing, name calling, creative history interpretation. That is not going to get us anywhere. We have a problem on our hands. If we were a family running in the red we would sit at the kitchen table and figure this out. And the answer is not going to be, I got it, let us go to the bank and get the biggest line of credit we possibly can and let everything go the same.

That is what the majority is proposing tonight. They are proposing simply to increase the line of credit and keep on borrowing. Let the wagons roll.

We have to do different than that. We have asked, as we consider this motion, for an alternative to be considered one

that would allow the debt to increase through the period of August, avoid any default on obligations of the government before then but require a plan, a plan to come before us to get us to a balanced budget in 7 years.

Let us not talk about partisan antics in the past, Republican or Democrat. Let us together agree. We need a plan. We need it now. And that is what we asked for with the substitute.

I could not be more dismayed that there was an objection and it will not even be allowed to be considered. Because this plan, this strategy of going up with the kind of debt increase they are looking at is the height of irresponsibility. In the next decade, 78 million Americans will turn 65; and the tap each will bring on Social Security and Medicare will strain the Nation's resources in a way it was never strained before.

What we need to do this decade is pay down the debt, not add to the debt. We are leaving for our children a crushing financial burden, if we, now that it is our time in control, and the baby boomers are in the workforce in full force, do not pay our way but merely run up the debt. So we ask the majority for a plan, a plan to be resolved in August of this year before the election, not swept under the rug, not kicked into next year, but now. How are we going to pay our own way?

We were not paying our own way now. That is why you have sought the debt increase. This is ultimately taking money coming in from Social Security and spending it on other government programs. Our children will pick up the tab. It is wrong. Vote this down.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the distinguished majority leader for yielding me time.

I rise today as a conservative Member of this institution, Mr. Speaker. I did not come here to increase the government's debt. I came here believing, as so many people I represent believe, that if you owe debts, pay debts.

I spoke to an elderly woman on a radio program in Richmond, Indiana, today in the heart of the heartland district that I represent. Mr. Speaker, she said with fear in her voice that she was worried that a conservative like me would not support raising the debt ceiling and would put at risk her Social Security check. She assumed that my loathing of red ink would cause me to vote in such a way or fail to act in such a way that it would jeopardize her benefits and the benefits of people that she loves.

Well, I assured her then and I rise today to assure all of those that are listening, Mr. Speaker, that I will not do that. I truly believe if you owe debts, pay debts. I am a member of a majority in this institution that has repaid the national debt nearly a half of a trillion dollars. We have balanced

the budget last year, adopted a plan to actually redeem all of the public debt over the next decade. We were on track, Mr. Speaker, to meet that goal, even after the President's tax cut was adopted.

And then, though it is convenient tonight to forget it on the other side of the aisle, that a recession struck America; and then, of course, as we all experienced here, the devastation in New York City and at the Pentagon. 9-11 struck and hundreds of billions of dollars that the CBO and the OMB and every independent organization in America predicted would be there was no longer there.

The result is that our government now needs to keep its promise to the American people, to all of various entitlement programs, but maybe most especially the program that that elderly woman asked about this morning.

We must raise the statutory debt limit. The truth is they have no budget. They have no credibility on debt reduction. They have no plan to guarantee the full faith and credit. They have no plan for that little old lady in Richmond, Indiana.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I speak in opposition to the bill on the floor at the present time. Kansas families live by three simple rules. Number one, do not spend more money than you make. Number two, pay off your debts. Number three, invest in basics in the future.

The basics for our country are national defense, Social Security and Medicare, a highway system, things we all would agree on. The basics for a family are food, shelter and education, health care, things, again, we all would agree on. And yet in this Congress, in this Congress, after we got our budget back in balance, we started down the wrong road again.

Now I do not blame anybody in this Congress for a recession. I do not blame anybody in this Congress for what happened on 9-11 and certainly not the President. And I voted for tax cut, so I do not blame anybody for that as causing the problem we are in. But I think we need to move back to fiscal responsibility.

Initially, Secretary O'Neill asked for a \$750 billion increase in the debt limit. I think that is an outrageous blank check to give to this Congress. Now they are asking for \$450 billion dollars. I think the appropriate amount is \$150 billion and move to a plan to get us back to balance. Just to work together, Republicans and Democrats, to get us back to balance.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

I did not plan to speak on this at all. I was up in my office and could not help but, watching some of the proceedings, I could not help understanding that there is something amiss here to have people, individuals on the Democrat side of the aisle who have voted for nearly every spending program that has been put up, who vote for the airline bail out, who vote for the farm bill, who vote for the education bill, spending bill after spending bill, none of which I voted for and yet I am over here saying to vote for this bill.

Now, how can somebody spend like a drunken sailor and then all of a sudden find religion when it comes to raising the debt limit? This is just like eating a big meal and walking out on the bill. There are only a few people in this House who could in good conscience vote against this bill, and they have spoken. And to see this display of people standing up and saying, we cannot raise the debt limit, that is not responsible, after voting to spend and spend and spend, it is just more than I could take. So I had to come here and talk about it.

□ 1945

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

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

We have heard the debate tonight. There is one question that lingers. Where are the fiscally responsible members of the Republican House of Representatives? So many of my colleagues campaigned, as many Democrats did, on the virtues of the balanced budget and paying down the debt.

The plan that has been outlined here tonight that has been offered as an amendment in the Committee on the Budget by me and others addresses all the concerns that have been expressed. It gives discretion for us to spend some money on security. It allows time to get back to a balanced budget and paying down the debt.

On September 11, thank God we had economic security. We had a balanced budget. We were on our way to paying down the debt. It kept us strong. It keeps us strong. We could not ignore that. We need to get back to it.

The arguments my colleagues make about tax cuts would be better arguments if we did not have the debt in the trillions of dollars, over \$4 trillion. The interest payment 2 years ago on that debt exceeded more than we spent on Medicare every year. Now a number of us are worried about the health of the economy.

If we continue down this path without adopting the plan that has been ad-

vocated tonight, we will start to drive interest rates up again and we will really be in trouble. I urge rejection of this bill. Let us adopt the plan.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I have one speaker left. I reserve my time.

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

At the appropriate time the minority would hope that common sense and fairness would allow us to send this bill to the Committee on Ways and Means and have it reported out the right way with the right amount of increase in the debt.

Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to yield the remaining time that is left to our distinguished leader from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) in order to close this argument on behalf of the minority.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge Members to vote for the motion to commit, which will be presented in a few moments, and if that motion to commit is not passed, I urge Members to vote against the bill.

The power to budget and to pass economic plans carries with it the responsibility to, if it is necessary, raise debt ceilings to accommodate the budget, the economic plan that we are operating under. The economic plan we are operating under is one propounded by the President and the Republican majority in the House. That is their prerogative and that is their right. There was not real collaboration on that plan. There was no need for that collaboration. That also is their right.

If that is the plan that is in place and that plan now leads to deficits and spending Social Security dollars against everything that we said together that we did not want to do because we passed the lockbox at least five times, then it seems to me it is incumbent upon the people who propose that plan to vote to increase the debt ceiling to accommodate the results that that plan has caused.

I have said many times that I would vote tonight or anytime to raise the debt ceiling by \$150 billion. I use that amount because I think it is sufficient to buy us a couple of more months' time to try to work out a bipartisan budget that will begin to move us back in the right direction, because I think that is what we ought to do.

I have said to the President that we should have a negotiation, we should have a summit, we should have a meeting, a bipartisan meeting, to try to work out a new budget for our country. I know we cannot get everything we want, and I know that the other side cannot get everything they want; but we had a tragedy in this country on 9-11 that no one anticipated. My colleagues can bet that every family who lost somebody on 9-11 has had a budget conference around their dining room table to come up with a new budget, given the fact that many of them lost their breadwinner or winners on 9-11.

Just as those families suffered tragically on 9-11, the American families suffered a tragedy on 9-11; and as many of us argued when the budget was on the floor, we should take care of those contingencies if they happen. Well, if 9-11 is not a contingency that happened, I do not know what is. We are faced with a hole in security responsibilities. We are faced with fighting a war in many countries abroad. If that is not a new contingency, I do not know what is.

As an American family, Democrats, Republican, Independents, whatever, we are all Americans tonight; and we ought to be sitting around a table in these next 2 months working out a new budget for America that does not lead us back into all these deficits and spending Social Security dollars that all of us together said we did not want to do.

So in the name of common sense, I ask that we come together tonight. We could get 435 votes to pass \$150 billion increase in the debt ceiling and move this country back into a budget that will be good for all Americans at war, fighting for our country, fighting against terrorism, and fighting for American values.

I urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to vote for the motion to commit and let us get back to an American budget that is good for all the American people.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

I have here a letter from the Concord Coalition, a nonpartisan group of distinguished American citizens who concern themselves daily with such matters as balanced budgets; and according to the Concord Coalition, it says that "it is clear that the debt limit must be increased. The Senate has acted and now it is up to the House. Republicans and Democrats alike should put the Nation's creditworthiness ahead of political considerations."

The Concord Coalition goes on to say that "the House must be prepared to act on a stand alone debt limit increase in time to avoid a crisis." It also calls upon us to be nonpartisan or bipartisan.

Mr. Speaker, what in the world could possibly be more bipartisan than to have the Republican majority leader of the House of Representatives schedule for debate and a vote a Senate-passed bill that is authored by the Senate Democrat majority leader? The head of the Democrat Party, the highest-ranking Democrat in America wrote this bill. What could possibly be more bipartisan than the tribute we Republicans are standing here paying to the distinguished leadership of the gentleman from South Dakota, the head of the Democrat Party?

Mr. Speaker, irony of ironies, the gentleman from South Dakota's own party's leadership in this House stands here in militant opposition to the head of their own party's plan to raise the debt ceiling. What are we to make of this partisanship? A party turning

upon itself in defiance of the Concord Coalition. What are we to do?

Mr. Speaker, we have before us Senate bill 2578 authored, as I have said, by the highest-ranking elected Democrat in America today, the Senate majority leader, Senator DASCHLE from South Dakota, a bill which when brought to the floor in the other body was passed with a vote of 37 loyal Senate Democrats and 31 thoughtful Senate Republicans. What a bipartisan effort that was. Was it not applauded by even The Washington Post for the spirit of bipartisanship?

Every author of bipartisanship in America stood in reverence at the action in the other body, for the collegiality around the Senate Democrat leader's plan, and yet we bring it to this floor and it is mocked, mocked by members of his own party. Oh, be still my heart. What am I to do with this? What can we say?

Are there 37 brave Democrat souls in this body, loyal to their own party's leadership, afflicted with affection for the gentleman from South Dakota who will stand up and say to the Concord Coalition count me in, I am with my leader, I will vote for Senator DASCHLE's plan? Are there 37 brave souls in this body? Oh, I pray, Mr. Speaker, I pray that they will present themselves.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, how disappointing it is to see the rejection of that leadership by a bill offered as a motion to commit, in the form of a bill offered by a small band of Members of the Senator's own party who do not even claim to be in the mainstream of their party. These Blue Dogs are treacherous. They are treacherous, Mr. Speaker.

I prevail upon my friends from the other side of the aisle. Look at the example that came before you from the other side of the building. Check the record of how your own, very own Democrat Senator voted. Please vote with him. Save yourselves the embarrassment of having to go home and answer this question at your local party gathering. Do not put yourself in a position where some wonderful lady who has labored in your party for years looks at you with horrified disappointment in her eyes and says why did you vote with that small band of renegades in our party and against the plan offered by our distinguished party leader, the majority leader of the United States Senate, the distinguished Senator DASCHLE?

I cannot believe it. There are times when every party must call upon their own rank and file, men and women of the cloth on the Democrat side of the aisle. Stand by your man. This is your opportunity. Do what is good for America; and oh, yes, those of you in the press, please report my gallant effort to stand here in this well today and defend, yea, defend the good-faith offering of the highest-elected Democrat in America from this unconscionable assault perpetrated against him by, yes,

members of his own party. It saddens me to no end.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair would remind Members that it is not in order to cast reflections on Senators.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to S. 2578, legislation to raise the debt ceiling by \$450 billion without engaging in a real debate on how to get our nation's fiscal house back in order.

Mr. Speaker, before the House signs off on permanently raising the debt ceiling to \$6.4 trillion, I think it would be helpful to take a step back and look at how we got here. It was not September 11th or the war on terrorism or even last year's recession that caused this predicament. Months before the impact of September 11th was realized in the budget, U.S. Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill asked Congress to raise the debt limit by \$750 million in response to deepening deficits that resulted primarily from the President's tax cut. By the Administration's own estimates, last year's tax cut—the one that I cautioned "left no room for error"—is responsible for 43 percent of the total deterioration in our fiscal picture.

So, here we are today, being told by the majority that if we vote against S. 2578, we are being irresponsible. Well, isn't that the pot calling the kettle black? Under their watch, our budget experienced the most dramatic reversal in history, losing \$4 trillion in projected surpluses in one year. To my mind, permanently raising the debt ceiling in the absence of a plan to get us back to surpluses is the epitome of fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. Speaker, last year, the majority's budget asserted that there would be no need to increase the debt limit until 2009. But here we are, poised to consider legislation raising the debt ceiling to \$6.4 trillion without being given a chance to offer a plan. Mr. Speaker, it is disgraceful that the majority has decided to block debate on a credible plan to address the short-term crisis and undo our present fiscal mess. My Democratic colleagues, Representatives SPRATT and MOORE, sought to offer a measure that would immediately increase debt limit by \$150 billion with the requirement that the President submit a revised budget that is in balance by 2007 without borrowing from Social Security. Regrettably, Mr. Speaker, this reasonable alternative never saw the light of day.

Mr. Speaker, I am simply unwilling to write the federal government a virtual blank check that may or may not keep us in the black until the midterm elections in November. Mr. Speaker, every day, Americans pay \$1 billion in interest on our national debt. That's about 16 cents of every dollar they pay in taxes—just to make the interest payment, not even to pay down the debt itself. Moreover, the indirect costs of raising the debt limit and the return to deficits prevent long-term interest rates high for Americans struggling to make mortgage, car, or credit card payments, even as the Federal Reserve has dramatically reduced short term rates.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this measure and forcing the Republican Leadership to work with the minority to develop a real plan to deal with the deficits that now stretch as far as the eye can see. Until we have a realistic budget that

eliminates those deficits, increasing the statutory debt ceiling is pure folly.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Secretary made it clear weeks ago that Congress would have to increase the federal government's debt ceiling. Since that time, many of us have been requesting an open debate on a bill to increase the debt ceiling.

How can the Republican leadership explain the debt ceiling increase added to the debate of the military construction appropriations bill by way of a procedural hijacking? This legislative ambush blocks any amendments from being offered, including the Democrats' intent to limit the increase to \$150 billion as opposed to the Republican's increase of \$450 billion.

I am ready to assure the debt limit is sufficient to meet our obligations, however, I vote against this measure because this chamber and the American people deserve that we conduct business of this manner with a full debate and consideration of reasoned amendments that will clarify a blueprint for fiscal responsibility.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 462, the Senate bill is considered as having been read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO COMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MOORE

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MOORE. In its current form, yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MOORE moves that the bill S. 2578 be committed to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following.

SECTION 1. INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT.

Subsection (b) of section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking "\$5,950,000,000,000" and inserting "\$6,100,000,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to commit.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader is leaving this Congress at the end of this term, and he might have a career as a comedian, but this is a very, very serious matter.

Tonight, we are talking, Mr. Speaker, about raising the debt limit of this country. We are, at present, approximately \$5.9 trillion in debt. Certainly nobody in this body wants to see the United States of America default on its financial obligations. That will not happen. That is not an option.

But the majority leader has not provided all the information from the Con-

cord Coalition, because I want to quote from their letter. "An increase of roughly \$250 billion would be sufficient for now without providing a blank check." And yet they are asking, the majority leader is asking for \$450 billion. We are offering \$150 billion, and I think that is sufficient.

If we spend further, we are into Social Security and Medicare, and the people of America need to understand that, Mr. Speaker. That is wrong. We can come together and come up with a plan to meet the obligations of this country without invading Social Security and Medicare.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, we are not trying to stop an increase in the debt ceiling. Here is what we are trying to stop.

This year, in the most dramatic fiscal reversal we have seen in the time many of us have served in this House, our budget will be in deficit to the tune of \$320 billion. Next year, according to our best calculation, our budget will be in deficit by \$373 billion. Over the next 10 years, by \$2.785 trillion. That is what we seek to stop.

If my colleagues vote for the bill instead of the motion to commit, what they will be voting for is fiscal denial instead of fiscal discipline. They will be voting for a little absolution, a ticket past the next election, a ticket past the next budget resolution, but we will simply put off dealing with this problem, this serious problem, this dramatic reversal.

We wanted to present a plan that would have allowed the budget to be increased by \$150 billion and then another \$100 billion without any obstacle. But, after that, we could only increase it if we had in place a budget that would be back in balance by 2007. That is what we really seek.

In the absence of being able to offer that plan, what we offer instead is the closest thing to it, an increase in the debt ceiling of \$150 billion which will bring us back to this problem which we will have to address but will allow us to keep to our obligation to our creditors and, at the same time, allow us to keep our obligation to our children and not leave them burdened with overwhelming debt.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 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 want to begin by congratulating my Republican colleagues for tonight voting to borrow the money to pay for their policies. I am disappointed, though, that they did not come to the floor with the same enthusiasm defending the vote to borrow the money that they did when they passed the policies that put us into debt. With the exception of the

majority leader; his enthusiasm for borrowing \$450 billion is unprecedented.

The need to increase the debt limit is not the result of September 11. In fact, the Secretary of the Treasury came to us last August predicting that we were going to have to borrow money when we were looking at the economic game plan that we were under. We agree on this side unanimously, well, almost unanimously, that we need to increase the debt limit by \$150 billion tonight, and we will get over 400 votes to do it. What we object to is providing a blank check to borrow \$450 billion to stay on the same economic game plan.

Now, my friend from Arizona made the comments about the spending. I would point out that every single spending vote this year that has occurred has come under the Republican-passed budget that we supported in the Blue Dogs but that my colleagues would never allow us to have the trigger on. So do not blame us for the spending when it is the Republican budget that we are spending to. In fact, we agree that we should not increase spending more than the President has asked us to spend.

That is not the issue tonight. The issue tonight is whether or not we are going to have a new economic game plan or whether we should borrow \$450 billion with a blank check to continue spending.

Now, I am perfectly willing to roll up my sleeves in a bipartisan way and work with the majority if they would just let us. But we will have a pharmaceutical bill on the floor later tonight in which we will be denied an opportunity to vote on. My Republican colleagues denied us an opportunity to have the Hill bill, the Moore bill on the floor today, and yet the chairman said a moment ago, where is the debate?

I have been begging my colleagues to debate me on whether we should borrow \$450 billion or \$150 billion. When we vote for the bill, we are borrowing \$450. We could do it at \$150 and be fiscally responsible. That is the issue. Vote for the motion to commit.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to commit.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but recall the minority leader's comments when he said there was no collaboration, that there was no discussion, that there was no working together.

I seem to remember a lot of working together, a lot of collaboration that got us to this point. I seem to remember a number of late-night meetings in September, when, in a bipartisan way, we decided to reach into that surplus, and there was not much left, but to reach into that surplus and take money and deal with the emergency. I seem to remember a bill that we voted on nearly unanimously to pay for a war against terrorism. Bipartisan. We reached in another time and did the same thing. I seem to remember a bill that came to the floor in a bipartisan way that said, you know what, that

pre-attack recession has gotten worse and we need an economic stimulus.

So let us reach in there again and let us make sure that we deal with the economy the way we did with the war and the way we did with the emergency.

Now, all of a sudden, the minority leader rushes to the floor and says, gosh, there was no collaboration, no one talked to us, no one consulted us. Now we need a plan all of a sudden. We have had a plan: It is called deal with the circumstances that were dealt last September. That was our plan. And we did it together. We did it together.

So tonight we have to do together what the other body did with the Senate Daschle bill, and that is to increase the debt limit to deal with the cards that we were dealt.

Now, if my colleagues want a plan, present one, but do not come down here and blame the tax cuts without having the courage or the guts to give us a plan to raise those taxes back up again.

And, no, I will not yield, because I am tired of my colleagues coming down here and demagogueing tax cuts and not having one ounce of guts to tell us their plan to increase those taxes back up. No, I will not yield, and I will not yield to Members who come in here and say, oh, gosh, but you are doing all the spending, when tonight my colleagues' bill on prescription drugs will be three times the bill that we offer on prescription drugs.

The applause is there, but where is the guts to vote for the increase in the debt ceiling to pay for it? That is called tax and spend, and we have seen it before. We are not going to allow it again.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, when we come down to the final analysis, we have before us a bill authored by Senator DASCHLE, the highest-ranking elected Democrat in America; and in the judgment of the Senator, \$450 billion was the right compromise between what was asked by the Secretary of the Treasury and what others might have proposed to him.

Thirty-seven Democrat colleagues agreed with the Senator as they passed this bill to the House.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the references to the other body, when the Chair has previously advised the other side that it is improper to refer to action in the other body in support of the motion and which they are supposed to argue otherwise independently against.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all Members not to characterize the position of a Senator on a legislation issue.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if we were to amend this substitute, something else for what the other body has sent us, it would go back to the other body and then we would be up in the air

again. There is so much that would be left to uncertainty: the difficult financial gymnastics of the Secretary of the Treasury, already beleaguered by our delay.

It turns out that the \$450 billion increase in the debt limit is exactly the same increase that we passed in 1997 at the request of the then Democrat administration, President Clinton; and, having done so, we found ourselves free to not revisit this issue for 5 years. Five years.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the gentleman characterizing the ex-President of the United States of America, President Clinton, who actually brought about the surplus that we used to enjoy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's objection is not well taken.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, as I said, in 1997, we passed a debt limit increase of \$450 billion at the request of the President that was in office at that time. It lasted for 5 years that we did not have to revisit this issue. That was a good thing. Because for several years prior to this majority taking over the House, we did not revisit it in the House because we had something called the Gephardt rule. That rule said the House never had to deal with these issues; they would just be done automatically. That was comfortable, but it did not in fact give us this wonderful opportunity to rejoice in this.

Well, what was my point? In 1997, we passed a debt limit increase of \$450 billion, exactly the request that has been sent to this body by the other body, authored by the majority leader in the other body, voted for by 37 Members of the other body, and that will take us perhaps for a while.

This substitute that my colleagues are being asked to vote for guarantees us the right to come back and deal with this issue in September or October. We will be guaranteed the right to do this again.

Now, I just do not believe we have got that many more entertaining speeches left in us.

I say vote against the substitute, the motion to commit, and vote for the Senate majority leader's bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to commit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to commit.

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

Mr. MOORE. 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 a minimum of 5 minutes the time for any electronic

vote on the question of passage of the Senate bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 207, nays 222, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

YEAS—207

Abercrombie	Hall (TX)	Murtha
Ackerman	Harman	Nadler
Allen	Hastings (FL)	Napolitano
Andrews	Hill	Neal
Baca	Hilliard	Oberstar
Baird	Hinchey	Obey
Baldacci	Hinojosa	Oliver
Baldwin	Hoeffel	Ortiz
Barcia	Holden	Owens
Barrett	Holt	Pallone
Becerra	Honda	Pascarell
Bentsen	Hooley	Pastor
Berkley	Hoyer	Payne
Berman	Inslee	Pelosi
Berry	Israel	Peterson (MN)
Bishop	Jackson (IL)	Phelps
Blagojevich	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy
Blumenauer	(TX)	Price (NC)
Bonior	Jefferson	Rahall
Borski	John	Rangel
Boswell	Johnson, E. B.	Reyes
Boucher	Jones (OH)	Rivers
Boyd	Kanjorski	Rodriguez
Brady (PA)	Kaptur	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Kennedy (RI)	Ross
Brown (OH)	Kildee	Rothman
Capps	Kilpatrick	Royal-Allard
Capuano	Kind (WI)	Rush
Cardin	Kleczka	Sabo
Carson (IN)	Kucinich	Sanchez
Carson (OK)	LaFalce	Sanders
Clay	Lampson	Sandlin
Clayton	Langevin	Sawyer
Clement	Lantos	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Scott
Costello	Lee	Serrano
Coyne	Levin	Sherman
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Shows
Crowley	Lipinski	Skelton
Cummings	Lofgren	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lowey	Smith (WA)
Davis (FL)	Lucas (KY)	Snyder
Davis (IL)	Luther	Solis
DeFazio	Lynch	Spratt
DeGette	Maloney (CT)	Stark
Delahunt	Maloney (NY)	Stenholm
DeLauro	Markey	Strickland
Deutsch	Mascara	Stupak
Dicks	Matheson	Tanner
Dingell	Matsui	Tauscher
Doggett	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (CA)
Dooley	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	McCollum	Thurman
Edwards	McDermott	Tierney
Eshoo	McGovern	Towns
Etheridge	McIntyre	Turner
Evans	McKinney	Udall (CO)
Farr	McNulty	Udall (NM)
Fattah	Meehan	Velazquez
Filner	Meek (FL)	Visclosky
Ford	Meeks (NY)	Waters
Frank	Menendez	Watson (CA)
Frost	Millender-McDonald	Watt (NC)
Gephardt	Miller, George	Waxman
Gonzalez	Mink	Weiner
Gordon	Mollohan	Wexler
Green (TX)	Moore	Woolsey
Gutierrez	Moran (VA)	Wynn
Hall (OH)		

NAYS—222

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

