

not about particular countries; its hate transcends borders. As cited by David Brooks in the New York Times today, quote, "You love life and we love death," unquote, the purported terrorist said in the videotape found in Madrid.

We are distinguished not by nationality but that we choose freedom and the rule of law and the terrorists choose rule by force. We resolve our disputes at the ballot box, they with bombs.

Furthermore, just because a country does not back the war in Iraq does not mean that it is safe from terror either. Of Spain itself, Osama bin Laden himself said long ago about Spain, modern Spain was al Qaeda's enemy because in 1492 the Spaniards removed all Muslims from their country. But also Osama bin Laden named Canada as one of al Qaeda's enemies, even though our northern neighbor has been especially vocal in opposing intervention in Iraq. Turkey refused to let us invade Iraq from its territory but it, too, suffered terrorist attacks anyway.

Mr. Speaker, these terrorists may use the excuse of Iraq to justify their massacre of innocents, but the fact of the matter is that their groups and these groups like al Qaeda are irrational and remorseless. They are barbarians and their only goal is the death of the West. For we, the freedom-loving people, appeasement, capitulation, and negotiation with terrorists are not options. How the civilized world responds to this challenge will determine the future of our society.

IRRESPONSIBILITY WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized during morning hour debates.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, one week ago today, the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), told the Members of this body and the national television audience watching C-SPAN, and I quote, "It is responsibility week here in the House." "It is responsibility week here in the House."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the majority leader was only half right. Last week indeed was responsibility week, but the real responsibility was being exercised not here in this House but on the other side of Capitol Hill.

While we named post office buildings, honored professional sports teams, and passed legislative solutions in search of national problems, the other Chamber adopted a bipartisan pay-as-you-go measure that repudiates the central fiction of the Republican Party's fuzzy math: that we can somehow reign in record budget deficits created by the Bush administration and the Republican-controlled Congress while ignoring the consequences of tax cuts.

Do not take it from me, my Republican friends.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must remind all Members not to characterize the actions of the Senate.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as responsible?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Either way.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, do not take it from me, my Republican friends, listen to a respected Member of your own party, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG.) In February Chairman YOUNG said, and I quote, "No one should expect a significant deficit reduction as a result of austere nondefense discretionary spending limits. The numbers simply do not add up." So said the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, one of the most respected Members of this body.

And why do not the numbers add up? Because nondefense discretionary spending represents only 17 percent of the entire Federal budget. The fact of the matter is we could wipe out all domestic discretionary spending, the funding for this House, the funding for the Senate, FBI, CIA, NIH, NASA, all of that. If you wipe it all out, we would still be running a deficit of more than \$100 billion.

Yet this week the Republican majority continues its markup of a budget resolution for fiscal year 2005 that utterly ignores mathematical and fiscal reality. By applying pay-go rules to spending only, the Republican budget resolution pretends that making existing tax cuts permanent or enacting new ones are a freebie with no budgetary impact. But, of course, that is false. And if one said it, it might even be a lie.

The truth is this Republican budget resolution cuts taxes while spending the entire \$1 trillion Social Security surplus between fiscal year 2005 and 2009. All of it. Every nickel of Social Security surplus, spent. And it would continue to do so in subsequent years.

The truth is the Republican budget resolution would make our deficits \$247 billion worse over the next 5 years under current law. And over 10 years it would increase the deficit, already projected by the Congressional Budget Office at \$2 trillion, by another \$1.6 trillion.

There are a lot of young people who are going to pay the price for our profligacy and irresponsibility. Indeed, this budget resolution proposal, as has the economic policies of this administration, been immoral to the extent that they adversely affect generations to come. And the truth is this budget resolution would freeze funding for domestic appropriations outside of Homeland Security to make room, not for defense, not for homeland security, but for new tax cuts.

For years House Republicans preened as, quote, deficit hawks. Some even suggested that tax cuts are not in fact

sacrosanct. For example, in 1997 the majority leader himself, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) who I quoted earlier, said of Jack Kemp, you all remember Jack Kemp, he served in this body, a member of the Committee on Appropriations, candidate for Vice President of the United States, he quoted and he said the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said this: "Jack Kemp worships at the altar of tax cuts. Jack has always said that deficits do not matter."

Now, this is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) the majority leader, the Republican leader of this House. He concluded by saying, quote, "We think that deficits do matter."

What a tragedy for our country and for our young people that the policies do not follow that conviction. My Republican friends, this week and next you are going to show the American people whether you are really serious about reducing the deficit you created or whether you are simply taking it and lack the courage to make the tough choices.

Now, when I say the deficit of your creation, let me remind all of our colleagues the first 4 years took us on a straight line out of deficit financing and the last 4 years, for the first time in 8 decades, in the lifetime of anybody older than 80, was in surplus for 4 years straight. So this administration inherited a budget surplus which they said, not what we Democrats said, which they said was \$5.6 trillion surplus over 10 years that they had to work with. It is now \$4 trillion of debt. That is what I refer to as immoral.

As Republican Senator JOHN MCCAIN said last week in supporting pay-go rules that apply to existing as well as future tax cuts, and I will quote again, Senator JOHN MCCAIN.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman will suspend. The Chair must remind Members not to quote Senators.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. While I cannot characterize the debate that occurs on the other side or characterize the position of the Senate itself, is the Parliamentarian or is the Speaker saying that the quoting of a Member who happens to be a Member of the United States Senate is contrary to the rules of this House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct. The gentleman may be identified as a sponsor of a measure but his remarks may not be quoted.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friends that a prominent American has said recently that our failure to start making some of the tough decisions will land squarely on the backs of our children and grandchildren.

□ 1245

Their financial future will be strapped with the digging out of holes that have been created by our actions

and inactions. I agree with that sentiment, and let me add that our failure to make the tough decisions also threatens the very future of Social Security and Medicare, two programs which now keep millions and millions and millions of Americans out of poverty.

Next week, Democrats will propose a budget plan that meets America's priorities and gets our financial house back in order. I urge all of my colleagues to support it because it is intellectually the right thing to do. From a fiscal policy, it is the right thing to do, and from a moral values, pro-family perspective, it is the right thing to do. It is time we delivered real responsibility this week to the American public.

SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHOCOLA). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for Congress and the President to be responsible. I object to the suggestion that somehow government can control the economy and decide whether it is a strong economy or there is good job growth. Government gets in the way every time.

Let me suggest this, Mr. Speaker. If the best possible economic advisors could simply be taken to governments around the world, and with their advice the economy would be strong, job growth would be strong, every country in the world would hire the best possible economists to have a strong economy. The fact is we have a cyclical situation, and for the last several years we have had a worldwide slump in the economy. Europe is even having a more dangerous downturn. In terms of doing some of the things that we should do, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is government getting out of the way and not imposing rules and regulations and taxes that put our businesses at a competitive disadvantage to other businesses throughout the world. We should not be taxing our business in the United States 20 percent more than what other countries, our competitors, are charging their business. It means that we should not have all of these overzealous regulations to impose extra costs on our business that other countries do not have.

The challenge for our kids and our grandkids is going to be huge. Overspending is part of that problem; but not dealing with the unfunded liabilities, not dealing with some of the huge challenges that are going to be faced by our kids and our grandkids is another area where Congress and the White House need to consider.

I would like to bring to mind Social Security. We have known for the last 14 years that Social Security was facing tough times. We passed a Social Se-

curity Reform Act from the Greenspan Commission in 1983. We dramatically increased the taxes and reduced benefits. I bring this chart to the floor, Mr. Speaker, because I want to call to everyone's attention the danger of not doing something in this House and in the Senate and in the White House to correct the Social Security problem.

Social Security is going broke. I just read an article, that it is no big deal because Social Security is not going to become insolvent technically until 2036, because that is how much money is in the trust funds; and if we pay that money back that government has borrowed, then there will not be any problem. But here is the problem and here is the situation, and we are looking for the actuary Social Security Commission report to come out next week.

We are looking at a situation where by 2017 there will be less money coming in from Social Security taxes than is needed to pay benefits. What do we do then? We have got these IOUs that government has taken some of this extra money and spent it for other government expenditures; but that means we have either got to borrow more money or reduce benefits or increase taxes. I just want to report to my colleagues what government has done in the past.

We started out with a Social Security tax of 1 percent on payroll. By 1940, we decided that was not quite enough money; we raised it to 2 percent on the first \$3,000. By 1960, we were short of money again. We decided to raise that tax again to 6 percent on the first \$4,800. By 1980, we raised it again to 10.16 percent on the first \$25,900. In the year 2000, 12.4 percent on the first \$76,000. Now it is 12.4 percent on \$89,000.

So the dangers of doing nothing is that we increase taxes or reduce benefits. So I plead with my colleagues, stand up and do what is right. Do not demagogue somebody's suggestion of a bill by saying that person is going to ruin your Social Security so do not elect them.

I would call, Mr. Speaker, on every voter at every chance they have to go to a forum of individuals running for Congress or for the Presidency, and ask what bill have they offered or signed on to that is going to make sure that Social Security stays solvent.

I have done this since I first came to Congress 12 years ago, all scored by the Social Security Administration to keep Social Security solvent. I chaired a bipartisan Social Security task force of Republicans and Democrats. By the time we spent a year studying the problem, we all agreed that we needed to do something very quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the White House, the President, and Members of the House and the Senate to move ahead to make sure we save this important program.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair and not to others outside the Chamber.

BIBLICAL PRINCIPLES BEHIND THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Maryland has talked about the budget that was supposed to come out this week, but is now apparently languishing someplace in the back room on the Republican side. The problem apparently is that some want to spend money and some do not, and they cannot agree among themselves and there is going to have to be some twisting and turning before it all happens.

So while we are in that period of waiting for them, I thought that since many in this House have begun to show an interest in Biblical principles on which this country should be run, and certainly on which the government of the United States should operate, I thought it would be good to talk about the Biblical principles behind the budget.

There are a lot of people who want to talk about the Christian teaching and so forth, as though it were an issue of right and wrong and those kinds of things, but if we look carefully at what went on in the New Testament, certainly there is an awful lot of talk about social justice.

There was a day when Christ brought all the people to the mountain and said, I am going to give you a little talk here; it is called the Sermon on the Mount. It is in Matthew 25, for those of my colleagues who have a Bible and read it on a regular basis. They might go and read it. Sort of the latter part of that chapter they will find the instructions that Jesus gave to the people.

A budget is how a society makes a statement about what it really cares about. If we spend our money on military, well that is clearly what we care about. If we spend our money on education, that is another kind of priority. So as the House gets ready to write a budget, we are going to set the priorities of this body for this country for the next year.

Christ started out by talking about feeding people. He said, when somebody's hungry, feed them because when you do that, you feed them in my name. He made it a Biblical priority to do this. Nobody should be hungry. All we have to do is look in this country and look at the problems we have in obesity and all the other things, and we see that this country has problems